Minutes
CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board
27 October 2005 Meeting

Attendees:

Keith Kennedy (CT)	Beth Hartley (NE)	John O'Hara (Volpe)
Chris Campbell (ID/Iteris)	Linda Forrester (NJ)	Ed Roman (Volpe)
Joe Foster (MD)	Steve Trudell (NY)	Andrew Wilson (Volpe)
DJ Waddell (MD/APL)	Laura Ellenbecker (SD)	Jingfei Wu (Volpe)
Barb Hague (MO)	Alana Gourneau (SD)	Nancy Magnusson (APL)
Jodee Alm (MT)	Tammy Duncan (TX)	Beth Roberts (APL)
Cathy Beedle (NE)	Sharon Holland (UT)	Sandy Salazar (APL)
John Casteel (NE)	Bill Guiffre (CSI)	Mary Stuart (APL)
Keith Dey (NE)	Tim Gonsalves (Volpe)	

A meeting of the CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board (ACCB) was held 27 October 2005. The list of CVISN Architecture Open Change Requests (CRs) for Discussion was distributed to the ACCB members via email. The Architecture, SAFER and PRISM Change Requests reviewed at the meeting are attached to these minutes.

Action items assigned appear in the relevant section of the minutes. Comments or corrections to these minutes or the CRs should be sent to Beth Roberts (mailto:Onna.Roberts@jhuapl.edu).

Items that the ACCB recommends for submitting to FMCSA for approval are noted below the action item list. In the attached list of CRs discussed at the meeting, the "Description" section of each CR summarizes the discussion and reflects changes to the CR.

The ACCB minutes and architecture CRs are posted on the Change Request page of the CVISN Web site: http://cvisn.fmcsa.dot.gov/index.html.

The next meeting will be held **17 November 2005** at 2:00 PM EDT.

General Discussion

- Volpe mentioned that there are some problems with the T0031 transaction. These problems should be resolved by next week.

- John O'Hara presented spreadsheets containing a statistical analysis of the data fields being populated per state in the T0022 and T0020 transactions. The data was found to be useful to the states by making them aware of the fact that some of the fields in the transactions were not being routinely populated. Additional requests were made to:
  - Perform an analysis between the two transactions
  - Synchronize with data coming in and data going out – does it match up?
  - Distinguish between states that are PRISM and states that are CVISN
  - Supply actual count of records in conjunction with percentages

o Supply two different numbers – Total and then by State

States can contact John O'Hara at Volpe to work out any data that is missing: (617) 374-2368 or john.o'hara@volpe.dot.gov.

- Barb Hague requested information on how to handle multiple DBA names that are provided in the data field for DBA from SAFER in the T0031 transaction. Her concern is that there can be more than one legal entity registered with the same DOT#, and that divisions of one legal entity use the same DOT #. How do states use this data? What is the purpose of having a string of multiple names in one data field? If the state cannot clearly assign legal responsibility, how can it assign responsibility for Safety? Barb can be contacted at (573) 751-7128 or by e-mail: barbara.hague@modot.mo.gov.

This issue is related to CR 2539, Request to review SAFER business rule regarding USDOT # and IRP account #, which was approved and closed with the recommendation that Volpe review this business rule as documented in the SAFER v4.2 ICD and as implemented in SAFER. This CR will be brought back for discussion at the next ACCB meeting.

CR Discussion

1. **SAFER CR 346**: Enhance T0022D transaction adding a check logic to flag the vehicle when the carrier is out of service.
   This CR was disapproved. The original intent of the T0022D transaction as described in Architecture CR 2563/SAFER CR 51 was 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." The T0022D transaction was not developed for the purpose of deleting vehicles that a state no longer wants in SAFER.

2. **SAFER CR 488**: Modify SAFER to support the initiative for data gathering for the non-registrant carrier.
   The Description of the CR reads: FMCSA has initiated an effort to collect information for non-registrant carriers. Volpe would like to know if states would like to receive this data from SAFER in the T0031v2 transaction.
   A Non-registrant carrier is an illegal carrier not authorized by FMCSA to operate and doesn't have a USDOT #. Most states' CVIEWs match up data by USDOT # and not by name. At the present time and without additional information from FMCSA the states feel that non-registrant data will not be beneficial to them. Volpe will pursue this with FMCSA and will post more information as it becomes available.

Action Items from ACCB Meeting 27 October 2005

1. **Action Item:** Volpe will provide a schema diagram for carrier and vehicle (for DJ)

2. **Action Item** (ongoing): Volpe will check to see which states are currently populating which data fields in the SAFER snapshots. This is an attempt to discover the reasons why certain

snapshot fields are not routinely filled in.

John O'Hara reported on the results of the query run against the data that was uploaded via the T0020 and T0022 transactions. He will continue to explore this analysis and will provide further explanation to the group.

3. **Action Item**: Volpe will pursue with FMCSA the issue of non-registrant carrier data for SAFER CR 488.

4. **Architecture CR 3013 (SAFER CR 139):** Standardization of data values in XML input transactions.

   Action Item: Volpe will update the summary spreadsheet for clarity and post it to the list serv; this will be presented at the November ACCB meeting. The earliest possible implementation would be in the first quarter of next year. Volpe will update CR 131 in Release 4.8 to reflect IRP_Fleet_Number as Mandatory to correspond to the standardization spreadsheet.

Items that the ACCB Recommended for FMCSA ECCB Approval

None.

Items that the ACCB Disapproved

SAFER CR 346: Enhance T0022D transaction adding a check logic to flag the vehicle when the carrier is out of service.

This CR was disapproved because the proposed change was inconsistent with the purpose of T0022D.