Minutes
CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board
23 March 2006

Attendees:

Terri Ungerman (LA, OK)	Tammy Duncan (TX)	Ed Roman (Volpe)
Joe Foster (MD)	Doug Deckert (WA)	Andrew Wilson (Volpe)
DJ Waddell (MD/APL)	Bill Goforth (WA)	Jingfei Wu (Volpe)
Jodee Alm (MT)	Kris Weaver (ACS)	Val Barnes (APL)
John Casteel (NE)	Frank Maly (RL Polk)	Beth Roberts (APL)
Keith Dey (NE)	Chris Campbell (Iteris)	Sandy Salazar (APL)
Jim Rhode (NV)	Dan Coelho (Volpe)	
Linda Forrester (NJ)	Gary DeRusha (Volpe)	

A meeting of the CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board (ACCB) was held 23 March 2006. The list of Change Requests (CRs) that were discussed was distributed to the ACCB members via e-mail prior to the meeting. CRs 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.com).

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.

For those who wish to join the CVISN System Architects' listserv, please contact Mary Beth Dill, mdill@wvadmin.gov, and ask her to add you to the list.

The next meeting will be held **20 April 2006** at 2:00 PM Eastern.

Discussion Items

- **Baselining.** During the discussion on baselining data, a few questions were asked:

  1. Why is it done? Baselines are performed for annual renewals, data correction, and after the recertification process. WA suggested that there needs to be a method of sending and receiving data so the volume is not so large and baselines are not run so often.
  2. What can we do about the volume of data? The amount of time it takes to process the XML files is an issue. NE noted that the XML tag overhead is significant. Several suggestions were proposed for consideration. One option would be to go to a tagless transfer using flat files. Another option proposed would be to have an on-demand on-

call system rather than transport these files. Volpe stated that FMCSA supports XML for data exchange and is moving away from flat files for data transfer. Volpe suggested having update transactions where only the fields that have changed would be sent out instead of the whole record. The subscription process, whereby a state can subscribe to the data that they want, was also proposed. NE asked if it would be cumbersome for Volpe to create different types of subscriptions. Volpe said that it would not be a lot of extra processing because the file would be generated once and then stripped for each subscription. APL suggested that an architecture CR be written as there is a need to look at methods for how to deliver data from SAFER to states.

3. NE asked Volpe if an ongoing purge routine had been implemented for deleting old data and if an output transaction would be implemented to send to the states to delete the old data from their state CVIEWs. Volpe replied that registration records older than two years are being deleted from SAFER, but there are no corresponding T0028D records being sent to the states. This is one reason why states should get a complete update from SAFER periodically. It is left to each state to implement its own routines to delete old records from the state CVIEW.

- **SAFER Release 5.0.** The CRs included in the February release were discussed. Two of the CR candidates for SAFER Release 5.0 – SAFER CR 431 and Phase 2 of SAFER CR 139 – were not implemented in this release. See the CR discussion below.

- **SAFER Release 5.1.** The ACCB reviewed only three of the CR candidates for SAFER Release 5.1 – SAFER CRs 10, 133, and 164 (see the CR discussion below). The discussion of the remaining CR candidates was tabled until the next ACCB meeting due to time constraints.

- **Sidebar Discussion.** In order to help resolve problems in a timelier manner, WA suggested that the states nominate a focus group to make decisions. The focus group members would be responsible for contacting their neighboring states to get comments. NE suggested that once per quarter, the states would all meet face-to-face to resolve CR issues, with non-attendees nominating proxies to vote for them.

CR Discussion

1. **Architecture CR 2798 (SAFER CR 122). Synopsis**: Data integrity issues are resulting from a source other than the authoritative source submitting vehicle registration data to SAFER. **Discussion**: Currently, State A can submit registration data for State B, and SAFER would not reject the transaction. A proposal was developed by a subcommittee of the ACCB and later approved and recommended for FMCSA approval in September 2004. SAFER CR 122 is pending and Volpe said that it was not a current candidate for the SAFER 5.1 release in August. States on the call felt strongly that the issue of management of update authority should be resolved as soon as possible and that the CR should be considered a high priority for the 5.1 release.

2. **Architecture CR 2555 (SAFER CR 108). Synopsis:** The maximum transaction size should be reduced from 5000 records to 2000 records for the T0028 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Output Transaction and the T0031 MCMIS Safety and Census Output Transaction.
Discussion: The CR, originally requested by WA, was recommended for FMCSA approval in March, 2004, but not scheduled for implementation. The states were asked if this change was still desired. Volpe said that a benefit of having a smaller file size would be faster aggregate processing time. WA suggested limiting the .zip file size to a megabyte. NE said they would prefer to receive fewer, larger files. Further discussion is needed, linked to the general issue of data volume.

3. **Architecture CR 733 (SAFER CR 16). Synopsis:** States requested that an XML permit transaction be included in a future version of SAFER. (Updated synopsis)
Discussion: This CR was originally proposed by WI in September, 2002. In order to share permit data through SAFER, we need to define what data is needed in the transaction. Long or short term permits? OS/OW permits? HazMat permits? Intrastate or interstate? NE issues short-term permits and views this as an intrastate concern. However, NV strongly supports the concept of permit transactions, as they issue annual permits and reciprocal permits with other states. Volpe was asked to report on what HazMat Safety Permit data fields are being sent to SAFER.

4. **Architecture CR 66. Synopsis:** A group of states is seeking to include diesel emissions data in inspection reports and flags in snapshots for interstate enforcement of environmental regulations. Corresponding CRs should be issued for changes to ASPEN and/or other inspection support systems.
Discussion: This CR was originally proposed by MD in June, 2000. MD said that sharing this data is important for the northeastern states, subject to Department of the Environment regulations. It would be very helpful if ASPEN supported diesel emissions data. APL will contact east coast states to see if they are still interested. WA will check with state patrols.

5. **SAFER CR 10 (Architecture CR 2412). Synopsis:** Implement SAFER XML subscription capability.
Discussion: This was partially implemented (T0028 only) in October, 2005. It will be extended to T0031 and possibly other transactions. States should let Volpe know which other transactions are of interest. Both CRs will be reopened to include additional transactions. This is a candidate for SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

6. **SAFER CR 133. Synopsis:** Allow SAFER to store one vehicle record per VIN for each jurisdiction.
Discussion: There are many issues with SAFER database design. In particular, the VIN table has design flaws that can cause mismatched vehicle registration and transponder data to be sent in T0028 transactions. This is a high priority CR for the SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

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

Discussion: Phase 1 of this CR was released in SAFER 5.0. Edit checks are in place, and states need to recertify their CVIEWs by the end of the Calendar Year 2006. The VIN/IRP account / IFTA account validation checks will be implemented in Phase 2. Iteris asked if the states will have to recertify again when Phase 2 is released. Volpe said yes. States asked if Phase 2 validation rules would cause SAFER to reject the records. Volpe said that would be up to the stakeholders. If the stakeholders only want a warning and not a rejection, then recertification wouldn't be necessary. This CR will be closed, and the Phase 2 changes will be documented in new Architecture and SAFER CRs.

8. **SAFER CR 164 (Architecture CR 3094). Synopsis:** Add a check constraint to SAFER for the value of IRP_weight_carried.
Discussion: No edit checks are done on this element, so that zero, null or blank weights are possible. This data element holds the "cab card weight" for each jurisdiction, and the value is used for e-screening. The original response to the CR included a lower bound of 10,000 pounds, but, after discussion, it was decided to simply require a numerical value greater than zero. The ACCB originally closed this CR in February, 2005, and included the contents in SAFER CR 139/Architecture CR 3013. Both CRs will be re-opened in their original state instead of including this problem in the new Phase 2 CR for 139/3013. This CR is a candidate for SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

9. **SAFER CR 431 (Architecture CR 3830). Synopsis:** Carrier snapshot changes to include Inspection Count for the OS/OW commercial vehicles and HM permit data to the company snapshot and distribute via T0031 V2 transaction.
Discussion: This was not released in SAFER 5.0 as planned. The SAFER side of the implementation is done, but the MCMIS side still needs to be completed. This CR will be implemented in SAFER Release 5.1 in August.

Action Items from ACCB Meeting 23 March 2006

1. **Action Item**: APL will write a CR regarding the number of DBA name fields requested by states to be handled in SAFER and post to the CVISN System Architects listserv for a 30-day comment period and vote.

2. **Action Item**: APL will write a CR regarding the data volume issue and more efficient baselining (linking CR 2555 to the new CR). This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for a 30-day comment period.

3. **Action Item**: Volpe will see what they can do to ensure Architecture CR 2798 gets into SAFER Release 5.1 (preferable) or 5.2.

4. **Action Item**: APL will add to the CVISN Issues list the suggestion that a face-to-face workshop be scheduled as soon as possible to allow CVISN states and FMCSA (leaders and software maintainers) to better understand and to draft solutions for high priority issues. Since it is likely that not all states will participate, states should nominate a focus group responsible for discussing issues and possible solutions with neighboring jurisdictions so that

all states have an opportunity to make their opinions heard. It is expected that the CVISN states-FMCSA interaction will be ongoing.

5. **Action Item**: Volpe will provide APL with a list of HazMat Safety Permit data currently stored in SAFER. APL will post the list along with Architecture CR 733 to the CVISN System Architects listserv.

6. **Action Item**: APL will contact the east coast states to see if they are still interested in diesel emissions data being included in inspection reports.

7. **Action Item**: Volpe and APL will close out Architecture CR 3013/SAFER CR 139 for Phase 1 edit checks and open a new CR for Phase 2 VIN/IRP/IFTA validation.

8. **Action Item**: APL will reopen Architecture CRs 2412 and 3094.

Items that the ACCB Recommended for FMCSA ECCB Approval

None.

Items that the ACCB Disapproved

None.