2008-07 Open and Approved Architecture CRs

CR Number: 5692

External Reference:

Category: Update COACH Part 1-Deleted/Modified Requirements & Criteria

Component: COACH Part 1

Synopsis: Update COACH Part 1-Deleted/Modified Requirements and Changed Criteria.

Status: Open

Disposition: [2008-07-21] Discussed at 2008-07-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Request additional state input by 2008-08-18.

Description: [2008-07-21] Discussed at 2008-07-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Request additional state input by 2008-08-18.

[2008-07-02] Original

These requirements have been deleted:
- In Table 4.3-2, delete item 4.3.23:
Provide revoked IFTA motor carrier information to other jurisdictions via State On-line Enforcement System (STOLEN).
- In Table 4.4-2, delete subcriteria 2 under item 4.4.1, because the rulemaking was withdrawn:
Be prepared to transition to the sandwich specification after rulemaking is complete. [See the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) regarding DSRC in ITS CVO [Reference 14].]

These requirements have been modified:
– In Table 4.1-1, item #10, change “ANSI ASC X12 EDI transactions are used for some carrier-state information systems’ interactions. XML will be also used in the future” to “HTML/XML are used for most carrier-state information systems’ interactions”;
– In Table 4.2-2, added subcriteria under requirement 4.2.9 regarding implementing CVIEW.
These criteria have been modified:
– In Table 4.2-2, item 4.2.1, change verification approach from “D” to “T/D”;
– In Table 4.3-2, items 4.3.1, 4.3.7, and 4.3.10, delete the subcriteria.
– In Table 4.3-2, items 4.3.7 and 4.3.10, change verification approach from “T” to “T/D”.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 7/21/2008 4:43:10 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 7/2/2008 3:16:09 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On:

CR Number: 5679

External Reference: Terri Ungerman, AR

Category: SAFERSYS UCR query

Component: SAFER Web site

Synopsis: Request carrier name in SAFERSYS UCR query output

Status: Open

Disposition: [2008-07-17] Discussed at ACCB. Clarify CR and IT Systems Change Request.

Description: [2008-07-17] Discussed at 2008-07-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Clarify in this CR and in the IT Systems Change request that the request is simply to display two data elements that are already available in MCMIS and SAFER on the SAFERSYS web screen in the results for the UCR query. Specifically, there are data fields already in MCMIS and SAFER for both legal and DBA name and both are currently available in the T0031 carrier output transactions.

[2008-06-19] Discussed at 2008-06-19 CVISN ACCB meeting. Both the legal name and the Doing Business As (DBA) name should be provided. This CR will be voted on at the 2008-07-17 ACCB meeting. It will also be entered into the HEAT system.

[2008-06-18] Original

Arkansas requests that when querying for UCR information using the safersys web query http://www.safersys.org/UCRQueryForm.aspx that the carrier name also be supplied in the query output. Providing the carrier name in the output would allow weigh station and patrol officers to verify that the carrier for the vehicle in front of them is the same as shown in the UCR query output.
Since the carrier name is not currently present in the output, officers have to make a second query for a company snapshot to get the carrier name. Making additional queries is time consuming and causes unnecessary backlog of vehicles at weigh stations.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 7/21/2008 1:00:06 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 6/18/2008 3:29:57 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5678

External Reference:

Category: Update COACH Part 1

Component: COACH Part 1

Synopsis: Update COACH Part 1, which was last published in 2003.

Status: Open

Disposition: [2008-07-21] Discussed at 2008-07-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Request additional state input by 2008-08-18.

Description: [2008-07-21] Discussed at 2008-07-17 CVISN ACCB meeting. Request additional state input by 2008-08-18.

[2008-07-10] Original

Changes to the wording were implemented to simplify the text and increase readability. Other types of changes made are noted below:
– Change all references to JHU/APL CVISN Web site to FMCSA CVISN Web site;
– Update document point of contact;
– Delete note referring to the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act;
– Delete summary of changes at the beginning of the document;
– Delete hyperlinks that do not work;
– Delete Figure 1-1 “The COACH Supports the Workshops” and references to workshops;
– Delete Figure 1-2 “CVISN System Design – Stakeholder View”. Section 1.3 in the old version, “How States Should Use This Document”, becomes Section 1.4 in this version;
– Change “state” to “jurisdiction” in all statements regarding IRP and IFTA agreements;
– Add summary of Core CVISN requirements in Section 1.3;
– Delete material on EDI, CAT, and outdated safety systems;
– In Chapter 4 tables, change “Req Level” from “Req Level (L1/E/C)” to “Req Level (Core/Expanded)” with values
o (Core) This rating identifies a Core CVISN compatibility requirement.
o (Expanded) This rating indicates an Expanded CVISN capability that a Core CVISN compliant state may choose to implement.
– Delete CR numbers from the tables in Chapter 4;
– In Chapter 4, shade cells in tables where user is not supposed to enter a value;
– In Chapter 4.3, replaced “Carrier Registration [Single State Registration System (SSRS)]” with “Carrier Registration [Unified Carrier Registration (UCR)]”;
– In Chapter 4.3, delete the text:
• FMCSA encourages the exploration of XML as an alternative to EDI for computer-to-computer interfaces between carriers and states.
This is a policy regarding Core CVISN. If a state chooses to first implement a Web-based (person-to-computer) credentialing approach, then implementation of a computer-to-computer interface is considered an Enhanced capability. Similarly, if a state first chooses to implement a computer-to-computer credentialing approach, then implementation of a Web-based interface is considered an Enhanced capability.
– In Table 4.4.1, add the concept: “Electronic screening is provided using license plate readers or technology other than DSRC transponders”;
– Add new Chapter 5, “Data Maintenance Requirements”, which was previously in COACH Part 3;
– Delete references to documents that are going to be/have been archived;
– Delete following references:
o ASTM Standard E2158-01, Standard Specification for Dedicated Short Range

Communication (DSRC) Physical Layer Using Microwave in the 902 to 928 MHz Band, September 2002.
o ASTM, PS105-99 Standard Provisional Specification for Dedicated Short-Range Communication (DSRC) Data Link Layer, June 2000.
o IEEE Standard 1455-99, Standard for Message Sets for Vehicle/Roadside Communications, September 1999.
o The U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Proposed Rule: Dedicated Short Range Communications In Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Commercial Vehicle Operations, 23 CFR Part 945, [FHWA Docket No. FHWA 99-5844] RIN 2125-AE63, published in Federal Register: December 30, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 250)], Page 73674-73742. Available from the Federal Register Online via GPO Access, http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces140.html [DOCID:fr30de99-43].
– Add following references:
o John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (Volpe Center), Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) Interface Certification Procedure (ICP) Version 1.0, July 2003. The latest version will be available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) CVISN Web site.
o Volpe Center, SAFER Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window (CVIEW) Interface Re-Certification, v7, January 2008. The latest version will be available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) CVISN Web site.
o Volpe Center, SAFER CVISN State Data Baseline Procedure, Version 1.0, March 2008. The latest version will be available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) CVISN Web site.
o JHU/APL, Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Architecture [Revised], POR-02-7364 V3.0, December 2006. The latest version will be available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) CVISN Web site.
o Volpe Center, SAFER Interface Control Document, Version 8.1, March 2008. The latest version will be available on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) CVISN Web site.
– Delete Appendix B “Change Requests (CRs) Incorporated into Previous Versions”;
– Add new Appendix B “Recommended End-to-End Tests”;
– Delete references to CRs that were addressed in the previous version of the document;
– Delete references to SSRS;
– Change references to “CVISN Level 1” to “Core CVISN”;
– Change references to “Enhanced CVISN” to “Expanded CVISN”;
– Change column “Recommended Interoperability Tests for Technical Deployment” in Appendix A checklists to “Comments”;
– Delete column with pairwise tests from tables in Appendix A.

Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C
Modified Time:	7/21/2008 4:42:32 PM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	6/18/2008 2:39:04 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No

Type: Adaptive Change

Closed On:

CR Number: 5544

External Reference: Terri Ungerman, OK

Category: Standard Code Set

Component: Federal Safety Systems

Synopsis: Need for Standard Code Set

Status: Approved

Disposition: [2008-06-04] Approved by FMCSA.

Description: [2008-06-04] Approved by FMCSA. J. Lane email to J. Curtis:
Janet,
Could you please look this over and let me know if you are okay with the change? We accepted from CVISNs perspective.
Thank you,
Julie

[2008-05-22] Recommended for approval – 15 approve, 36 non-voters.

[2008-04-21] Discussed at 2008-04-17 ACCB meeting. This topic was originally discussed at the CVISN Deployment Workshop in March 2007. It will be voted on at the 22 May ACCB meeting.

[2008-03-25] Initial posting

Oklahoma requests that SAFER, ASPEN, and other federally available commercial vehicle enforcement software use the vehicle codes from a standard set of Vehicle Use Type Codes. All vehicle codes wouldn't need to be available for each software package, but each software package should use a subset of the standard set of Vehicle Use Type Codes.

As an example of the current misalignment of codes between SAFER and ASPEN, attached is a comparison of ASPEN codes as used by Oklahoma, and SAFER codes.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names: CR5544_SAFER-ASPENcodes.xls

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 6/20/2008 10:01:56 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 4/2/2008 5:38:56 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5348

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

Category: SAFER Upload

Component: SAFER

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

Status: Deferred

Disposition: [2008-04-21] Deferred.

Description: [2008-04-09] Bill Goforth email: There was very little response to the letter. Florida is the only state that requested we not send their data and that was because they were in the process of being certified.

(Suggest having) its status changed to pending further analysis. It adds another layer of complexity to SAFER and CVIEW that, right now, seems like overkill. We can always resurrect this CR if we start encountering problems with states abusing their right to upload data for other states.

[2007-10-22] Discussed at 2007-10-18 ACCB meeting.
NE noted that there are privacy concerns with a state sending cab card information to SAFER without the state's permission. It was suggested that FMCSA should take the lead and send "data upload request" letters to all non-CVISN states on behalf of all certified CVISN states. It was also suggested that a non-authoritative source first send any registration data they wish to upload to SAFER to the base state for verification before uploading it to SAFER. WA stated that the point of the CR is to get more registration data into SAFER. Some states on the call felt that if states are receiving CVISN funds, they should be willing to have registration data uploaded to SAFER. APL took the action item to present this issue to FMCSA.

[2007-10-18] Initial posting

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

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

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

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

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

JURISDICTION varchar(4) -- Country/Jurisdiction
AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS varchar(255) (or could be a secondary table)
CAN_UPLOAD_FOR_OTHERS_FLAG char(1) – "1" or "0"

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

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

A jurisdiction will send a written request to the ACCB to specify the jurisdiction(s) that are authorized to upload T0019, T0020, T0021 and T0022 data on their behalf. By only specifying their own jurisdiction for AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS, the authoritative source jurisdiction can prevent any other jurisdiction from uploading data on their behalf. The right to specify AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS can be revoked by the ACCB if it is found that a jurisdiction (or its delegate) is unable to upload their data and make corrections in a reasonable time frame (for example, where a current cab card does not agree with data uploaded to SAFER or a state loses its SAFER certification for an extended period of time). In this case, AUTHORIZED_UPLOAD_JURISDICTIONS will be reset to "ANY".

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact:

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 4/21/2008 4:23:30 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 10/18/2007 6:06:28 AM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5234

External Reference: WA, SAFER CR 1782

Category: Data Quality

Component: SAFER web page; A&I web page

Synopsis: Published ISS-D scores should agree with scores sent via XML

Status: Approved

Disposition: [2007-08-24] Approved by FMCSA.

Description: [2008-06-19] Implementation had been planned for March 2008 but has been deferred until after September 2008.

[2007-08-24] Approved by FMCSA

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

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

CVISN users request to see consistent ISS score from SAFER and from the T0031 download file. Currently the ISS score is refreshed monthly from SafeStat and MCMIS. The SafeStat online web site displays the ISS score that is refreshed monthly. However, SAFER computes the ISS score for carriers that have insufficient data and this is done

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

[2007-06-04] Bill Goforth, WA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time:	6/20/2008 10:35:15 AM
Modified By:	Salazar Sandra B
Entered On:	7/18/2007 5:00:41 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	

CR Number:	5088
External Reference:	ARCH CR 4991
Category:	Business Rules
Component:	SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis:	Business Rules to Support Data Quality Regarding USDOT Number
Status:	Open
Disposition:	[2007-08-24] Open. This CR captures a goal. It will not be voted on at this time.
Description:	[2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. This CR captures a goal. It will not be voted on at this time. [2007-03-21] At the CVISN Deployment Workshop, it was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states. State Upload Rules for Registration Data: • The state must capture the IRP licensee's USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it at the carrier account level (IRP_CARRIER_ID_NUMBER field) in the T0020 IRP Account Input transaction. • The state must capture the safety (carrier responsible for safety) USDOT number during vehicle registration and provide it in the SAFETY_CARRIER field of the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input transaction. ---------- Impact Summary: SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD) SAFER - Enforce these business rules. State business processes State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems
Fix:	
Comment:	
Attachment names:	
Responsibility:	Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time:	9/10/2007 2:53:20 PM
Modified By:	Magnusson Nancy C
Entered On:	5/31/2007 5:19:25 PM
Entered By:	Salazar Sandra B
Severity:	Medium
Priority:	No
Type:	Defect
Closed On:	

CR Number:	5087
External Reference:	ARCH CR 4991
Category:	Business Rules
Component:	SAFER/CVIEW
Synopsis:	Interim Business Rules to Support Data Quality Regarding USDOT Number
Status:	Approved
Disposition:	[2007-09-24] Approved by FMCSA.
Description:	[2007-09-21] Approved by FMCSA

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

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

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

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

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

State Upload Rules:

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

Impact Summary:

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

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

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

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

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

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 5086

External Reference: ARCH CR 4991

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

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

Status: Approved

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

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

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

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

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

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

• If a state is going to send a T0019 IFTA Input Transaction for a carrier, it should send the T0019 before sending a T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
• If the IFTA field (IFTA_LICENSE_NUMBER) in the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction is non-blank, it must be a valid IFTA account based in the same

jurisdiction as the IRP base state and a corresponding T0019 with the same IFTA account number must be in place.
• The IFTA field (IFTA_LICENSE_NUMBER) in the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction may be blank, for those states that do not associate IFTA and IRP.

Impact Summary:

State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems – states agree to enforce these rules
SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)
SAFER - Volpe/SAFER will enforce these rules and specifically these Processing Rules:
• Volpe needs to process files from a state in the order sent.
More specific information will be included in the analysis section of the corresponding SAFER CR.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Salazar Sandra B

Modified Time: 9/24/2007 6:46:29 AM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

Entered On: 5/31/2007 5:12:03 PM

Entered By: Salazar Sandra B

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 4991

External Reference: ARCH CRs 5086, 5087, 5088, SCR 147

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

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

Status: Approved

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

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

[2007-09-20] Recommended for FMCSA approval by vote of 13-0.

[2007-08-24] Discussed at ACCB meeting 2007-08-23. Vote at ACCB meeting on 20 September 2007.

[2007-07-26] Has been rewritten.

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

Rewritten version appears here:

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

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

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

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

Impact Summary:

State CVIEW or CVIEW-equivalent systems – states agree to enforce these rules
SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD)
SAFER - Volpe/SAFER will enforce these rules and specifically these Processing Rules:
• Volpe needs to process files from a state in the order sent.
• Volpe will reject vehicle (T0022) records if the referenced fleet or carrier is not in SAFER.
• Volpe will reject the fleet (T0021) record if the referenced carrier is not in SAFER.
More specific information will be included in the analysis section of the corresponding SAFER CR.

OLD:

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

State Upload Rules (related to uploading IRP-related data):
• If changing carrier data, a state only needs to send the T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
• If changing or adding fleet data, a state should send the T0021 IRP Fleet Input Transaction. A corresponding T0020 transaction must be in place.
• If changing or adding vehicle data, a state should send the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction. Corresponding T0021 and T0020 transactions must be in place.
• If a state is baselining, all three transactions (T0020, T0021, and T0022) must be sent.
• A state must complete sending the T0020 before the T0021, the T0021 before the

T0022, etc.
• If adding new carrier, fleet, and vehicles, a state should send the T0020, then T0021, then T0022s.
• If the IFTA field in the T0022 is non-blank, it must be a valid IFTA account and a corresponding T0019 must be in place.
• For exempt states, rules about bogus values are needed (see action item below).
• If a state is going to send a T0019 IFTA Input Transaction for a carrier, it should send the T0019 before sending a T0020.
• The state must provide the USDOT number at the carrier IRP account level.
• If a CVISN state does not have the safety USDOT number for a vehicle, it must provide the IRP USDOT number in the "safety carrier" field. (Beware: the vehicle may be driving for a different carrier on a particular trip.)
• For PRISM states, the state should report the safety USDOT number in the "safety carrier" field.
• CVISN wants all states to start capturing safety USDOT number.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 12/21/2007 2:19:54 PM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 4/12/2007 1:04:00 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Defect

Closed On:

CR Number: 4990

External Reference:

Category: Business Rules

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Business Rules to Support Data Timeliness

Status: Approved

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact Summary:

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

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/21/2007 8:11:39 AM

Modified By: Salazar Sandra B

Entered On: 4/12/2007 1:01:06 PM

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 4674

External Reference: SAFER CR 797

Category: Data integrity

Component: SAFER

Synopsis: Modification to data requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER

Status: Approved

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

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

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

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

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17/06 ACCB meeting
The PRISM team noted that this CR should be consistent with the PRISM Procedures Manual. In particular, the difference between GVW (gross vehicle weight – the weight the carrier declares at registration) and GVWR (gross vehicle weight rating – the weight that the manufacturer stamps on the inside of the power unit door) was discussed. The Volpe PRISM team agreed to reconcile the PRISM Procedures Manual with CVISN by using GVW rather than GVWR. They would also like the lower limit to be 0 rather than 4000 lbs.

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

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

The proposed modification to the edit check for the SAFETY_CARRIER field is that SAFER will allow null for the SAFETY_CARRIER field only if the GVW is provided in the T0022 transaction and the value is under 10,000 lbs and greater than 4,000 lbs. Regardless of the GVW, if the vehicle has three or more axles, the DOT number is required for the SAFETY_CARRIER field. Other situations where the DOT number is required for PRISM are when vehicles of any size haul placardable quantities of HM and when Limo's are subject to Federal insurance requirements that need to be defined.

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

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

comment.

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

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

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

The new requirement for SAFETY_CARRIER will be as following:
1. Conditional mandatory for CVISN states participating in PRISM only if the IRP_weight_Carrier for the vehicle is over 6,000 lb or to be defined.

2. Optional for CVISN only states and carriers whose vehicle IRP weight carried in under 6,000 lb or to be defined

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

Volpe will post the CR to the listserv for comment.

[2006-05-12] PRISM stakeholder requested to re-visit the data requirement for safety_carrier. After SAFER version 4.9, safety_carrier becomes a conditional mandatory field in T0022 transaction. That requires CVISN/PRISM states to populate safety_carrier data field for all vehicle uploaded to SAFER. This is not required for CVISN-only states. The proposed modification is when the IRP_Weight_Carried is under 6,000 lbs or to be determined, the carrier responsible for safety of the vehicle doesn't required to have DOT number. Therefore, the safety_carrier field does not need to be filled.

Fix:

Comment:

Attachment names:

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

Modified Time: 9/10/2007 2:50:18 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

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

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 4651

External Reference: CR3013, SAFER CR 705

Category: SAFER XML, SAFER ICD

Component: SAFER/CVIEW

Synopsis: Implement VIN, IRP Account and IFTA Account validation for SAFER XML Service input transaction.

Status: Open

Disposition: [2007-07-26] Open. Pending Volpe review of reqts. submitted by States.

Description: [2007-07-26] Discussed at ACCB meeting. Volpe will present update on consolidated requirements 2007-08-23 ACCB meeting.

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

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

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

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

[2006-05-04] re discussion of CR 3013 at 4/20/06 ACCB meeting.
CR 3013 was closed, and the Phase 2 (VIN/IRP/IFTA) validation checks will be documented in Architecture CR 4651 (SAFER CR 705).

[2006-04-19]
CR 3013 was closed at the 3/23/06 ACCB meeting. Phase 2 of that CR is moved to this CR. The following are segments from the old CR that pertain.
"VIN validation was the topic of discussion for this CR. Jingfei Wu (Volpe) pointed out that only the data formatting rules will be enforced, and the IFTA/IRP/VIN validation will be in the following release of SAFER after receiving comments from stakeholders. Some states expressed an interest in getting a warning for invalid VINs instead of rejections. Validation is done at the jurisdiction site because of home-made VINs that the state considers valid. These VINs would fail the VIN validation routine at SAFER. It was suggested that states send their VIN patterns to Volpe so SAFER can check against those as well. Phase 1 of the implementation will be to enforce the edit checks for the formatting rules listed in the specification document. After a state is recertified, the rules will be enforced for that state. Phase 2 of this CR will enforce IFTA/IRP/VIN validation."

"The VIN/IRP account / IFTA account validation checks will be implemented in Phase 2. Iteris asked if the states will have to recertify again when Phase 2 is released. Volpe said

yes. States asked if Phase 2 validation rules would cause SAFER to reject the records. Volpe said that would be up to the stakeholders. If the stakeholders only want a warning and not a rejection, then recertification wouldn't be necessary."

Fix:

Comment:

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

Responsibility:

Modified Time: 9/7/2007 12:10:43 PM

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

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

Entered By: Magnusson Nancy C

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Enhancement

Closed On:

CR Number: 733

External Reference: Tania Rossouw, WI - VOLPE CR 16

Category: Need for permit snapshots

Component: CVISN Architecture and Standards

Synopsis: States requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

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

Status: Open

Disposition: [2006-08-21] Open pending stakeholder comment.

Description: [2006-11-27] Attachment from SD added.

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

[2006-08-21] Discussed at the 8/17 ACCB meeting
Data element requirements for HazMat permits from the Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures, which includes 7 states, were posted to the listserv. Terri Ungerman also noted that since there will be other types of permits besides HazMat, a Permit Type data

element should be added. Perhaps there should also be a way to indicate for which states a particular permit type is applicable. SD has identified about 30 different types of permits (www.SDTruckinfo.com). The CR will remain open during this requirements gathering phase. Volpe will define each proposed data element. States are asked to continue to provide comments via the listserv.

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

SAFER fields - Recommendations
as of August 4, 2006

Alliance for Uniform HazMat Procedures

Participating States
Illinois IL
Michigan MI
Minnesot MN
Nevada NV
Ohio OH
Oklahoma OK
West Virginia WV

Credential Unique Identifier - AAA-NNNNNNNN-AA
AAA =
UPM = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste, in all states but OH and MN.
UPW = Hazmat, including Hazardous Waste in OH and MN & for NV Radioactive Waste after Part lll Review
UPR = Intrastate Carrier only (without reciprocity into other states)
NNNNNNNN = 8 digit USDOT #
AA = Two digit Issuing State

Credential Expiration Date (Not Applicable for P status)
MM-DD-YYYY

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

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

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

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

[2006-04-25] This CR will be posted to the listserv for a 30-day comment period.
Stakeholder action:
1. Review the attached document for Permit data already being sent to SAFER via

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

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

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

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

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

[initial posting]
At the Sept. 19, 2002 ACCB meeting, Tania Rossouw of Wisconsin requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

Fix:

Comment:

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

Responsibility: Magnusson Nancy C

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

Modified By: Magnusson Nancy C

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

Entered By: Goldfarb Robert H

Severity: Medium

Priority: No

Type: Suggestion

Closed On:

Total: 14