

## Summary of Open/Recent Architecture CRs 2005-03-22

**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 Disapproved

**Disposition:** [2005-03-01] Disapproved; incorporated into CR 3013.

**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

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment Names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Modified Time:** 3/1/2005 10:37:05 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 2/14/2005 3:46:44 PM  
**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Defect  
**Closed On:** 3/1/2005 10:37:05 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\_CARRIER) 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 screening 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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-12-16] Recommended for FMCSA approval as a versioned T0031.

**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.

Impact on architecture:

-----

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 12/17/2004 12:39:53 PM

**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:**

---

**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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-12-16] Recommended for FMCSA approval as a versioned T0031.

**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.

Impact on architecture:  
-----

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment Names:** SAFER Company New Entrant Code.pdf

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 12/17/2004 12:39:36 PM

**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:**

---

**CR Number:** 3013

**External Reference:** 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.

Proposal: Volpe will draft SAFER data requirements and distribute to stakeholder for review and discussion.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-11-22] Recommended for FMCSA approval. Volpe will report on analysis results.

**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 2094 (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.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment Names:** CR139\_data standardization.xls

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 3/21/2005 10:50:15 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:**

---

**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:** New

**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.

-----  
Impact on SAFER:

Impact on States:

Impact on architecture:

Impact on documentation:

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 11/12/2004 11:43:46 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2954

**External  
Reference:** SAFER CR 131; ARC CR 2728; SAFER CR 138

**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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-11-22] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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.

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:**

**Modified Time:** 11/24/2004 10:01:34 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:**

---

**CR Number:** 2936

**External Reference:** SAFER CR pending

**Category:** New data element needed

**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards

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

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

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

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-10-25] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

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

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

[2004-09-27] Presented and discussed at the 2004-09-27 ACCB meeting.

CR 2936 will be posted to the CVISN System Architects list serv for comments and will be voted on at the October ACCB.

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

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

Impact on documentation:  
SAFER ICD

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

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 10/25/2004 1:30:48 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Entered By:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-10-25] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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.

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:**  
**Modified Time:** 10/25/2004 1:29:21 PM  
**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:**

---

**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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-10-25] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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".

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 10/25/2004 1:26:30 PM

**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:**

---

**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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-08-19] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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 dissenting votes, so recommended for FMCSA approval.

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:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Modified Time:** 10/18/2004 2:09:34 PM

**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:**

---

**CR Number:** 2798

**External  
Reference:** DJ Waddell - MD - 240-228-5878

**Category:** Business rules/process to clarify data source

**Component:** SAFER/CVIEW

**Synopsis:** Synopsis: Data integrity issues are resulting from a source, other than the authoritative source, submitting vehicle registration data to SAFER.

Summary: A source other than the authoritative source can submit vehicle registration data to SAFER. If the authoritative source later updates the information, the data already in SAFER may be overwritten. Business rules/process need to be established (a) to clarify the source of data and (b) to coordinate data entry/update by

authoritative source and authorized but not 'authoritative' source.

Proposal: The proposal consists of several clauses.

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

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-09-27] Recommended for FMCSA approval. Will be posted to CVISN System Architects list serv for review.

**Description:** 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.

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

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

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

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

The registration data is sent to SAFER by MD CVIEW.

Analysis is needed on potential data collisions. If an authoritative source for vehicle registration data begins to contribute data to SAFER, and provides an update to one of the registration records entered by another source, the new data will probably overwrite the data already in SAFER. For example, if the IRP base state updates registration data entered by the MD e-screening program, this would probably un-enroll the vehicle from MD E-Screening, since transponder number and

CVIS\_DEFAULT\_CARRIER USDOT number would probably not be provided by the IRP base state, and they would probably be replaced by NULL.

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

#### Vehicle Registration Data Fields:

##### Mandatory Fields:

VIN

License plate number

License plate state (= IRP base state)

Registration expiration date

IRP registered weight for the e-screening state

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

Transponder identifier

##### Optional Fields:

Title number

Title jurisdiction

Owner name

Unit number

Model year

Make

Type

Fuel type

GVW

Unladen weight

Number of axles (truck)

Number of seats (bus)

Registration start date

[2004-07-19] Presented and discussed at the 7/15/04 ACCB meeting.

This CR will be posted to the CVISN Systems Architects list serv for discussion; no decision is being proposed at this time. A conference call will be scheduled for the week of August 16 if states are interested.

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

1. The attached Word document contains some background notes for the upcoming conference regarding CVISN Architecture CR 2798.

2. The attached spreadsheet contains the number of IRP records by IRP base state currently in the SAFER database. The relatively small number of records for some states are typically records that were entered to support E-Screening enrollment or PRISM vehicle targeting for another State.

[2004-08-23] This CR was discussed at the July and August ACCB meetings, and at a

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

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

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

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

Impact on architecture:  
None

Impact on documentation:  
SAFER ICD

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

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

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

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 9/28/2004 6:50:13 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 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 volume for download. Instead, SAFER will provide those carrier data to the states via the SAFER web service interface. This function will be implemented in conjunction 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:** Terri Ungerman (LA)

**Category:** SAFER XML

**Component:** SAFER/PRISM/CVIEW

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

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2004-06-17] Open pending further discussion.

**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.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:**

**Modified Time:** 6/28/2004 7:30:44 AM

**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:**

---

**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:** Open

**Disposition:** [2004-06-17] Open pending further analysis.

**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 yyyyymmdd date Mandatory the date on the current registration  
Registration Date Expiration yyyyymmdd 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:**

**Modified Time:** 6/22/2004 6:14:04 PM

**Modified By:** Salazar Sandra B.

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

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**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 were 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 yyyyymmdd date  
Registration Date Expiration yyyyymmdd date  
Make 10 string  
Model Year yyyy date  
Last Census Update Date yyyyymmdd date  
Vehicle Last Update Date yyyyymmdd 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 9:55:11 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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-07-19] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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.

=====  
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:** 9/16/2004 12:29:18 PM

**Modified By:** Salazar Sandra B.



**Entered On:** 3/25/2004 9:39:26 AM

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 2562

**External Reference:** SAFER CR # 50

**Category:** XML, EDI, ICD

**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards

**Synopsis:** Request to review SAFER business rule regarding multiple VINs

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** [2005-03-01] Open pending further comment and analysis.

**Description:** Submitted on Dec 16th, 2003  
Nebraska is requesting that the following SAFER business rule be reviewed.

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

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

[2004-03-11] Discussed at 2004-01-15 ACCB meeting.

It was recommended that states not send a vehicle registration to SAFER when it is in a transitional state.

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

[2004-08-23] Discussed at 2004-08-19 ACCB meeting.

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

[2005-02-08] Discussed at 2005-01-20 ACCB meeting (as Volpe CR 50)

Volpe updates 2005-02-03 to CR 50:

"At the request of the stakeholder, this CR is reopened since CR 50 was created primarily for a transitional data issue. There are other business scenarios where non-transitional data in the state IRP system need to be uploaded to SAFER but are currently rejected by SAFER due to the business rule violation. The data sent by the states may contain both active and inactive records for the same vehicle as states desire to have inactive statuses sent to SAFER in order to ensure that the most accurate data are kept there and sent to other jurisdictions. This would require SAFER to modify the business logic to allow one vehicle to have more than one record accepted during data input processing. Additionally, states may have business practices where multiple license plates need to exist for one vehicle within the jurisdiction and this is not allowed by the existing SAFER business rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IMPACT on architecture:

No impact on documentation (other than SAFER ICD)

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Entered By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 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 7:50:02 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

**Category:** Change to file size limit

**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards

**Synopsis:** 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.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-03-18] Recommended at ACCB meeting. for future SAFER release.

**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.

**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:**

**Modified Time:** 9/17/2004 6:28:53 PM

**Modified By:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Entered On:** 3/19/2004 11:44:28 AM

**Entered By:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**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:** 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:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-08-19] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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".

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Modified Time:** 9/27/2004 1:44:37 PM

**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:**

---

**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:** Request for XML subscription capability

Summary: This CR requests that a subscription capability, similar to that used for the EDI interface, be made available for the XML interface.

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

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2004-07-19] Recommended for FMCSA approval.

**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 through 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

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:**  
**Modified Time:** 7/26/2004 12:51:02 PM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 10/14/2003 11:53:58 AM  
**Entered By:** Salazar Sandra B.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Defect  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 733

**External Reference:** Tania Rossouw, WI - VOLPE CR 16

**Category:** Need for permit snapshots

**Component:** CVISN Architecture and Standards

**Synopsis:** Since SAFER was originally developed in contained a capability to process carrier and vehicle permit data in an "assumed" form and data content. To this date, no organization or application has ever sent permit data - of any kind - to SAFER. We do not know if the original software and EDI design is correct or at all useful. At this point in time SAFER is not aware of any intention of any organization or application to send either carrier or vehicle permit data to SAFER. Unless a specific source of carrier or vehicle permit data can be identified, SAFER requests that the requirement for carrier and vehicle permit data processing be deleted.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2002-10-18 ncm] Recommended for FMCSA approval. Open pending inclusion in future version of SAFER.

**Description:** At the Sept. 19, 2002 ACCB meeting, Tania Rossouw of Wisconsin requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER.

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

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
Names:**

**Responsibility:** Goldfarb Robert H.

**Modified Time:** 5/19/2004 8:24:47 AM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

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

**Entered By:** Goldfarb Robert H.

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Suggestion

**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 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 it be provided, and in what form.

**Status:** Recommended

**Disposition:** [2002-10-18 ncm] Recommended for FMCSA approval. Open pending inclusion in future version of SAFER.

**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.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment**

**Names:**  
**Responsibility:**  
**Modified Time:** 5/19/2004 8:24:29 AM  
**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.  
**Entered On:** 9/18/2002 8:29:29 AM  
**Entered By:** Goldfarb Robert H.  
**Severity:** Medium  
**Priority:** No  
**Type:** Suggestion  
**Closed On:**

---

**CR Number:** 66

**External Reference:** CR 1082

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

**Component:** Snapshots

**Synopsis:** A group of states is seeking to include diesel emissions data in inspection reports and flags in snapshots for interstate enforcement of environmental regulations. Corresponding CRFs should be issued for changes to ASPEN and/or other inspection support systems. The original emails from Massachusetts and New Jersey are in the folder \PVO\Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\CRF\_1082. Also in that folder are two presentations made originally at the Eastern States CVISN Design Workshop that spell out the proposal.

submitted by DJ Waddell 6/9/2000

**Status:** Open

**Disposition:** Open pending more information from states.

**Description:** Analysis is provided in \PVO\Config Mgmt\CRF Database\CRFs\Attachments\CRF\_1082\Diesel Emissions.doc

Waddell 10/27/2000

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

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

**Responsibility:** Salazar Sandra B.

**Modified Time:** 12/21/2001 5:18:03 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:** Defect

**Closed On:**

---

**Total:** 34