**Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)**
**Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO)**

# Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN)

# Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues

# Summary Report

**Baseline Issue**

Department of Transportation Contract Number DTFH61-99-C-00051, Task No. PQJ13

**NSTD-07-0416 V1.0**

**May 2007**

*Prepared by:*

The Johns Hopkins University
APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY
11100 Johns Hopkins Road
Laurel, MD 20723-6099

*Prepared for:*

U.S. Department of Transportation
**Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration**

***Note***

*The Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act was signed into law on December 9, 1999. This act established a new Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) within the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), effective January 1, 2000. Prior to that, the motor carrier and highway safety program was administered under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).*

*The mission of the FMCSA is to improve truck and commercial passenger carrier safety on our nation's highways through information technology, targeted enforcement, research and technology, outreach, and partnerships. The FMCSA manages the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/Commercial Vehicle Operations (CVO) Program, a voluntary effort involving public and private partnerships that uses information systems, innovative technologies, and business practice re-engineering to improve safety, simplify government administrative systems, and provide savings to states and motor carriers. The FMCSA works closely with the FHWA's ITS Joint Program Office (JPO) to ensure the integration and interoperability of ITS/CVO systems with the national ITS program.*



**Note:** This document and other CVISN-related documentation are available for review and downloading by the ITS/CVO community from the FMCSA CVISN site on the World Wide Web. The URL for the CVISN site is: http://cvisn.fmcsa.dot.gov/.

Review and comments to this document are welcome. Please send comments to:

Ms. Sandra B. Salazar
JHU/APL CVISN Project
Phone: 240-228-7610
Fax: 240-228-2144
E-Mail: sandra.salazar@jhuapl.edu

**Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN)**
**Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues**
**Summary Report**

## Table of Contents

# Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues Summary Report

## Executive Summary

In the summer of 2006, states suggested that the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) plan a face-to-face workshop to tackle Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) deployment concerns and issues related to data integrity, data quality, and data availability, and to discuss common business rules related to maintenance and usability of the data that is exchanged via the Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) System. After months of preparation by FMCSA, the states, and Volpe, the *CVISN Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues* was held March 20–22, 2007, at the National Training Center in Arlington, Virginia.

The workshop accomplished the objective of bringing together leaders of the federal and state CVISN community for a productive discussion of issues that have been hampering successful Core CVISN deployment nationwide. It provided a unique opportunity for FMCSA to meet in person with multiple state CVISN champions and work directly with them to resolve issues. More than 30 jurisdictions participated either directly or through their CVISN contractors and 17 federal staff participated in at least part of the three-day workshop.

More than 40 specific action items were assigned to organizations or individuals; most of these are currently being addressed, and some have already been closed. Some of the key decisions and recommendations resulting from workshop discussions include:

- Business rules that address how frequently data must be sent, both from states and to the states
- Business rules that address how states upload International Registration Plan-related data
- Business rules that address how Volpe/SAFER processes certain eXtensible Markup Language transactions received from states
- Establishment of an ongoing, proactive data quality/operational issues focus group charged with the responsibilities of identifying and working on issues, and recommending solutions
- Improvements in the CVISN Architecture configuration control process
- Improvements in FMCSA Technical Support to CVISN stakeholders, with an emphasis on more proactive communications and support
- Need for performance measurement, including establishment of metrics, monitoring of processes, and tracking of problems

Participants' evaluations of the workshop were very favorable. However, as noted by many participants, the ultimate conclusion as to whether the workshop was truly a success will be decided months from now. It will depend on:

- follow-through on the many action items assigned to states, Volpe, and FMCSA
- resolution of certain key issues by federal and state decision-makers
- continuing the spirit of cooperation and collaboration among the federal and state motor carrier safety community

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the Workshop

In the summer of 2006, states suggested that the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) plan a face-to-face workshop to tackle Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks (CVISN) deployment concerns and issues related to data integrity, data quality, and data availability and to discuss common business rules related to maintenance and usability of the data that is exchanged via the Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) System. The CVISN Deployment Workshop was a unique opportunity for FMCSA to meet in person with multiple state CVISN champions and work directly with them to resolve issues.

After months of preparation by FMCSA, the states, and Volpe, more than 25 states plus the District of Columbia participated either directly or through their CVISN contractors at the *CVISN Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues* held March 20–22, 2007, at the National Training Center in Arlington, Virginia.

## 1.2 Purpose of this Document

This summary document captures the discussion highlights and actions items of the three-day workshop. For a number of the issues, action plans will be developed and documented separately.

## 1.3 Pre-Workshop Activities

FMCSA held four pre-workshop teleconferences with CVISN stakeholders between January and March 2007. The first teleconference was held on January 25, 2007. Jeff Secrist explained the overall goal of the workshop—to advance successful Core CVISN deployment nationwide. He listed the specific objectives:

- to make substantial progress on solving long-standing CVISN deployment problems, as articulated by states and documented in "Core CVISN Deployment Issues" [Reference (1)]
- to obtain help from FMCSA information technology (IT) staff on data quality and efficiency issues
- to obtain support from FMCSA program staff in settling business rules issues

Mr. Secrist invited the states to participate in pre-workshop teleconferences and preparation activities to identify what needed to be addressed in face-to-face discussions, to refine the problem statements for the problems suitable for workshop discussion, and to address certain issues with FMCSA outside of the workshop context. The pre-workshop conference calls helped in developing the final agenda and in planning for the technical discussions that occurred at the workshop.

More than 40 participants, including 20+ states and FMCSA, were involved in off-line pre-work and the three remaining teleconferences, held on February 8, February 22, and March 8, 2007. During this time, state volunteers led discussions and collected information on the issues. Participating states shared information and statistics on missing data and baseline load times. States also began sharing ideas on data quality monitoring and proactive data quality measurement. The CVISN Architecture Configuration Control Board (ACCB) e-screening focus group met several times to review the data elements needed for e-screening. The Performance and Registration Information Management System (PRISM)/CVISN working group met to propose solutions to compatibility issues. Volpe began a dialogue with the states on SAFER and Motor Carrier Management Information Systems (MCMIS) data quality issues. These activities laid the groundwork for a productive workshop.

## 1.4 List of Issues Addressed

Following are the issues that were presented for discussion at the workshop. They are organized into topic area (though there are some overlaps) and numbered for ease of reference.

- **Data Quality (DQ) Issues**
  - DQ01. Timeliness of data updates [MCMIS, Inspection Selection System (ISS), other].
  - DQ02. Data quality problems in the SAFER registration files.
  - DQ03. Data quality problems related to U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) numbers.
  - DQ04. SAFER-Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window (CVIEW) interface efficiency.
  - DQ05. States do not check for errors before uploading data to SAFER.
  - DQ06. Volpe does not adequately check for errors in data from states before sending out.
  - DQ07. Data Dictionary.
  - DQ08. Ability of state to validate their data (without re-baselining).
  - DQ09. Complete transponder information.
- **Configuration and Change Management (CM) Process Issues**
  - CM01. States believe that CVISN concerns do not have adequate visibility at FMCSA.
  - CM02. Attention needs to be elevated on critical issues so that they are addressed in a timely manner.
  - CM03. States feel that they have no input into prioritization.
  - CM04. States feel that issues are talked about forever, with no resolution.
  - CM05. States believe that the CVISN ACCB is limited in its ability to address all state concerns.

- **Technical Support (TS) Issues**
  - TS01. CVISN states question why limited resources do not seem to be focused on technical support vs. new development.
  - TS02. The CVISN Web site needs work/cleanup, and relevant technical documentation needs to be maintained in a timely fashion. It should be easy for states to find the most recent interface documentation.
  - TS03. States think that problems reported to Technical Support are not addressed in a timely manner.
  - TS04. After problems are reported, there is no visibility into how/when/if they are being addressed.
  - TS05. States feel that when they point out failures, they often receive no response or no explanation regarding what occurred.
  - TS06. States believe that Volpe should be monitoring their data exchange processes on a daily basis and checking for problems. They have been told that a monitoring system is in place, but have not seen evidence of such.
  - TS07. States think that Volpe should inform states of problems that they detect or that are reported to them, especially when the states need to take action.
  - TS08. States feel that Volpe should inform states when data is not available in the expected timeframe. States feel that they are often the first to observe that there has been a problem with either sending or receiving files.
  - TS09. How are priorities set for key SAFER issues?
  - TS10. States would like to engage in a dialog with Volpe on solutions/work-arounds.
  - TS11. Balancing need for long-term solutions and need for quick fixes.
- **Operational (OP) Issues**
  - OP01. Frequency of updates.
  - OP02. Not enough states sending data to SAFER.
  - OP03. Too many choices.
  - OP04. States would like to understand how other states send data to SAFER and what their process is for updating their CVIEW/state system.
- **Business Rules Issues – PRISM/CVISN (PC)**
  - PC01. Review Business Rule #1: SAFER shall allow multiple International Registration Plan (IRP) records with the same Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) but different License Plate values to exist in the database within the same jurisdiction.

  - PC02. Review Business Rule #2: SAFER shall NOT allow multiple IRP records with the same License Plate but different VIN values to exist in the database within the same jurisdiction.
  - PC03. Review Business Rule #3: States using CVIEW or equivalent systems to upload IRP vehicle transactions to SAFER shall maintain the IRP Status Code of those records, in the event that the registration submitted to SAFER is no longer active, by sending an updated transaction to SAFER with the correct IRP Status Code.
  - PC04. Review of the PRISM/CVISN Business Rule matrix rules.
  - PC05. Do CVISN states want to identify PRISM targeted vehicles for roadside screening and inspection?
  - PC06. What other changes could improve data exchange and data availability for both programs?

- **E-screening (ES) Enrollment and E-screening Data**
  - ES01. Should Safety USDOT (SAFETY_CARRIER data element) be required on every vehicle registration transaction?
  - ES02. E-screening authorization should not be at the carrier level.
  - ES03. Enable a state to send enrollment and registration data to SAFER, for a carrier in a base state that does not send data to SAFER, to share with other states for e-screening.
  - ES04. Need for separate table in SAFER for e-screening – for both enrollment and update authority.
  - ES05. What are the business rules for transponder update transactions?
  - ES06. Need consensus on fields that will be used during e-screening.
  - ES07. How should e-screening work via SAFER?

## 1.5 Organization of this Document

Sections 2 through 5 include discussion summaries, decisions, and action items related to specific issues or groups of issues. Section 6 consists of general observations, action items that did not relate to a specific issue, and recommendations resulting from the workshop. Acronyms are listed in Section 7. References are in Section 8. Appendix A lists everyone who attended at least part of the workshop. Appendix B collects all the action items referenced throughout this document. Appendix C shows the actual workshop flow; sessions were rearranged after the first day to combine discussion and strategy aspects.

# 2. DATA ISSUES

## 2.1 Data Timeliness Issues

DQ01. Timeliness of data updates (MCMIS, ISS, other)

### 2.1.1 Discussion

NE emphasized that safety systems must provide accurate, real-time data to be useful. WA noted that visibility of the data timeliness is important because states currently cannot tell if a problem is a state-specific problem or a global problem that is being worked by Volpe. The ability to monitor, review, and share the status is critical. Jeff Hall [FMCSA-Creating Opportunities, Methods, and Processes to Secure Safety (COMPASS)] stated that FMCSA system development is not frozen, but restricted, so interim changes prior to COMPASS deployment need to be prioritized. NY commented that, at the state level, users need data that is robust, complete, and reliable. Users do not need to "see" the different programs and databases; they need seamless delivery.

To address T0031 data timeliness, WA has introduced a CVISN Architecture Change Request (CR) "T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring (control file concept)" that proposes a MCMIS control file so that carrier data timeliness can be more accurately monitored on an on-going basis. This CR will be refined by a small group of stakeholders and then brought forward to the CVISN ACCB.

### 2.1.2 Decisions

***24-Hour Rules to Support Data Timeliness***

It was agreed that there should be requirements that address how frequently data must be sent, both from states and to states. The discussion led to decisions on the following business rules that will be captured in CVISN Architecture CRs and subsequently documented in the SAFER Interface Control Document (ICD):

- Within 24 hours of the authoritative source deeming the record valid, the data should be transferred to SAFER
- SAFER should transfer the data back within 24 hours
- New data in MCMIS should be transferred to SAFER within 24 hours

***Other Decisions***

Establish an ongoing ***proactive data quality/operational issues focus group (Volpe, WA, NE, CS, Iteris, others)*** charged with the following responsibilities:

- Identify issues
- Work on issues
- Identify potential solutions
- Recommend solutions

### 2.1.3 Action Items

- **APL**: Develop CVISN Architecture CRs for the recommended state and SAFER business rule changes.
- **APL**: Enter WA's proposed CR on T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring (control file concept) as a CVISN Architecture CR.
- **Proactive Data Quality/Ops Issues Focus Group**: Meet on April 12 to discuss the CR on T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring and report on it at the ACCB meeting in April/May.

## 2.2 Data Quality Issues

DQ02. Data quality problems in the SAFER registration files

DQ03. Data quality problems related to USDOT numbers

DQ05. States do not check for errors before uploading data to SAFER

### 2.2.1 Discussion

NE listed a number of the data quality issues that they face: data dictionary discrepancies, vehicle records are "active" but have outdated expiration dates, the number of vehicles in the T0028 IRP Registration transactions do not seem to be correct. States noted that data is updated in MCMIS, but the changes are not reflected in SAFER and not sent to the states. States emphasized that, if users are confronted with inconsistent data, they stop trusting the system.

There are two cases where record-level failures occur in the MCMIS-SAFER update process. An edited record in MCMIS may not make it into the table that is used to send information to SAFER. Thus, the SAFER process that updates tables based on MCMIS data changes may not be including all the updates it should. Another case is when the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) file is generated by SAFER, but some of the changes are not included. The SAFER CR (SCR) 1613 proposal "Modernization of MCMIS snapshot process to SAFER" should correct these two record-level failures.

It was agreed that both Volpe and the states need processes to clean up their databases. Also, states need to check the quality of data before they submit it to SAFER.

It was agreed that there should be basic requirements for states uploading data to SAFER as well as for SAFER sending data to states. The discussion led to a decision on business rules that will be captured in CVISN Architecture CRs and subsequently documented in the SAFER ICD. States also requested a simple rulebook that explains what they need to do. This information should be made available to states in hardcopy, not just through e-mail.

AK and HI are exempt from IRP regulations. AK was represented at the workshop and agreed to abide by the rules regarding uploading registration data to SAFER. However, rules regarding what values should be used by exempt states for IRP fields must be established.

There was discussion as to whether International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) data should be used for e-screening, since the IFTA account is not associated with a vehicle. WA proposed that data should be tracked going up to SAFER and tracked coming back down to a state. The data should be time stamped on both ends so that the time and number of transactions can be verified. Both good data and rejected data should be tracked. There was discussion of what exception-based summary reports states would like Volpe to generate, and a task force (WA, NE, and Volpe) was assigned to develop a recommendation.

The need to help states that are new to CVISN was stressed. These states need guides and introductory material to make them aware of the rules. There is also a need for more communication between these new CVISN states and FMCSA and/or experienced CVISN states. For example, it was noted that TN has been sending data to SAFER without the T0022 Registration transactions. States considered whether Volpe should stop TN from sending data to SAFER or would incomplete data be useful. It was decided that TN needs more help, probably from the FMCSA Division Administrator or Service Center directly, on what they need to be sending and why.

States proposed that there is a need to develop an ongoing certification/de-certification plan.

States repeatedly asked why requirements cannot be levied on CVISN states. They were reminded that CVISN is a voluntary program. Jeff Secrist noted that FMCSA is committed to achieving Core CVISN and PRISM compliance in every state, with the intention of using the PRISM/CVISN architecture.

### 2.2.2 Decisions

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

- If changing carrier data, a state only needs to send the T0020 IRP Account Input Transaction.
- If changing or adding fleet data, a state should send the T0021 IRP Fleet Input Transaction. A corresponding T0020 transaction must be in place.
- If changing or adding vehicle data, a state should send the T0022 IRP Registration (Cab Card) Input Transaction. Corresponding T0021 and T0020 transactions must be in place.

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

### *Volpe/SAFER Processing Rules*

- Volpe needs to process files from a state in the order in which they were sent.
- Volpe will reject vehicle (T0022) records if the referenced fleet or carrier is not in SAFER.
- Volpe will reject the fleet (T0021) record if the referenced carrier is not in SAFER.

### *Other Decisions*

Screening should be based on the safety carrier (rather than the IRP carrier or the USDOT number on the side of the truck).

Volpe will provide written status report(s) on all open PRISM and SCRs two weeks in advance of each CVISN ACCB meeting. These reports will be posted to the CVISN Collaboration site. Volpe will also report on PRISM CRs relevant to CVISN stakeholders at CVISN ACCB meetings.

### 2.2.3 Action Items

The following action items were assigned.

- **AK/Iteris**: Develop a plan for bogus values for IRP fields from exempt states. Coordinate with HI (Roger Hoopengardner).
- **Volpe**: Continue research and planning for September release of changed MCMIS-SAFER update processes per SCR 1613 "Modernization of MCMIS snapshot process to SAFER."
- **Volpe**: Create an SCR to enhance the file naming convention for the T0031 MCMIS Safety and Census Update subscription (sequentially name files and limit the file size to 5000 records).
- **Volpe**: Continue with planned summary report on uploads (CVISN Architecture CR 4777 / SCR 1508 "Request for summary reports") for the April release.
- **Volpe**: Consider whether SAFER could generate a regular report to summarize transactions processed over some period of time.
- **FMCSA (CVISN and PRISM)**: Encourage TN to submit T0022 transactions.
- **States and Volpe**: Implementation of new business rules will require recertification after both states and SAFER changes are made. Additional certification test procedures may be needed. States will help test SAFER by sending transactions that deliberately violate new rules. Tentative schedule: September SAFER release.
- **Volpe**: There is a need to develop an ongoing certification/de-certification plan. Volpe will look at PRISM, IRP, etc., for models and lessons learned toward developing a process.

## 2.3 Interface Efficiency Issues

DQ04. SAFER-CVIEW interface efficiency

### 2.3.1 Discussion

As outlined in SCR 1613 "Modernization of MCMIS snapshot process to SAFER," Volpe will be redesigning and streamlining the interface between MCMIS and SAFER. This should greatly improve the timeliness of carrier data updates being sent to CVISN states. Subsequent to the meeting, NE reported on the results of using the subscription service. Total processing time for T0031 baseline files was reduced by about 75 percent (12+ hours down to 4+ hours).

### 2.3.2 Decision

States and Volpe agreed that this issue will be resolved by re-engineering of the MCMIS-SAFER interface and by the new subscription service, rather than the original proposal of using flat files instead of XML transactions for re-baselining.

## 2.4 Volpe Data Validation Issues

DQ06. Volpe does not adequately check for errors in data from states before sending out

As noted above, states agreed that it was important to establish and enforce rules for what transaction relationships must exist. If a state stops updating records, Volpe should inform all the states. It was suggested that records from states that are not providing timely data should be removed from the SAFER database. Volpe stated that the TN T0022 records have been deleted and will not appear in the next baseline. (It was noted that the TN CVIEW is being moved from one location to another, so there will be some down times as the state makes changes.)

It was suggested that a "health meter" Web site be established to show the validity of different record types for each state. Perhaps Volpe and states could post summaries of data submitted and returned on SharePoint site. It was considered whether such a process could be automated.

## 2.5 State Data Validation Issues

DQ08. Ability of a state to validate their data (without re-baselining)

### 2.5.1 Discussion

WA led the discussion on developing and sharing troubleshooting tools. They noted that states need to have some way of tracking what they send to SAFER. WA and NE have similar tracking capabilities and troubleshooting processes that involve time stamping and saving all data uploaded or downloaded to SAFER. Since WA uploads data for several states, they have a database and internal tracking for those states. The problem is that information on data sent to/received from SAFER by other states is unknown. For example, WA has found that MT vehicle registration dates do not match the actual cab cards. If states had tracking data, they would know what the flow/history is on the vehicle. The solution now is to call the state in question, but often that state would not know why the data is incorrect. WA suggested that perhaps a central repository is needed.

There was discussion of how the scope of SCR 1507 (CVISN Architecture CR 4776) "SAFER Upload Change Tracking" could be expanded to make the log files produced by SAFER more easily readable by a person or to automate the process. An automated SAFER process would compare what the state said it sent versus what SAFER received and processed. It would report only exceptions.

WA volunteered to develop a prototype to provide vehicle and transponder update tracking information. A module will also be included to provide exception reporting for upload errors and monthly upload summary reports. This tool is specifically intended to enhance the ability of all states to monitor their IRP/vehicle data uploads and troubleshoot missing or out-of-date vehicle data problems. If the prototype proves to be a useful tool, it could eventually be transitioned to Volpe.

### 2.5.2 Action Items

- **Volpe**: Provide an update to SCR 1507 (CVISN Architecture CR 4776) "SAFER Upload Change Tracking" based on discussion with WA (Bill Goforth). Include this change in the April SAFER release.
- **WA**: Prototype a tracking system based on April SAFER release. This would be an automated SAFER process to compare what a state said they sent versus what SAFER received and processed. It would report only exceptions. Volpe and NE will participate in testing the prototype, which will then be demonstrated to the CVISN ACCB.

## 2.6 Data Flows Discussion

### 2.6.1 SAFER Discussion

Volpe walked through a diagram of SAFER data flows (file named *SAFER systems.doc*). Questions posed by states and Volpe responses/discussion are captured here.

Question: Why are there so few T0030 (vehicle inspections) transactions each day?
Answer: This is due to a defect in SAFER caused by an ASPEN upgrade; Volpe is working on a patch release. After the fix is put in place, states should re-baseline T0030 data. The 24-hour rule should apply to T0030 (actually, the T0030 is generated and should be sent every half hour.)

Question: Where is the subscription service in this data flow?
Answer: The subscription files are generated whenever a T0031 (MCMIS data) transaction is generated. Volpe manually checks the subscription files.

Question: Can SAFER monitor whether T0031 records in the download area are all that have been revised in SAFER? We would like to match counts of MCMIS inputs, SAFER record updates, and SAFER T0031 outputs. Could these numbers be published? When should we schedule the monitoring process (between 12 p.m. and 5 a.m.)?

Question: How can data timeliness be monitored?
Answer: States and Volpe need to use data quality metadata. We could compare timestamps on record updates, transaction inputs and transaction outputs. One approach is to identify "mission critical data elements" from MCMIS and capture them periodically in a "control file." We could then check updates that occurred against the control file to see if they were applied in a timely fashion.

States emphasized that they want state discovery of missing data to be a rare event. They want automated processes running at Volpe that discover when an update step breaks and want Volpe staff/processes to take action to notify users and repair the problem. If we decide to implement the control file concept, ideally, the control file would be generated daily; but any frequency is better than not having the file. Volpe agreed that their goals are that data problems will be rare,

missing data will be rare, and states will not need to do frequent baselining. Volpe noted that collecting data quality metadata at "touchpoints" is a well-accepted best practice.

Volpe noted that it would be good for states to have a way to communicate back up to SAFER that their data is in synch.

There was discussion of whether a control file should be generated by Volpe and how it would be used by states. There was some thought that it could be used to make a quick update to critical data when a problem is detected. Then records for the entity would be partially "correct" and partially "incorrect." There was also concern about building a system to share the same data from multiple sources. Would the monitoring system be as complicated as the original system? It was suggested that transactions be tracked through the system instead.

As noted in an earlier section of this document, WA drafted a CR on T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring (control file concept) that will be refined by a small group of stakeholders and then brought forward to the CVISN ACCB.

### 2.6.2 ISS Discussion

Brenda Lantz led a discussion on the generation and use of ISS scores. The ISS score for every carrier is recalculated at least once per month, in connection with the Motor Carrier Safety Status Measurement System (SafeStat) run that occurs on the last full weekend of each month. During the next week, the data is validated. It is then posted on the first weekend of the month to Analysis & Information (A&I), MCMIS, and SAFER; note that all three systems are updated at the same time. The ISS score is normally based on safety data, but if there is insufficient data available, then the Insufficient Data Algorithm-based score is calculated by SAFER once per week. These calculated scores do not get posted to MCMIS.

It was noted that the timing of when the SAFER baseline is run (on the first of the month, which may occur before the first weekend of the month) may be a factor in ISS scores missing from SAFER baselines but appearing in MCMIS.

States expressed the concern that ISS data is stale, which could result in unsafe operators being passed and safe ones being pulled in. In response to the question as to whether ISS data could be updated more frequently, it was explained that SafeStat is run monthly because statistics need to be accumulated over time. Comprehensive Safety Analysis (CSA) 2010 is looking at new processes and they could be asked to update ISS more frequently. There was some discussion about the PRISM "target indicator," which is updated daily to reflect out-of-service (OOS) status. Currently, FMCSA supports the use of ISS but is actively exploring the issues with respect to ISS scores.

### 2.6.3 Action Item

- **Volpe**: Schedule the processing of the SAFER snapshot baseline to occur after ISS data are processed.

## 2.7 Data Dictionary Issues

### 2.7.1 Information Management Authority (IMA) and COMPASS Discussion

Pat Savage, the FMCSA data quality/IMA coordinator, spoke on the IMA. The IMA is focused on ensuring that FMCSA data are accurate, complete, available, consistent, properly-structured, accessible, secure, timely, and at an acceptable level of quality to support the FMCSA mission and goals. She noted that there are two data quality initiatives at FMCSA, one dealing with quality of data from the states and another dealing with standards, dictionary, etc. The IMA membership includes FMCSA, the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) Data Committee, and a CVISN representative (Keith Dey, NE) and is open to other members.

IMA initially focused on COMPASS Release 1 screen labels, but is now moving to data dictionary work and would like input from CVISN stakeholders. The FMCSA data dictionary will be used for COMPASS. Others, such as states, will be encouraged to use it as well.

The DataQs system is an electronic means for filing concerns about federal and state data released to the public by FMCSA. Through this system, data concerns are automatically forwarded to the appropriate office for resolution [e.g., FMCSA if carrier registration; Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) contact in state for inspection or crash data]. The system also allows filers to monitor the status of each filing. DataQs is used by carriers to challenge data about themselves held by MCMIS. It can also be used by states. The system could be adapted to handle additional data types.

FMCSA is using an IBM tool for the data dictionary. CVISN stakeholders should feed information to the IMA, and they will enter it.

Jeff Hall, the FMCSA COMPASS Program Manager (PM), noted that migration of SAFER to COMPASS would impact the states. States asked whether there is a migration strategy and requested a brief paper to explain the impact of COMPASS on states. The CVISN-COMPASS Coordination ad hoc team was mentioned as a good venue to discuss the impact of COMPASS on states. States asked if there would be a mapping in the data dictionary to show restructured interfaces. States should work with FMCSA to develop a common dictionary that would define elements used in interfaces. Both PRISM and SAFER have dictionaries. Ambiguities among the various FMCSA safety systems need to be resolved. Volpe is involved in the COMPASS data modeling effort. Web services and XML will be used.

It was noted that COMPASS has not been concerned with vehicle registration, but, since it will be absorbing SAFER, it will need to deal with vehicle registration in the future.

The initial COMPASS Portal release will be in June 2007 and is intended mostly for carriers and internal FMCSA staff. Monitoring and compliance processes will be released next summer followed by registration at the end of 2009. Inspections and crash data uploads would be in the next release; that is when access requirements would be needed. COMPASS plans to implement data and operational quality metrics and monitoring tools. States need to have a role since they

are data contributors. Business intelligence will help measure the safety impact resulting from improved processes and data quality.

### 2.7.2 Decision

States agreed to consider changing screens on state roadside systems to match the names COMPASS will be displaying.

### 2.7.3 Action Items

- **APL**: Send Pat Savage a pointer to the SAFER Dictionary and code information.

### 2.7.4 Specific SAFER ICD Discussion

Volpe distributed a preliminary update to the SAFER ICD [Reference (2)]; it has been posted to the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site. This version of the ICD includes business rules associated with each XML transaction. States were asked to review the ICD and send comments to Volpe. The ICD appendices have not yet been updated, pending resolution of action items listed below.

- Vehicle status codes
  - States proposed a reduction of the 9 active and 14 inactive codes for FLEET_STATUS_CODE and IRP_STATUS_CODE to code options 0, 100, and 900. This would apply to T0022, T0026, and T0028 transactions.
- Vehicle use class codes
  - Many of the codes specified in the SAFER ICD are either unnecessary or inconsistent with codes commonly used by states and IRP/American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA). For example, in the NE IRP office, “TR” stands for “tractor”; in the T0022 transaction, “TR” stands for “trailer.”
- Vehicle make codes
  - The vehicle make codes are also inconsistent. There was discussion regarding whether or not there is a standard used by AAMVA that should be followed for both use class and make. It was noted that we should also look at what other federal safety systems use these codes. Volpe will coordinate with AAMVA to recommend what table might be applicable.
- IFTA status codes
  - Again, there are too many codes. States proposed that the codes be reduced to 0, 1, and 9.

- SAFER ICD Updates
  - It was noted that CVISN Architecture CRs will need to be brought before the CVISN ACCB and approved for all of these code value changes. If approved, SAFER error checking will need to be changed, and the SAFER ICD will need to be updated. Volpe is currently in the process of a major update to the ICD, but there was discussion of how future updates should be handled. Volpe will consider the most efficient way to reflect ICD changes, perhaps creating errata sheets instead of publishing an entirely new document.
- VIN checking
  - In the T0022 transaction, CVISN allows for 30 characters in the VIN. PRISM only allows 17 characters. PRISM-only states do not have the T0020 and T0021 concept. They submit PRISM Vehicle File (PVF) records for vehicles, which populate the same tables that CVISN uses the T0022 transactions to fill. This is not a problem for CVISN states, because SAFER downloads that data via the T0041P transaction, never in a T0028 transaction. States agreed that systems that input the VIN should apply VIN edit checks.

It was emphasized that it is important not to make it more difficult for states to send data to SAFER and also noted that users of the data are not necessarily the senders of the data.

### 2.7.5 Action Items

- **WA**: Write CVISN Architecture CR that proposes reducing the allowable codes for FLEET_STATUS_CODE and IRP_STATUS_CODE in the T0022, T0026, and T0028 transactions. Coordinate with IRP.
- **NE (Cathy Beedle)/WA/PRISM/ASPEN/SD (Alana Gourneau)/AAMVA Standards Committee**: Propose a simpler list of vehicle use class codes that CVISN should use. Coordinate with IRP, Inc.
- **NE (Cathy Beedle)/WA/PRISM/ASPEN/SD (Alana Gourneau)/AAMVA Standards Committee**: Propose a simpler list of vehicle make codes that CVISN should use. Volpe coordinate with AAMVA to suggest what table might be used.
- **WA:** Prepare Architecture CR to reduce values for IFTA Status code and present to the CVISN ACCB. Coordinate with IFTA, Inc.
- **Volpe:** After the corresponding CVISN Architecture CR is approved, add IRP data rules (T0020-T0021-T0023 relationships) to the SAFER ICD.
- **Volpe**: Determine the most efficient way to reflect ICD changes. Consider creating errata sheets instead of publishing an entirely new document.
- **WA:** Make the VIN algorithm available on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site.
- **CVSA, FMCSA, WA**: Develop a consolidated recommendation on VIN data entry, validation, and handling.

- **WA (Bill Goforth), NE (John Casteel), Volpe (Andrew Wilson)**: This team will consider the following questions and report back to Workshop participants at a future CVISN ACCB meeting.
  - Should SAFER check the valid meaning of critical data fields during the CVIEW certification process?
  - What data quality measures should be established for fields and assessed during certification? How should noncompliance be reported? What compliance level should be required for a state CVIEW to be certified?
  - Identify additional edit checks for inputs to SAFER to check consistency across fields. (e.g., valid dates; if the expiration date is in past, the status cannot be active; etc.)

# 3. SUPPORT ISSUES

## 3.1 Configuration and Change Management Process Issues

### 3.1.1 Discussion

The FMCSA enterprise and CVISN Architecture configuration and change management processes were discussed during a pre-workshop teleconference on February 22, 2007. Most of the discussion at the workshop centered on what improvements could be made to the processes.

CM01. States believe that CVISN concerns do not have adequate visibility at FMCSA

States have commented that the level of attention given to issues that impact screening, data quality, and the reception of data is lukewarm at best. There is also a question of whether there are changes discussed during the FMCSA Developers' calls that impact SAFER or other CVISN systems. Bill Coleman explained that Tom Keane represents CVISN on the FMCSA Enterprise Change Control Board.

CM02. Attention needs to be elevated on critical issues so that they are addressed in a timely manner

States perceive that priority issues such as bug fixes, data issues, files of zero length, issues with baseline or update files, and File Transfer Protocol (FTP) issues are not given high enough priority and are not dealt with in a timely manner. Issues that result in a lack of data, poor data quality, or similar problems should be given priority status and need to be dealt with immediately. These issues are different from routine CR issues.

It was explained that there are two types of CRs: problem/defect corrections and routine changes/enhancements. In the session on technical support, Volpe explained how the different categories of issues are addressed.

CM03. States feel that they have no input into prioritization

Prioritization needs to be addressed separately within the above two categories. Volpe expressed an interest in obtaining input from states on priorities of CRs. For enhancements, this will be handled through the CVISN ACCB.

CM04. States feel that issues are talked about forever, with no resolution

FMCSA is committed to making SCRs/status (including priority) and problem report tickets/status information visible to all users. Volpe will institute processes to support this, including generation and posting of weekly reports from the trouble report systems and posting status reports on all open PRISM and SCRs weeks in advance of each ACCB meeting.

CM05. States believe that the CVISN ACCB is limited in its ability to address all state concerns

Discussion centered on the need to restructure the CVISN change control process to achieve a higher level of state participation. One of the proposals was to improve the ACCB voting process by instituting rules, such as the following:

1. Every state participating on the ACCB call can vote.
2. 50 percent plus one vote of those states represented on the call via roll call by state will be required to approve or disapprove a CR.
3. "50 percent plus one vote" must be a minimum of 11 total votes for a final decision.
4. In some cases, consultant organizations or states will be casting votes on behalf of their state clients (e.g., Iteris, CS, WA). A documented proxy must be posted to the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site (under "Proxy Assignments" in the ACCB telecon workspace) prior to the vote; this must be done for every CR to be voted upon.
5. Certain issues that the ACCB members determine need to be decided by the CVISN PMs will go to the next CVISN PM call for discussion with instructions to state ACCB members to cast their vote on the next ACCB call. (i.e., PM calls on Tuesday and Wednesday, ACCB vote on Thursday.)

The following ideas were also expressed during the discussion:

- Discontinue use of the CVISN Architect listserv; use SharePoint discussion thread capability instead.
- Post CRs to the SharePoint ACCB Collaboration site two weeks in advance of each ACCB telecon.
- Regional representatives should reach out to neighboring jurisdictions to inform them about CRs.
- If a state has an issue to raise, they should bring it to the call.
- CVISN states need to attend the meeting or send their thoughts in advance; there will no longer be a requirement to post CRs for 30-day review with implied concurrence.
- On the PM calls, ask who plans to attend the ACCB meetings.

### 3.1.2 Decisions

FMCSA Technical Support will generate a report from HEAT weekly and post it on the CVISN ACCB Collaboration SharePoint site; Volpe will report high-level CR status at the monthly CVISN ACCB call.

Volpe will provide written status reports on all open PRISM and SCRs two weeks in advance of each CVISN ACCB meeting.

Volpe will add a verbal report on PRISM CRs relevant to CVISN stakeholders at CVISN ACCB meetings.

APL/FMCSA will report information of interest from the developers' calls during the CVISN ACCB telecon.

### 3.1.3 Action Items

- **Keith Dey (NE), Warren Dunham, Thad Hoffman (SD):** Develop a proposal for restructuring the CVISN change control process and present it to the CVISN PMs at the April or May PM teleconferences. The PMs will vote on the proposal.

## 3.2 Technical Support Issues

### 3.2.1 Discussion

The first eight issues were addressed by Volpe in the presentation "FMCSA Technical Support in Relation to CVIEW State Partners." Because of actions initiated by Volpe during the previous eight weeks, Volpe felt that the situation had improved. States were encouraged to contact Chris Flynn personally (617-494-2662) with ideas for further improvement.

TS01. CVISN states questioned why limited resources did not seem to be focused on technical support vs. new development.

Volpe emphasized that correction of production defects has higher priority than new development. They requested that states prioritize all approved SCRs. There is an attempt to make more resources available to support the CVISN program.

TS02. The CVISN Web site needs work/cleanup and relevant technical documentation needs to be maintained in a timely fashion. It should be easy for states to find the most recent interface documentation.

APL will provide updated Web content and relevant technical documentation to FMCSA. As resources are available, Volpe will attempt to improve timeliness of posting information to the Web site.

TS03. States think that problems reported to Technical Support are not addressed in a timely manner.

The FMCSA Technical Support team will closely monitor the e-mail inbox and ensure that the appropriate support staff is aware of the call. Rita DaSilva of the FMCSA Technical Support team will focus on customer issues related to CVIEW data transactions.

TS04. After problems are reported, there is no visibility into how/when/if they are being addressed.

Volpe stated that users will have access to Volpe's technical assistance tracking system, HEAT Self Service, in the near future, via the FMCSA Information Systems Web site (InfoSys) (http://infosys.fmcsa.dot.gov/ChangeRequest.asp) with a User Authentication System ID and password. Each user will be able to look at the status of the trouble tickets they submitted.

States requested that ticket report status include explanation of cause (if known) and reference to CRs (if one was generated).

TS05. States feel that when they point out failures, they often receive no response or no explanation regarding what occurred.

Technical Support is the single source users should contact for their issues:

617-494-3003
fmctechsup@volpe.dot.gov

If an issue seems to have fallen through the cracks, call Chris Flynn.

TS06. States believe that Volpe should be monitoring their data exchange processes on a daily basis and checking for problems. They have been told that a monitoring system is in place but have not seen evidence of such.

Volpe has updated their daily monitoring checklist. They are also enhancing the SAFER monitoring system. A staff person will now be responsible for calling state users on a daily basis to report any anomalies with failed schema validations or other errors.

TS07. States think that Volpe should inform states of problems that they detect or that are reported to them, especially when the states need to take action.

Volpe has updated their procedures to clarify when to contact users and are providing training to operations staff. They have requested a dedicated resource for SAFER/CVISN support.

TS08. States feel that Volpe should inform states when data is not available in the expected timeframe. States feel that they are often the first to observe that there have been problems with either sending or receiving files.

There was discussion about sending out e-mails to the general CVISN population when there are problems that affect everyone, such as the FTP server down. It was noted that PRISM sends out e-mails in similar situations. It was suggested that PRISM and CVISN use the same process, whatever is decided.

There was also discussion about what Web site(s) should be used for communicating with CVISN stakeholders. It was noted that the FMCSA CVISN Web site is one of a number of official FMCSA Web sites and consists primarily of approved CVISN documentation. The site

must adhere to USDOT regulations regarding privacy, Section 508 compliance, and Web site linking. The CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site is intended to be used for free and open exchange of ideas among CVISN stakeholders. This site includes relatively dynamic information such as draft documents, working papers, meeting notes, and threaded discussions in support of the CVISN ACCB (including focus groups and deployment workshop), Expanded CVISN ad hoc groups, and CVISN PMs calls. States asked that links to FMCSA Web sites and other sites of interest to CVISN stakeholders be made available from the SharePoint site. There is no way to avoid separate sign-out for the CVISN Collaboration site and protected FMCSA Web sites such as InfoSys.

TS09. How are priorities set for key SAFER issues?

TS11. Balancing need for long-term solutions and need for quick fixes

Some issues deal with broken processes, others with making improvements/enhancements. Production defects generally get higher priority, though some quick enhancements also get priority.

A "bug" is something that doesn't meet clearly defined requirements. It is essential that requirements are clear, detailed, and complete so that implementation can be tested and so that the delivered product meets those requirements.

For bug fixes, FMCSA looks at the impact of the problem and assigns higher priority to those with a greater business impact. As part of the revised FMCSA configuration management process, a new "IT Systems Change Request Form" has been posted on the InfoSys Web site. Note that if a state person would like to request a change to an FMCSA IT system, that individual must coordinate with an FMCSA sponsor (e.g., FMCSA Division Administrator) to submit the CR form. Volpe then needs to complete the analysis, assessing the options for fixing the bug, and then set the priority for actually implementing the bug correction. Even bug fixes have priorities. The HEAT trouble report system shows the priority for each item.

For enhancements, setting priority starts with the Volpe SAFER project team and runs through the FMCSA enterprise configuration and change management process. The CVISN ACCB is the venue for discussing priority for architecture changes. Then the CVISN stakeholders' priority list is carried forward to the developers' call and the other parts of the FMCSA change management process.

It was suggested that a CVISN stakeholder who submits an enhancement request to the CVISN ACCB should be responsible for supplying information on the impact to states. For example, this would include the business case for implementing the change, the cost to the state, and the implications of not making the change. This may require the CVISN stakeholder to contact other states to obtain this information prior to submitting the CR.

### 3.2.2 Decisions

All technical and operational issues should be reported to FMCSA Technical Support. Users should put CVIEW/state name in subject header for all e-mails related to CVIEW issues.

### 3.2.3 Action Items

- **APL**: Develop recommendation on the role and purpose of the CVISN SharePoint, CVISN Web site, and the CVISN Architects' listserv.
- **APL**: Add information about key FMCSA Web sites and links to them on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site (or the CVISN Web site?).
- **FMCSA Technical Support**: Consider proactively reporting problems observed to all users. (e.g., when zero-byte files are reported, tell all the states about the problem.)
- **FMCSA Technical Support**: Explore with APL the possibility of hosting SharePoint. Note that it is important to keep the free user collaboration capability.
- **FMCSA Technical Support**: Consider using a process similar to what PRISM is doing to keep users informed. At least include PRISM in the discussions about what to do.

## 3.3 Operational Issues

### 3.3.1 Discussion

OP01. Frequency of updates

The issue of states not uploading data to SAFER in a timely manner was addressed in the Data Issues session with the decision regarding the 24-hour rule.

OP02. Not enough states sending data to SAFER

States have commented that there are not enough states in SAFER to make CVISN meaningful to enforcement. They questioned how to sell CVISN if they have to train enforcement, "If you're searching for a plate from states X or Y, use CVIEW; but if you need to conduct a state Z search, use something else." States need a correlation between safety improvement and investment to justify the expense of uploading data to SAFER.

Recently, Battelle completed a model deployment evaluation and is planning a follow-on to that study. States were asked to complete self-evaluations to help assess safety performance improvement. FMCSA has been working on defining useful performance measures.

OP03. Too many choices

FMCSA and states have invested in a variety of systems, all with some ability to provide enforcement information. The motor carrier enforcement community needs to work together to develop solutions for enforcement upon which everyone can agree.

States noted that it is difficult to sell the use of CVIEW to enforcement folks who are used to the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS)—The International Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing Network—and other services.

COMPASS should address the necessity to use competing systems and approaches. CVISN stakeholders need to pass their business requirements to the COMPASS team. Before COMPASS comes online, training and discussion of best practices will be needed.

OP04. States would like to understand how other states send data to SAFER and what their process is for updating their CVIEW/state system

During a pre-workshop teleconference, John Casteel presented "State of Nebraska SAFER Data Exchange Monitoring Processes." It was suggested that we schedule presentations during future teleconferences and/or post briefings on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site.

### 3.3.2 Action Items

- **Dunham**: Ask applicable states why they are not uploading data to SAFER.
- **FMCSA**: During upcoming planning session, consider developing and posting a CVISN map that shows red/yellow/green status regarding Core Compliance. This could be like the "State Safety Data Quality [SSDQ] Quarterly Map" posted at http://ai.fmcsa.dot.gov/DataQuality/dataquality.asp?redirect=staterating.asp. The effort would involve defining performance measures, ongoing monitoring, etc.
- **NY (Don Baker)**: Develop requirements for COMPASS to define the preferred way for users to assess safety risk. Are there different preferred ways to support different business processes? Be sure to include the requirement for update dates on data. Revisit the Commercial Driver's License (CDL) program's efforts to see if they have established requirements based on different user groups.

This Page Intentionally Blank

# 4. PRISM/CVISN ISSUES

## 4.1 PRISM/CVISN Business Rules Issues

### 4.1.1 Discussion

There was discussion on how PRISM determines targeted vehicles. The IRP status for the vehicle and the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Process (MCSIP) step and OOS indicator for the carrier are considered when setting the target indicator. T0028 transactions are not sent by SAFER for vehicles registered in PRISM-only states. T0041P records represent the PRISM target file.

It was noted that if a targeted vehicle does not have a transponder, e-screening systems cannot identify it. There is no movement afoot at the federal level at this time to mandate transponders. The decision rests with the states.

PC01. Review Business Rule #1: SAFER shall allow multiple IRP records with the same VIN but different License Plate values to exist in the database within the same jurisdiction.

PC02. Review Business Rule #2: SAFER shall NOT allow multiple IRP records with the same License Plate but different VIN values to exist in the database within the same jurisdiction.

PC03. Review Business Rule #3: States using CVIEW or equivalent systems to upload IRP vehicle transactions to SAFER shall maintain the IRP Status Code of those records in the event that the registration submitted to SAFER is no longer active, by sending an updated transaction to SAFER with the correct IRP Status Code.

PC04. Review of the PRISM/CVISN Business Rule matrix rules

### 4.1.2 Action Items

- **WA, NE, TX, Iteris, LA, DC, ACS, MD, APL, Volpe**: Hold a discussion on SCR 50 and PRISM/CVISN business rules. Telecon scheduled for Monday, April 23, 2007, 2:00 p.m., eastern standard time.
- **Volpe (DeRusha)**: Provide list of vehicles that violate the business rules, by state.

## 4.2 Program Compatibility Issues

PC05. Do CVISN states want to identify PRISM-targeted vehicles for roadside screening and inspection?

PC06. What other changes could improve data exchange and data availability for both programs?

### 4.2.1 Discussion

CVISN states agreed that they would like targeted vehicle information. The PVF does not contain IRP active or inactive status; only active carriers and targeted vehicles are included in the file. If a carrier asks why a vehicle is targeted, Query Central (QC) can be used to step through possible causes. It was suggested that a feature could be added to QC to highlight the reason. If a carrier is in MCSIP, then it is targeted. Both MCSIP and OOS cause the target indicator to be set.

There was discussion about how to obtain IRP data from the five or six PRISM-only states. It was agreed that it would probably be a hardship for those states to submit T0020 and T0021 transactions. It was also conceded that the IRP Clearinghouse would not be able to send the needed data elements.

### 4.2.2 Action Items

- **APL/Volpe**: Write CVISN Architecture CR and SCR to add target indicator to T0028.
- **Brenda Lantz**: Write a CR to request QC to display the IRP status (active or inactive) for a vehicle on the "Vehicle Summary" screen.
- **APL/Volpe/FMCSA**: Consider adding a pointer to the PRISM Web site or a PRISM section on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site.

# 5. E-SCREENING DATA AND E-SCREENING ENROLLMENT ISSUES

## 5.1 Carrier Responsible for Safety Issues

ES01. Should Safety USDOT (SAFETY_CARRIER data element) be required on every vehicle registration transaction?

### 5.1.1 Discussion

Linking the USDOT number to IRP and IFTA data is currently not required by IRP or IFTA. This means IRP and IFTA information cannot be reliably tied to a carrier during e-screening. States considered whether the data is useful if this field is dummy/blank. Should there be a separate data element? PRISM requires this data element, but some states that have signed the PRISM agreement will not be compliant for several years.

There is currently no way to get authoritative source IFTA data for vehicles that have their IFTA in a state other than their IRP base state. There is also concern that IFTA data quality is poor and that more needs to be done to get states to do a better job getting their IFTA data uploaded and, where possible, including associated IFTA USDOT numbers. As things stand now, IFTA data is not considered reliable enough to use for e-screening, and it is provided as "informational only" data. NE will try to submit a ballot to make USDOT number a required field in IFTA. Every state has a vote. So, states are encouraged to talk to their IFTA representative and tell them to vote YES!

### 5.1.2 Action Items

- **Dunham**: If the ballot to make USDOT number a required field in IFTA is accepted, notify CVISN states. Cathy Beedle will assist.
- **ALL**: Talk to your IFTA rep and tell them to vote YES!
- **APL**: Add a link on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site to the IFTA Web site.
- **WA**: Decide whether it is worthwhile to add the IFTA jurisdiction code to the T0022 and T0028 transactions.
- **E-screening Focus Group**: Evaluate the potential usefulness of IFTA data in the screening process and make recommendations.

## 5.2 E-screening Enrollment Issues

ES02. E-screening authorization should not be at the carrier level

### 5.2.1 Discussion

A problem occurs when two different states manage different fleets or vehicles for a carrier and e-screening authorization is different between the vehicles or fleets. The two states will override each other's T0023 transactions. Architecture CR 4948: "T0023 Transaction is Ineffective" was submitted to request elimination of the T0023 transaction.

It was agreed that T0023 and its implementation are broken, so the transaction should either be deleted or fixed. There was discussion about whether SAFER should continue to give carriers the ability to request that their transponders not be given to states where they do not want to be screened. In other words, should all states be given all transponders and then let each state decide whether or not they will give a carrier this option; or should SAFER control which transponders go to which states. Under the North American Preclearance and Safety System (NORPASS) business model, states have flexibility, and carriers can opt out of participating in a particular jurisdiction. For example, at least one NORPASS state collects more data (to audit weight distance tax) on transponder-equipped trucks, so some carriers do not want to be screened in that state. So NORPASS may not support sharing of transponder data with all states. PrePass does not supply transponder IDs to SAFER. They have considered an opt-out program with some states.

States agreed that it is worth considering adding opt-out capability handling in SAFER. Possibly, the T0023 would carry information about where the carrier does NOT want its transponders to be recognized. It was also noted that the T0023 transaction is at the carrier level, but e-screening enrollment should also be at the vehicle level. From an enforcement side, states did not think it makes sense to have an opt-out at the vehicle level.

Joe Crabtree will be asking the NORPASS board to consider this issue and will also be asking for recommendations from the NORPASS transponder administration committee. Once this is decided, WA will put together a CR to recommend changes to the T0023 transaction to accommodate the functionality required by NORPASS.

### 5.2.2 Action Items

- **APL/NORPASS/WA**: Discuss the issue of sharing transponder data with all SAFER participants at the PM level first, before bringing to the CVISN ACCB.
- **NORPASS (Joe Crabtree)**: Discuss the idea of sharing transponder data with all SAFER participants and the opt-out option with the NORPASS Board at the March 26 Board meeting.
- **E-screening Focus Group**: Review e-screening enrollment process and propose how to move towards desired solution (perhaps the opt-out solution).

- **NORPASS Transponder Administrators**: Review e-screening enrollment process and propose how to move towards desired solution (perhaps the opt-out solution).
- **WA**: Close CVISN Architecture CR 4948. Write a new CR to change T0023 "E-screening Enrollment" to support the preferred e-screening enrollment option.

## 5.3 E-screening Authorization Issues

ES03. Enable a state to send enrollment and registration data to SAFER, for a carrier in a base state that does not send data to SAFER, to share with other states for e-screening

### 5.3.1 Discussion

A CVISN Architecture CR has been submitted to address this issue. CR 2936 states, "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." This would involve the addition of new data elements to the T0022 and T0028 transactions for "transponder issuing entity" and "transponder authorized updater."

In SD, the carrier owns the transponder and must tell the issuing SD agency if they change it to a different vehicle. It was suggested that the administrator who issues the transponder should be the authoritative source for association of that tag to a vehicle and carrier. Therefore, the "transponder issuing entity" field should be added to the SAFER table.

The NORPASS vision is that the motor carrier could change the association between transponder and vehicle. But there is the possibility of fraud that has not yet been addressed.

Currently, SAFER does not decouple the original VIN and transponder if the transponder is assigned to a different vehicle. However, it can make the data change if the authoritative source authorizes it. It is necessary to remove the transponder from one vehicle via a null entry in transponder ID field.

It was agreed that it should not be okay to have the same transponder associated with more than one vehicle. Any jurisdiction or transponder administrator should be allowed to deactivate a transponder if it is observed on a vehicle other than the one for which it was registered. The carrier would be required to request reactivation with the correct VIN-transponder association.

Use of NLETS for verification of e-screening administrator (non-authoritative source) IRP and vehicle data was discussed. FMCSA will talk to NLETS folks about doing this as an initiative to increase available screening data to all states. It was noted that this could clear the way to dramatically increase the number of vehicles in SAFER from states that are not uploading to SAFER. The major stumbling block to this in the past was the concern that non-authoritative source data was not being adequately verified. At the workshop, the states that had concerns about this said they were willing to use non-authoritative source data as long as it was verified in NLETS. Ultimately, Volpe may be charged with providing this verification service (perhaps once per month for all non-authoritative source vehicles).

### 5.3.2 Action Items

- **WA**: Write a CR regarding a SAFER query to NLETS to verify registration/ transponder data for non-authoritative source.
- **APL/FMCSA**: Explore access to NLETS for CVISN purposes.
- **Volpe**: Investigate digital signature or other security features for CVIEW inputs to SAFER.

## 5.4 Transponder Update Issues

ES05. What are the business rules for transponder update transactions?

This issue raises the e-screening administration issue: who owns a transponder and who is authorized to change it?

WA noted that a transponder update (T0024) is rejected if the uploaded transponder is already on another vehicle. If the transponder is erroneously on a vehicle whose carrier has not authorized their transponders for a state, it is impossible to remove the transponder from the errant vehicle and put it on the correct vehicle (it is unknown what vehicle the transponder is on). One way this problem could be fixed is if a transponder update automatically deleted the transponder from the old vehicle and added it to the new one.

Currently, T0029 transactions (vehicle transponder ID output) are incomplete because they have the VIN but not transponder data. It was suggested that DataQs be used in the short term to fix the database, while the larger issue is being worked separately.

## 5.5 Data Needed for E-screening Issues

ES06. Need consensus on fields that will be used during e-screening

### 5.5.1 Discussion

SD provided a list of the fields that they consider mandatory:

- Active USDOT number (should specify as carrier responsible for safety)
- Current registration or pro-rated or permit in SD
- Not subject to OOS
- Valid registration
- Active IRP (and IFTA) account
- Satisfactory ISS safety score
- 80K lbs or under, or have permit

- Actual weight does not exceed gross vehicle weight by more than 5 percent
- Actual weight legal for axles not exceeded by more than 5 percent

States were cautioned that when submitting data about a vehicle not registered in their states, they should verify the IRP status, not assume that the cab card is valid.

### 5.5.2 Action Items

- **NORPASS**: Discuss the e-screening enrollment administrators' need for a procedure to verify status on an ongoing basis.
- **WA**: Add "mandatory" attribute to e-screening spreadsheet.

## 5.6 Issues Deferred to E-screening Focus Group

ES04. Need for separate table in SAFER for e-screening – for both enrollment and update authority

ES07. How should e-screening work via SAFER?

These issues were tabled and will be discussed by the e-screening focus group.

This Page Intentionally Blank

# 6. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

## 6.1 Summary

The CVISN Deployment Workshop: Solving the Issues accomplished its objective of bringing together leaders of the federal and state CVISN community for a fruitful discussion of issues that have been hampering successful Core CVISN deployment nationwide. Thirty-one jurisdictions were represented, and 17 federal staff participated in at least part of the three-day workshop.

## 6.2 Analysis

Twenty-five workshop evaluation forms were returned by participants. Of these, 12 participants rated the workshop value as "excellent," 10 as "good," and only three scored it as "fair."

As noted by many participants, the ultimate conclusion as to whether the workshop was truly a success will be decided months from now. It will depend on:

- follow-through on the many action items assigned to states, Volpe, and FMCSA
- resolution of certain key issues by federal and state decision-makers
- continuing the spirit of cooperation and collaboration among the federal and state motor carrier safety community

## 6.3 Observations and Recommendations

This section presents observations and recommendations concerning the CVISN Deployment Workshop.

### 6.3.1 Future CVISN Deployment Workshops

Workshop participants agreed that face-to-face meetings should occur on a regular basis. Possibly FMCSA could hold one meeting per year in the Washington, D.C., area so that FMCSA Headquarters staff could easily support, then have a second meeting approximately six months later elsewhere, perhaps in conjunction with another event. Both the states of WA and NE volunteered to host the next event.

### 6.3.2 Improving the Monthly CVISN PM Calls

States suggested that the PM calls should involve more discussion and sharing of experiences among the states.

### 6.3.3 Working Groups

In the past year, focus groups have been identified by the CVISN ACCB to work on specific issues and report back to the larger body. The CVISN Deployment Workshop confirmed the need for the e-screening focus group to continue its efforts. The need for at least one additional focus group, referred to as the "Proactive Data Quality/Operational Issues Focus Group" was recognized.

- E-screening Focus Group. The e-screening focus group will continue to meet to address the action items assigned at the workshop.
- Proactive Data Quality/Operational Issues Focus Group. A new CVISN ACCB focus group will be established. Initially, the "Proactive Data Quality/Operational Issues Focus Group" will consist of Volpe, WA, NE, CS, and Iteris. Other CVISN stakeholders are invited to participate. The group will have the following charges:
  - Identify issues
  - Work on issues
  - Identify potential solutions
  - Recommend solutions

The initial task for the group is to discuss the draft CVISN Architecture CR developed by Washington to address T0031 MCMIS Data Timeliness Monitoring. A teleconference has been scheduled for April 12, 2007.

### 6.3.4 PRISM/CVISN Coordination

The CVISN and PRISM programs share the goal of improving motor carrier safety through information exchange. They also share the same stakeholders, the same source for carrier census data (MCMIS), the same source for vehicle registration data (state IRP systems), and the same data repository (SAFER-PRISM Central Site). FMCSA encourages states to deploy both programs in a mutually supportive and synergistic manner.

Discussions between developers and managers of both programs have been going on for more than a year and much progress has been made in reconciling data needs. The Deployment Workshop gave CVISN states more insight into the nuances of implementing both programs and of exchanging data from states that are implementing one or both programs.

Agreement is still needed on several business rules that were presented at the workshop. The PRISM/CVISN team will continue to seek resolution through meetings with CVISN stakeholders. FMCSA outreach to states is needed to encourage deployment of both programs and to provide training in how to accomplish deployment.

### 6.3.5 Performance Monitoring and Technical Support

Due to FMCSA attention to technical support issues in the weeks leading up to the Deployment Workshop, monitoring of processes and improvements in technical support have already begun to take place. However, as noted during the workshop discussions, there is much more that could be done. States are stepping up to the plate by proposing proactive data quality monitoring solutions and volunteering to build and test prototypes.

A process needs to be instituted to ensure that states' problems are tracked and reported according to the decisions made and action items assigned at the workshop. FMCSA/APL/Volpe should explore this as a joint activity, perhaps with quarterly reports and a teleconference to review CVISN trouble ticket trends, proactive interactions with CVISN stakeholders, assessment of performance monitoring processes, etc.

### 6.3.6 Improving the CVISN Architecture Change Management Process

Participants agreed that the monthly CVISN ACCB teleconferences should continue to provide a forum for states to discuss issues and problems. However, it was also argued that the change management process could be improved by instituting a number of modifications such as:

- Requiring the author of a CR to provide criteria: cost, level of effort, benefits, users, effect of not undertaking, effect on other processes/users/programs, etc.
- Introducing the CR one month, then voting the next month
- Establishing rules for voting on CRs
- Defining a process for prioritizing the implementation of changes that require Volpe resources

A stakeholder task force is currently working on recommendations for process improvement.

## 6.4 General Action Items

Several action items that applied to the workshop as a whole are listed here.

**APL/FMCSA**: Recap the workshop during April CVISN PMs' calls and CVISN ACCB teleconference. In particular, spread the word to other states who did not attend the workshop.

**APL**: Develop a separate "help" document that explains the highlights of changes to the states. Capture all results from the workshop, not just the ICD changes.

## 6.5 Ongoing Actions

A number of ongoing actions and processes were identified. While not assigned as specific action items, these efforts will be followed up and reported on periodically to CVISN Stakeholders.

Primary responsibility: FMCSA

1. Work towards making SCRs/status (including priority) and problem report tickets/status information visible to all users.

Primary responsibility: JHU/APL

1. Report information of interest from the developers' calls during the CVISN ACCB telecon.

Primary responsibility: Volpe

1. Generate a report from HEAT weekly and post on the CVISN ACCB Collaboration SharePoint site; Volpe report high-level CR status at CVISN ACCB call.
2. Provide written status report on all open PRISM and SCRs two weeks in advance of each CVISN ACCB meeting.
3. Verbally report on PRISM CRs relevant to CVISN stakeholders at CVISN ACCB meetings.

Primary responsibility: CVISN Stakeholders

1. Report all technical and operational issues to FMCSA Technical Support.
2. During a pre-workshop teleconference, John Casteel presented "State of Nebraska SAFER Data Exchange Monitoring Processes." It was suggested that other states present at future teleconferences and/or post briefings on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site.

# 7. ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| A&I | Analysis & Information |
| AAMVA | American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators |
| ACCB | Architecture Configuration Control Board |
| ACS | Affiliated Computer Services, Inc. |
| APL | Applied Physics Laboratory |
| ASPEN | not an acronym |
| CDL | Commercial Driver's License |
| CM | Change Management |
| COMPASS | Creating Opportunities, Methods, and Processes to Secure Safety |
| CR | Change Request |
| CS | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. |
| CSA | Comprehensive Safety Analysis |
| CVIEW | Commercial Vehicle Information Exchange Window |
| CVISN | Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks |
| CVO | Commercial Vehicle Operations |
| CVSA | Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance |
| DC | District of Columbia |
| DQ | Data Quality |
| ES | E-screening |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FMCSA | Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration |
| FTP | File Transfer Protocol |
| HEAT | HEAT HelpDesk Software |
| IBM | International Business Machines |
| ICD | Interface Control Document |
| IFTA | International Fuel Tax Agreement |
| IMA | Information Management Authority |
| InfoSys | Information Systems |
| IRP | International Registration Plan |
| ISS | Inspection Selection System |
| IT | Information Technology |
| ITS | Intelligent Transportation Systems |
| JHU/APL | The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory |

| | |
|---|---|
| JPO | Joint Program Office |
| LA | Louisiana |
| MCMIS | Motor Carrier Management Information System |
| MCSAP | Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program |
| MCSIP | Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Process |
| MD | Maryland |
| NE | Nebraska |
| NLETS | National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System |
| NORPASS | North American Preclearance and Safety System |
| NY | New York |
| OOS | Out of Service |
| OP | Operational |
| PC | PRISM/CVISN |
| PM | Program Manager |
| PRISM | Performance and Registration Information Systems Management |
| PVF | PRISM Vehicle File |
| QC | Query Central |
| SAFER | Safety and Fitness Electronic Records |
| SafeStat | Motor Carrier Safety Status Measurement System |
| SCR | SAFER Change Request |
| SD | South Dakota |
| SSDQ | State Safety Data Quality |
| TN | Tennessee |
| TS | Technical Support |
| TX | Texas |
| USDOT | U.S. Department of Transportation |
| VIN | Vehicle Identification Number |
| WA | Washington |
| XML | eXtensible Markup Language |

# 8. REFERENCES

1. JHU/APL, “Core CVISN Deployment Issues White Paper,” NSTD-07-0012 D.1, Draft, January 2007.

2. The John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, “Safety and Fitness Electronic Records (SAFER) Safer Software version 5.1 Interface Control Document,” draft Version 5.1, March 2007.

This Page Intentionally Blank

# APPENDIX A. – CVISN DEPLOYMENT WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

This appendix lists those who participated in the CVISN Deployment Workshop (denoted by "*") or in one or more of the pre-workshop teleconferences (from January – March 2007).

| Name | Organization | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| Tim Adams | AAMVA | tadams@aamva.org |
| Jodee Alm | Montana Department of Transportation | jalm@mt.gov |
| Valerie Barnes* | JHU/APL | valerie.barnes@jhuapl.edu |
| Cathy Beedle* | Department of Motor Vehicles – Nebraska | cbeedle@notes.state.ne.us |
| Mark Bell | Kentucky Transportation Center | markbell@insightbb.com |
| Betsy Benkowski* | FMCSA | betsy.benkowski@dot.gov |
| Roan Bennett * | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | rbennett@camsys.com |
| Cpl/2 Brian Bishop* | Delaware State Police (MCSAP) | brian.bishop@state.de.us |
| Chris Campbell | Iteris, Inc. | clc@iteris.com |
| Steve Capecci | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | scapecci@camsys.com |
| John Casteel* | Department of Motor Vehicles – Nebraska | jcasteel@notes.state.ne.us |
| Ron Char* | JHU/APL | ronald.char@jhuapl.edu |
| Punita Choxi | Delaware Department of Transportation | punita.choxi@state.de.us |
| Andy Choquette | FMCSA – NY | andrew.choquette@dot.gov |
| Daniel Coelho* | Volpe | Coelho@volpe.dot.gov |
| Bill Coleman* | FMCSA | bill.coleman@dot.gov |
| Bill Copley | FMCSA | william.copley@dot.gov |
| Joe Crabtree* | Kentucky Transportation Center, University of Kentucky | crabtree@engr.uky.edu |
| Aaron Cringan* | ACS Government Solutions / CVO | aaron.cringan@acs-inc.com |
| Janet Curtis* | FMCSA | janet.curtis@dot.gov |
| Doug Deacon | New Jersey Department of Transportation | Doug.Deacon@dot.state.nj.us |
| Doug Deckert* | Washington State Department of Transportation | deckerd@wsdot.wa.gov |

| Name | Organization | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| Gary DeRusha* | Volpe | Gary.DeRusha@volpe.dot.gov |
| Chuck DeWeese | FMCSA – NY | chuck.deweese@dot.gov |
| Keith Dey* | Department of Motor Vehicles – Nebraska | kdey@notes.state.ne.us |
| Tammy Duncan* | Southwest Research Institute | tduncan@swri.org |
| Warren Dunham* | Warren B. Dunham Associates (WDBA) | WBDA@aol.com |
| Sharon Easley* | E-Squared Engineering | seasley@e-squared.org |
| Cliff Estes* | Louisiana OMV | cliff.estes@dps.la.gov |
| Shelley Feese* | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | sfeese@camsys.com |
| Chris Flynn* | Volpe | chris.flynn@volpe.dot.gov |
| Linda Forrester | New Jersey Department of Transportation | linda.forrester@dot.state.nj.us |
| Joe Foster* | District of Columbia Department of Transportation | Joe.foster@dc.gov |
| Todd Ganey | Washington State Department of Transportation | GaneyT@WSDOT.WA.GOV |
| William Giuffre* | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | wgiuffre@camsys.com |
| Bill Goforth* | Washington State Department of Transportation | gofortb@wsdot.wa.gov |
| Valinda Gorder* | Parker Young | vpgimi@aol.com |
| Bob Hale | Oklahoma Department of Transportation | bhale@odot.org |
| Jeff Hall* | FMCSA | jeff.hall@dot.gov |
| Beth Hartley* | Department of Motor Vehicles – Nebraska | bhartley@notes.state.ne.us |
| Kate Hartman* | U.S. DOT | kate.hartman@dot.gov |
| Dick Hayworth | Indiana Department of Revenue | dhayworth@dor.in.gov |
| Ben Hinkle | Florida | |
| Thad Hoffman* | Iteris, Inc. | tth@iteris.com |
| David Jackson* | Kentucky Transportation Cabinet | david.jackson@ky.gov |
| Quon Kwan* | FMCSA | quon.kwan@dot.gov |
| Julie Lane* | FMCSA | julie.lane@dot.gov |

| Name | Organization | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| Brenda Lantz* | North Dakota State University | brenda.lantz@ndsu.edu |
| Jim Leamon | Oregon Department of Transportation | Jim.Leamon@odot.state.or.us |
| Delores Machias | FMCSA – ID | dolores.macias@fmcsa.dot.gov |
| Nancy Magnusson | JHU/APL | nancy.magnusson@jhuapl.edu |
| Youlanda Massey* | Louisiana DPS/OMV/IRP | ymassey@dps.la.gov |
| Michael McDonald* | Delaware State Police | michael.mcdonald@state.de.us |
| Rick McDonough* | NYSDOT | rmcdonough@dot.state.ny.us |
| Pam Minton | Alaska Department of Transportation | pamela_minton@dot.state.ak.us |
| Ross Morris | Washington State Department of Transportation | morrisr@wsdot.wa.gov |
| Kalyna Nedilsky* | Maryland State Highway Administration | knedilsky@sha.state.md.us |
| Clem Novenario | Florida | |
| Ron Nuel | New Jersey Department of Transportation | Ron.Nuel@dot.state.nj.us |
| Funke Ogundare* | PrePass / ACS Government Solutions, Inc. | funke.ogundare@acs-inc.com |
| Michael Pannone* | State of Alaska / DOT & PF / MSCVE | michael_pannone@dot.state.ak.us |
| Manoj Pansare* | Maryland State Highway Administration | mpansare@sha.state.md.us |
| John Powers | New Jersey Department of Transportation | john.powers@dot.state.nj.us |
| Brian Pyle* | ACS | brian.pyle@acs-inc.com |
| Larry Ramsey* | FMCSA | larry.ramsey@dot.gov |
| Alex Reyes* | RSIS/FMCSA | alex.reyes@dot.gov |
| Jim Rhode | Nevada Department of Public Safety | jimrhode@dps.state.nv.us |
| Ed Roman | Volpe | Edmund.Roman@volpe.dot.gov |
| Chris Rotondo | FMCSA – NJ | chris.rotondo@dot.gov |
| Hal Rumpca* | South Dakota Department of Transportation | hal.rumpca@state.sd.us |
| Sandra Salazar* | JHU/APL | sandra.salazar@jhuapl.edu |
| Terrence Samuel | Florida | |

| Name | Organization | E-Mail |
|---|---|---|
| Pat Savage* | FMCSA | patricia.savage@dot.gov |
| Rick Schulte | Cambridge Systematics, Inc. | rschulte@camsys.com |
| Jeff Secrist* | FMCSA | Jeff.Secrist@fmcsa.dot.gov |
| Basheer Shaik | North Carolina Department of Transportation | bshaik@dot.state.nc.us |
| Carrie Silcox | Utah | NA |
| Jason Stein* | ACS Government Solutions, Inc. | jason.stein@acs-inc.com |
| Phil Strohm | Delaware | Philip.Strohm@state.de.us |
| Mary Stuart* | JHU/APL | mary.stuart@jhuapl.edu |
| Brian Temperine | FMCSA – NY | brian.temperine@dot.gov |
| Carolyn Temperine | FMCSA | carolyn.temperine@dot.gov |
| Ron Thompson | FMCSA – IL | ron.thompson@dot.gov |
| Steve Trudell | NY | strudell@dot.state.ny.us |
| Paul Tsimikas* | State of Rhode Island Division of Motor Vehicles | ptsimikas@dmv.state.ri.us |
| Terri Ungerman | Westcliffe Technologies | terri@westcliffe-tech.com |
| Jamie Vasser* | FMCSA | jamie.vasser@dot.gov |
| Jerry Ward* | HELP/ACS | jerry.ward@acs-inc.com |
| Kris Weaver* | ACS Government Solutions, Inc. | Kris.Weaver@acs-inc.com |
| Barbara Webb-Edwards | FMCSA – MD | barbara.webb-edwards@ dot.gov |
| Andrew Wilson* | Volpe Transportation Center – CSC | Andrew.wilson@volpe.dot.gov |
| Jingfei Wu* | Volpe Transportation Center | wu@volpe.dot.gov |

# APPENDIX B. – SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

| Who | Description | Area | CR # | Issue # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| APL | Develop CVISN Architecture change requests (CRs) for the recommended state and SAFER business rule changes. | Data | 41 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | Continue research and planning for September release of changed MCMIS-SAFER update processes per SAFER CR (SCR) 1613 “Modernization of MCMIS snapshot process to SAFER.” | Data | 42 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | Create a SCR to enhance the file naming convention for the T0031 MCMIS Safety and Census Update subscription (sequentially name files and limit the file size to 5000 records). | Data | 43 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | Continue with planned summary report on uploads (CVISN Architecture CR 4777, SCR 1508 "Request for summary reports") for the April release. | Data | 47 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | Consider whether SAFER could generate a regular report to summarize transactions processed over some period of time. | Data | 48 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| APL | Develop a separate "help" document that explains the highlights of changes to the states. Capture all results from the workshop, not just the Interface Control Document (ICD) changes. | Data | 49 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| APL/FMCSA | Recap the workshop during April CVISN PM calls and CVISN ACCB teleconference. In particular, spread the word to other states who did not attend the workshop. | Data | 50 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| AK, Iteris | Develop a plan for bogus values for International Registration Plan (IRP) fields from exempt states. Coordinate with HI (Roger Hoopengardner). | Data | 52 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | There is a need to develop an ongoing certification/de-certification plan. Volpe will look at PRISM, IRP, etc. for models and lessons learned toward developing a process. | Data | 53 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| States and Volpe | Implementation of new business rules will require recertification after both states and SAFER changes are made. Additional certification test procedures may be needed. States will help test SAFER by sending transactions that deliberately violate new rules. Tentative schedule: September SAFER release. | Data | 54 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| FMCSA (CVISN and PRISM) | Encourage TN to submit T0022 transactions. | Data | 55 | DQ02/ DQ03/ DQ05 |
| Volpe | Provide an update to SCR 1507 (CVISN Architecture CR 4776) "SAFER Upload Change Tracking" based on discussion with WA (Bill Goforth). Include this change in the April SAFER release. | Data | 56 | DQ08 |

| Who | Description | Area | CR # | Issue # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WA | Prototype a tracking system based on April SAFER release. This would be an automated SAFER process to compare what a state said they sent versus what SAFER received and processed. It would report only exceptions. The prototype will be demonstrated to the CVISN ACCB. | Data | 57 | DQ08 |
| APL | Enter WA's proposed CR on T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring (control file concept) as a CVISN Architecture CR. | Data | 58 | DQ01 |
| Proactive data quality/ops Issues focus group | Meet on April 12 to discuss the CR on T0031 Data Timeliness Monitoring and report on it at the ACCB meeting in April / May. | Data | 59 | DQ01 |
| APL | Send Pat Savage a pointer to the SAFER Dictionary and code information. | Data Dictionary | 60 | DQ07 |
| Volpe | Schedule the processing of the SAFER snapshot baseline to occur after Inspection Selection System data are processed. | Data | 61 | Data Flows |
| WA | Write CVISN Architecture CR that proposes reducing the allowable codes for FLEET_STATUS_CODE and IRP_STATUS_CODE in the T0022, T0026, and T0028 transactions. Coordinate with IRP. | Data Dictionary | 62 | DQ07 |
| NE (Cathy Beedle), WA, PRISM, ASPEN, SD (Alana Gourneau), AAMVA Standards Committee | Propose a simpler list of vehicle use class codes that CVISN should use. Coordinate with IRP, Inc. | Data Dictionary | 63 | DQ07 |
| NE (Cathy Beedle), WA, PRISM, ASPEN, SD (Alana Gourneau), AAMVA Standards Committee | Propose a simpler list of vehicle make codes that CVISN should use. Volpe coordinate with AAMVA to suggest what table might be used. | Data Dictionary | 64 | DQ07 |
| WA | Prepare Architecture CR to reduce values for International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA) Status code and present to the CVISN ACCB. Coordinate with IFTA, Inc. | Data Dictionary | 65 | DQ07 |
| Volpe | After the corresponding CVISN Architecture CR is approved, add IRP data rules (T0020-T0021-T0023 relationships) to the SAFER ICD. | Data Dictionary | 66 | DQ07 |
| Volpe | Determine the most efficient way to reflect ICD changes. Consider creating errata sheets instead of publishing an entire new document. | Data Dictionary | 67 | DQ07 |

| Who | Description | Area | CR # | Issue # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WA | Make the Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) algorithm available on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site. | Data Dictionary | 68 | DQ07 |
| Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA), FMCSA, WA | Develop consolidated recommendation on VIN data entry, validation, and handling. | Data Dictionary | 69 | DQ07 |
| WA (Bill Goforth), NE (John Casteel), Volpe (Andrew Wilson) | Consider: Should SAFER check the valid meaning of critical data fields during the CVIEW certification process?<br>Consider: What DQ measures should be established for fields and assessed during certification? How should noncompliance be reported? What compliance level should be required for a state CVIEW to be certified?<br>Consider: Identify additional edit checks for inputs to SAFER to check consistency across fields (e.g., valid dates; if the expiration date is in past, the status cannot be active; etc.). | Data Dictionary | 70 | DQ07 |
| Keith Dey, Warren Dunham, Thad Hoffman | Develop a proposal for restructuring the CVISN change control process and present it to the CVISN PMs at the April or May teleconference. The PMs will vote on the proposal. | Change Mgmt. | 72 | CM05 |
| APL | Develop recommendation on the role and purpose of the CVISN SharePoint, CVISN Web site, and the CVISN Architects' listserv. | Technical | 75 | TS04 |
| APL | Add information about key FMCSA Web sites and links to them on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site (or the CVISN Web site?). | Technical | 76 | TS04 |
| FMCSA Technical Support | Consider proactively reporting problems observed to all users (e.g., when zero-byte files are reported, tell all the states about the problem). | Technical | 78 | TS04 |
| APL, FMCSA Technical Support | Explore with APL the possibility of hosting SharePoint. Note that it is important to keep the free user collaboration capability. | Technical | 79 | TS04 |
| FMCSA Technical Support | Consider using a process similar to what PRISM is doing to keep users informed. At least include PRISM in the discussion about what to do. | Technical | 80 | TS04 |
| Warren Dunham | Ask applicable states why they are not uploading data to SAFER. | Operational | 81 | OP02 |
| FMCSA | During upcoming planning session, consider developing and posting a CVISN map that shows red/yellow/green status regarding Core Compliance. | Operational | 82 | OP02 |

| Who | Description | Area | CR # | Issue # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NY (Don Baker) | Develop requirements for Creating Opportunities, Methods, and Processes to Secure Safety (COMPASS) to define the preferred way for users to assess safety risk. Are there different preferred ways to support different business processes? Be sure to include the requirement for update dates on data. Revisit the Commercial Driver's License (CDL) program efforts to see if they have established requirements based on different user groups. | Operational | 83 | OP03 |
| WA, NE, TX, Iteris, LA, DC, ACS, MD, APL, Volpe | Hold a discussion on SCR 50 and PRISM/CVISN business rules. | PRISM | 84 | PC01 |
| Volpe (DeRusha) | Provide list of vehicles that violate the business rules, by state. | PRISM | 86 | PC02 |
| Volpe/APL | Write CVISN Architecture CR and SCR to add target indicator to T0028. | PRISM | 87 | PC05/ PC06 |
| Brenda Lantz | Write change request against Query Central to add field to indicate whether the vehicle's IRP status code is active or not. | PRISM | 88 | PC05/ PC06 |
| APL, Volpe, FMCSA | Consider adding a pointer to the PRISM Web site or a PRISM section on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site. | PRISM | 89 | PC05/ PC06 |
| Warren Dunham | If the ballot to make USDOT number a required field in IFTA is accepted, notify CVISN states. Cathy Beedle will assist. | E-screening | 90 | ES01 |
| All | Talk to your IFTA rep and tell them to vote YES! On the ballot to make USDOT number a required field. | E-screening | 91 | ES01 |
| APL | Add a link on the CVISN Collaboration SharePoint site to the IFTA Web site. | E-screening | 92 | ES01 |
| WA | Decide whether it is worthwhile to add the IFTA jurisdiction code to the T0022 and T0028 transactions. | E-screening | 93 | ES01 |
| E-screening focus group | Evaluate the potential usefulness of IFTA data in the screening process and make recommendations. | E-screening | 94 | ES01 |
| APL, North American Preclearance and Safety System (NORPASS), WA | Discuss the issue of sharing transponder data with all SAFER participants at the PM level first, before bringing to the CVISN ACCB. | E-screening | 95 | ES02 |
| NORPASS (Joe Crabtree) | Discuss the idea of sharing transponder data with all SAFER participants and the opt-out option with the NORPASS Board. | E-screening | 96 | ES02 |
| E-screening focus group | Review e-screening enrollment process and propose how to move towards desired solution (perhaps the opt-out solution). | E-screening | 97 | ES02 |

| Who | Description | Area | CR # | Issue # |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NORPASS Transponder Administrators | Review e-screening enrollment process and propose how to move towards desired solution (perhaps the opt-out solution). | E-screening | 98 | ES02 |
| WA | Close CVISN Architecture CR 4948. Write a new CR for the preferred option regarding T0023. | E-screening | 99 | ES02 |
| Volpe | Investigate digital signature or other security features for CVIEW inputs to SAFER. | E-screening | 100 | ES03 |
| WA | Write a CR regarding a SAFER query to National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS) to verify registration/ transponder data for non-authoritative source. | E-screening | 101 | ES03 |
| APL, FMCSA | Explore access to NLETS for CVISN purposes. | E-screening | 102 | ES03 |
| E-screening focus group | Work on issue ES04 “Need for separate table in SAFER for e-screening – for both enrollment and update authority.”<br>Schedule next telecon. | E-screening | 103 | ES04 |
| NORPASS | Discuss the e-screening enrollment administrators’ need for a procedure to verify status on an ongoing basis. | E-screening | 104 | ES06 |
| WA | Add “mandatory” attribute to e-screening spreadsheet. | E-screening | 105 | ES06 |

This Page Intentionally Blank

# APPENDIX C. – WORKSHOP APPROACH

## CVISN Deployment Workshop: "Solving the Issues"
## Arlington, Virginia
## 3-Day Agenda

**Tuesday, March 20, 2007**

| Start Time | Agenda Item |
|---|---|
| 8:30 a.m. | *Registration Open* |
| | *Continental Breakfast* |
| 9:00 a.m. | Executive Welcome, Jeff Secrist, FMCSA Office of Research and Analysis |
| 9:15 a.m. | General Introduction |
| 9:30 a.m. | Workshop Approach and Objectives |
| 9:45 a.m. | Review Issues to be Discussed |
| 10:00 a.m. | Summary of Pre-workshop Activities |
| 10:20 a.m. | *15 Min. Break* |
| 10:35 a.m. | WORKING SESSION: DATA ISSUES |
| 10:35 a.m. | Part 1: Data Issues<br>• Timeliness of data updates |
| 12:00 p.m. | *Lunch* |
| 1:00 p.m. | WORKING SESSION: DATA ISSUES, *CONTINUED* |
| 1:00 p.m. | Part 2: Data Issues<br>• Data quality problems in the SAFER registration files<br>• Data quality problems related to USDOT numbers<br>• States do not check for errors before uploading data to SAFER<br>• SAFER-CVIEW Interface Efficiency<br>• Volpe does not adequately check for errors in data from states before sending out |
| 3:00 p.m. | *15 Min. Break* |
| 3:15 p.m. | WORKING SESSION: DATA ISSUES, *CONTINUED* |
| 4:45 p.m. | Wrap-up discussion |
| 5:00 p.m. | Overview and discussion of SAFER data flows |
| 6:30 p.m. | Adjourn – Day 1 |

**Wednesday, March 21, 2007**

| Start Time | Agenda Item |
|---|---|
| 8:00 a.m. | *Continental Breakfast* |
| 8:00 a.m. | STRATEGY SESSION: DATA ISSUES |
| 8:00 a.m. | • Recap issues |
| 8:30 a.m. | Develop Strategies<br>• Data quality problems in the SAFER registration files<br>• Data quality problems related to USDOT numbers<br>• States do not check for errors before uploading data to SAFER |
| 11:30 a.m. | Technical Support Issues<br>• Technical support issues and resolutions |
| 12:30 p.m. | *Lunch* |
| 1:30 p.m. | Configuration and Change Management Process |
| 2:00 p.m. | Operational Issues<br>• Frequency of updates<br>• Not enough states sending data to SAFER<br>• Too many choices<br>• States would like to understand how others states send data to SAFER and how they update CVIEW/state system |
| 3:30 p.m. | *15 Min. Break* |
| 3:45 p.m. | STRATEGY SESSION: CHANGE MANAGEMENT /OPERATIONAL/ TECHNICAL SUPPORT ISSUES |
| 4:30 p.m. | Data Dictionary / Information Management Authority (IMA) |
| 5:00 p.m. | Data Dictionary / SAFER Interface Control Document |
| 6:30 p.m. | Adjourn – Day 2 |

**Thursday, March 22, 2007**

| Start Time | Agenda Item |
|---|---|
| 7:30 a.m. | *Continental Breakfast* |
| 8:00 a.m. | VIN validation |
| 9:00 a.m. | COMPASS discussion |
| 9:30 a.m. | STRATEGY SESSION: PRISM/CVISN BUSINESS RULES ISSUES |
| 10:00 a.m. | *15 Min. Break* |
| 10:15 a.m. | WORKING SESSION: E-SCREENING DATA & E-SCREENING ENROLLMENT BUSINESS RULES ISSUES<br>• What are the business rules for transponder update transactions?<br>• Need consensus on fields that will be used during e-screening<br>• How should e-screening work via SAFER? |
| 12:00 p.m. | *Lunch* |
| 1:00 p.m. | STRATEGY SESSION: E-SCREENING DATA & E-SCREENING ENROLLMENT BUSINESS RULES ISSUES |
| 2:45 p.m. | *15 Min. Break* |
| 3:00 p.m. | FMCSA Feedback to Participants |
| | State Response – open dialogue |
| 3:15 p.m. | FY 2007 CVISN Funding Plan – Jeff Secrist |
| 3:55 p.m. | Close workshop – Jeff Secrist |
| 4:00 p.m. | Adjourn – Day 3 |

This Page Intentionally Blank