

**ROSS Change Board
Conference Call Notes
January 14, 2004 ~ 0930-1200 MST**

Participants:

Rod Chaffee
Jon Skeels
Sheri Fox
Kathy Miles
Dave Hart
Dave Hendren
Grant Kemp
Beth Mason

Version 2.0 & 2.1 Update and Release Schedule – Jon Skeels

- Ver. 2.0 testing begins January 26th with a target release in early March. Few changes will be apparent in the look and feel of the application. Performance should be noticeably enhanced by new equipment and architecture as well as network changes.
- Work on ver. 2.1 is proceeding. The preparation of Business Requirements is nearly complete. Our focus is (1) bugs; (2) issues surfaced via reviews and the Coordinators; and (3) continued development of the application. There will be quite a few changes which will be outlined in paper to be out soon. Notable fixes and/or new functionality include:
 - Fix Prepositioning issues
 - Reassigning Group Requests
 - Restrict use of “Fill with New Resource” to Dispatch Managers
 - Add ability to “Fill with Agreement” *not maintained in ROSS*
 - Add ability to “Fill with AD” *not maintained in ROSS*
 - Add ability to “Release to Home” by Home Dispatch
 - Add “Name Request” functionality
- Release is targeted for June 1, 2004.
- Other items of note:
 - Rex Alford and LMCO folks are at NIFC this week working on the report writing tool, Data Warehouse, etc.
 - ROSS Team has requested input from the business community on revisions to the printed Resource Order form. Various business process updates and revisions to the National Mobilization Guide have also been requested.
 - A general ROSS Team meeting will be held in Denver in late February. Invitation is extended to any Change Board members that can attend.

Kathy: When is version 2.0 due to be released?

Jon: The target is March 1, provided testing goes well and equipment is delivered to NITC in sufficient time.

Sheri: When is the general Team meeting?

Jon: February 24 to 26 with travel on Monday and Friday. Meeting will be held at the BLM State Office (*where RMCC is located*).

IRB Process Update / Investment Segment Submission Due Dates – Jon Skeels

- This is a six-step process. The first two steps are development of a business case and submission to the Investment Review Board (IRB). This is the step where the Change Board is currently at with the FY 2006 Segments. For ROSS the path is FS→USDA→OMB. The IRB includes upper-level agency management—there are no Fire people on the board. The issues presented must be substantial and the business cases well-developed. Upon approval the funds pass back down the chain.
- Six segments were submitted for the 2005 budget cycle:
 1. Approved scope segment (base funding)
 2. Operations and maintenance (base funding)
 3. Contracts / Agreements module
 4. Hotsite development
 5. IQCS permanent interface
 6. Tactical Aviation module.
- All six segments made it through the first approval level fully funded (*i.e., they will be part of the President's budget submitted to Congress*).
- Eight investment segments are in draft for the 2006 budget cycle. We anticipate a request for submissions soon. The eight existing segments, in no particular order, are:
 1. FireCode interface module
 2. Update to Application Program Interface (API)
 3. Compacts module
 4. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) interface (*not application specific*)
 5. Incident prioritization module
 6. Resource drawdown module
 7. Stand-alone hot sync module
 8. Telephone Status module
- Submission must come from Project Manager through the Project Business Lead.
- We must be prepared with priorities in the event that the submission is not fully funded. Kim Christensen, Neil Hitchcock, Jon, Rod and the Change Board will provide input to setting priorities. Keep in mind that the Change Board is not part of the ROSS Project and is not supervised by Jon who serves in an advisory role.

FY 2006 Investment Segment Review and Discussion – All

Rod: We need consensus that these eight items are appropriate for submission.

Beth: Resource Drawdown and Incident Prioritization are CDF's high priority items with Drawdown being the highest. Are other groups interested in these two items?

Jon: Yes, the National MAC Group to name one. We also need to know if the Change Board feels there are any glaring omissions from this list.

Dave Hendren: What is involved in the FireCode interface?

Jon: Would likely entail putting a button on the Incident screen that would go out to the FireCode system and retrieve a code to ROSS.

Grant: Didn't you indicate that DOI may fund this?

Jon: That's a political issue outside our control. The item could be withdrawn later were that to occur. After submission, items may be withdrawn but not added.

Dave Hendren: Don't feel that this is a critical issue since often a FireCode would be retrieved prior to creating the Incident in ROSS.

Sheri: It eliminates a step and that's a good thing.

Jon: Secretary of Interior directed that the two systems be interfaced but failed to provide any funding. The estimated cost is not great ~ \$100K. The FS position is that DOI should fund it since they manage the FireCode system.

Dave Hendren: Authorities within FireCode are based on roles much the same as ROSS. We would have to address meshing the required roles between the two applications.

Jon: This will be addressed if the segment is funded.

Rod: Do we have a consensus to ask for all eight items? Are there any other issues that are missing?

Kathy: Ver. 2.1 addresses the most critical issues. The rest will come with time.

Rod: Ver. 2.0 release will give us new capabilities which may generate new issues. We will need another meeting / conference call to review additional items for the 2007 submission.

Kathy, Sheri, Beth, Grant and Dave Hendren: Agree with submitting these eight items.

Dave Hart: Where do the various CAD programs stand in relation to CPIC requirements and continuing development?

Jon: Our focus would be on providing a data exchange standard which the various CAD programs would adopt. Don't know if WildCAD has met CPIC requirements. California has not done anything but nothing is required until there's federal involvement.

Dave Hart: What is the cost and necessity of the Telephone Status module?

Jon: The original suggestion came from Jerry Day. It's expensive—close to \$1,000K. However, some vendors are one-person operations and have no access to internet status.

Rod: Suggest you talk with your constituents about priorities. Do they feel that this is needed?

Dave Hendren: Any way to get additional resources statused more efficiently is a plus. If this can be done without phone calls to the Dispatcher so much the better. We may reach resources that are not currently being statused.

Sheri: Agree. Currently have system to allow vendors update status via answering machine which dispatcher's must manually input to ROSS. Telephone Status would be a great help.

Kathy: Wasn't there a caveat about discussing some issues outside the Board? Is it OK to solicit input on these submission items?

Rod: Yes, this is definitely OK (*earlier concern related to discussion of items to be included in version 2.1 prior to final decision*). We need to be open for discussion, feedback and input.

Dave Hart: Not opposed to Telephone Status. Just interested in determining where the biggest bang for the buck is.

Grant: Will Telephone Status be in addition to Internet Status and not a replacement?

Rod: Yes, addition to, not replace.

Rod: Will prepare and distribute a decision matrix to document priorities / decisions. Regarding the new issues that were sent to you—is there anything that you feel must be addressed ASAP?

Dave Hendren: Status by qualification.

Rod: This is addressed in version 2.1. Some of the items rated as “New” may already be included in 2.1 and got missed.

Dave Hendren: – Can we progress with CAD interface when some of these systems are just in development?

Jon: We need to develop a standard for how data will be exchanged between the various CAD programs and ROSS. Those interested in an interface would have to adjust to the standard and be approved.

Beth: Explain API again.

Jon: API stands for Application Program Interface and is a library of software routines that programmers can incorporate into other applications so that those applications can interface with ROSS.

New Item Discussion / Review – All

Dave Hart: Many of the new issues seem to be small or maintenance related.

Rod: We need to determine which are basic and can be incorporated into Operations / Maintenance and which can be consolidated to create a segment.

Kathy: Reviewed the list and separated into top 10 and “nice to have”. Will write up and send to Rod.

Rod: That’s great. Would the rest of you send me your top 10 as well as any that you don’t think we should do.

Dave Hendren: Are these in their original format?

Rod: Yes. Some were taken over the phone and put directly into StarTeam (*change tracking software*) and others are from e-mails to the ROSS Suggestion Box. They have been screened and those that could be addressed by answering a question or providing information to the users have been handled.

Dave Hendren: It would be helpful to know what level of the dispatch organization generated the suggestion and what levels would benefit from its implementation.

Rod: Have tried to do this where possible. Also helps to know what task the suggester was doing when they determined that a change was needed. Were they statusing resources, filling a request, releasing a resource, etc?

Dave Hart: Should we anticipate implementation of the Supply module prior to 2007?

Rod: Supplies will be partially implemented in version 2.1. Users will be able to create requests for NFES items and place those requests. This will not address inventory. The full implementation of the Supply module will be addressed through the ICBS Reengineering project.

Dave Hendren: Would be nice if ROSS could handle qualification hierarchies. For example a DIVS may also be a qualified STCR but not a STDZ. This would be complicated.

Rod: This may be addressed with implementation of the ICQS interface. We should get more information.

Close Out / Next Step – Rod Chaffee

- Would like to schedule a meeting in April or May to address the submission for the 2007 budget cycle. Location to be determined. If necessary this could be handled by conference calls. Conflict with week of April 19th noted.
- Due dates for the 2007 submission—we must prepare a list for National Coordinators to review and prioritize in December of this year. Submission will be January / February of 2005.
- **Dave Hart:** We don't know what version 2.1 is going to look like. Could we preview and discuss 2.1 at the spring meeting? This would give us a better idea where some of the ideas fit in or whether they've already been fixed.
Rod: Yes. Will also send a .zip file of the 2.1 requirements documents.
- **Dave Hendren:** How are we going to prioritize the eight items for the 2006 submission?
Rod: Will send out a matrix of the items to be ranked by each member. We can follow up with a short conference call after responses are received.

- **Action Items :**
 - **Rod:**
 - › Review and distribute notes from this call
 - › Have notes posted on new Change Board portion of the website
 - › Send information about the February general Team meeting
 - › Send ROSS Team paper on version 2.1 changes (*when available*)
 - › Send priority matrix for 2006 Segments; schedule follow-up conference call
 - › Send .zip file of 2.1 Requirements
 - › Schedule April / May meeting
 - › Research whether ICQS interface will address qualification hierarchy
 - **Board Members :**
 - › Send Rod review comments on new items (e.g., top 10, items not to do, etc.)
 - › Return completed priority matrix for 2006 Segments by January 30 2004.