

# Computer Aided Dispatch Standardization (CADS) Webinar Transcript

**Event Started: 2/29/2016 5:00:00 PM**

Please stand by for real-time captions.

Ladies and gentlemen, thanks for standing by. Please continue to hold.

Ladies and gentlemen, thanks for standing by. Welcome to interagency dispatch implementation project. You are in listen only mode. Later, there will be a question and answer opportunity.

Good morning everyone. Thanks for coming to the first of several virtual road show webinars in support of the Interagency Dispatch Implementation Project. This one is about the standardized station effort. Why are we doing this? Why are we doing all of these things? In July in July 2014, a project plan and charter was signed, that said to take the years of study effort, and now implement those changes. Pair the methodologies. To give us three key deliverables. Why are we doing a better service to the field? My premise is better dispatch makes better deliverability in the field. It is better dispatch, because it translates to the people you take care of in the field. The give us three deliverables. A computer aided dispatch standardization. You know if you are in Minnesota for example, and you are told to go to California, you cannot fill that order. We need to get it across the agency spectrum to support total mobility. We need to have an updated technology to make sure that we stay compliance with security. There are various other reasons. That was a key deliverable. Another one is to create an Internet agency dispatch operations guide, similar to the helicopter operations guide. Third, around governance and staffing. They give us a huge laundry list. From IT, to workload. Those are key deliverables. We will talk about the other things. The first one we want to talk about is the computer aided standardized nation effort. It has timelines in order to make sure there is a delivery in a good timeline, to meet the needs of the field. That is why we are here today. We want to share what we are doing and we want to source in your feedback. If you need clarification, and make sure that we get it right. It is ultimately your tool. I have asked Douglas Thomas, from aviation and Ford -- field office to join. Mark?

Thank you calling. -- Colleen. I am the assistant director for accountability within the forest service. I know there has been a tremendous amount of work by her staff, and by all of you and trying to push the world of dispatching further. I know as well, with Susie Stingley-Russell, she has put a lot of work into pushing this into the 21st century. Since we have moved to the evolution of computers, we have become more dependent on these applications. CAD is no different. We hope to these types of discussions and your involvement that we will be able to create a system that is robust, and is able to manage your workload and facilitate more effectively, what you are trying to do on a day-to-day basis. This is part of a much larger paradigm shift in the forest service, to reestablish the ownership of these computer systems with the business community. Your engagement and telling us what you want to do, how you want the services to be delivered, is essential, for us to move forward. We do not want to deliver a product that only does five percent of the work. We need it to do 100 percent. Your involvement in this will help us push that initiative forward. I look forward to the work that is created out of this group. I am sure you will deliver an amazing product. If there ever any questions that you would have for me, feel free to reach out. I am more than happy to help in any way that I can.

Thanks so much Mark. We appreciate your support. I want to rewind one moment. Want to ensure that everyone understands. Tom harbor was the director of fire in aviation in the forest service. He has

retired. Jim Douglas is the Department of Interior director. Most of you probably knew that. With -- Mark works for Dan. Mark is here and speaking on behalf of those folks. Susie Stingley-Russell is the national business liaison. She is the one that says you are doing it right or not. I rely on Suzy heavily, to make sure that we are leaving things better. I go back and forth and talk to her. She tells me if we are not doing things as we should, or give me things to think about. I cannot express my gratitude enough for the support that she has given to this effort, and the way that she has tried to make things better overall. Hopefully, she looks of -- at this is an extension of her effort. Susie and I had another one of our meetings a few weeks ago. She says we have been briefing leadership, but not the field. We have been briefing you at dispatch meetings at a high level, but not about the specifics. We chose to do a series of virtual road shows because travel agents -- budgets are what they are. We will have a series of road shows. I will filter the times and places through Suzy to your coordinators. Thank you Susie Stingley-Russell for all of your support and making sure that we got these road shows online to give people knowledge.

Can you hear me?

I can.

This is good because we are going for a new phone system, including new speaker phones. As stated, my name is Susie Stingley-Russell, I am the center manager at the national interagency coordination Center. With that title, comes the job of being the business lead for the dispatch coordination system, as a whole. I realized from my previous experience in Northern California, the great basin, Eastern area, Alaska, that 85 to 90 percent of our business community is at the local unit. It is very important to make sure that when we are looking at the requirements for a future system, that we are engaging that group. I agree with Mark and Colleen -- the CADS working group has done an excellent job of being objectives, open-minded and looking at future technologies. It always takes us a while to build a technology. To fund it and get it into the system and build the technology and implement the technology. Featuring out -- I am looking at what can make our business more effective and more efficient at the local unit. I think we are seeing some of that -- specifically with future CADS. Putting together the work for the request for information and trying to view what the industry now has out there, as top-of-the-line technology. I think what we need to also remember, is that part of this effort is not only coming up with a -- something that we can train to nationally. The face of it would look the same. We need to be inclusive, and be flexible of all of the different modular components. The things that different partners do. National parks to search and rescue, law enforcement -- they build it so that we have that flexibility to accommodate our current business model, but also our inter-agencies business model as well. How the data standards are implemented into systems of record, and with our continuing efforts with Erwin -- having an interchange with an orchestration of data. We are finding that more and more of the data that is important to the fire community originates in the CADS system. Part of looking at the CADS system, is also potentially taking out some of the flexibility, so that our data is more standard as it comes out of the computer system program. Such as drop-down menus. Trying to make our business more standard, not only through the data standards, but also on how we do things. As we implement any new CADS system, we will be asking the dispatch efficiencies workgroup -- and the knowledge of the IA dispatchers. What is the best solution? What is the best business practice, to make sure we have this? We will be going through the same thing with the design on the new Rauf or inter-agency ordering system and a little bit. I commend the work that is going on here. If anybody has worked on these projects, they take a long time. Your efforts are going to be rewarded. You may not see it right away.

They will be rewarded. I advise staying up on the projects. Keeping up on what is going -- if there are any future webinars, or ways that you can provide input, please do that. Every voice out there will be heard. Thanks again for participating. Very good work by this team. I look forward to the questions and answers.

Thank you so much for your input. I want to share one other thing. I want to emphasize that every voice will be heard. We will consider your input. I encourage that. I failed to mention that this meeting is being recorded. If people are trying to attend and cannot -- or could not attend because it did not meet their schedule, send an email and we will send you the link. It is also being closed-captioned. If you need a copy of the transcript, that will be available. Please understand, this is about the future. Today's session is not about legacy systems that we are currently using. We know there are questions about the current situation. If you have questions, specific to legacy systems, you can email those two CADS@fs.fed.us. Know that we are focusing on the future in today's session. We are interested in your feedback on all subjects. I want you to know who your CADS team is and who is working behind the scenes to make it happen. There is a long list of people who are involved. Check is involved. Betsy Walatka, she is the lead of the team. Ken Maas, you have heard from him before. He is the co-lead. K Steffi is our contracting office. Laura Hill is the strategic planner. Check while Mac -- chocks while Mac. Barry Wallace is the assistant manager. Ray Crowe as the Alaska interagency coordination are -- coordination manager. Norval Tyler is the Arizona dispatch center. We have Traci Beaudin, she works for the forest team she is the IDIP team. Nancy Ellsworth, Jennifer Parrish, Linnea Keating is doing communications for IDIP. That is the team. There have been others that are involved as well. There you have the core of the team. This slide is not coming to life. I will turn this over to Ken Maas. Can will go through the process and actual RFI. He will begin the process of sharing with you. We may have a technical glitch.

Not a problem.

Go ahead can.

Thanks Colleen. Good morning everyone. I will try to provide a brief review of the process that our team has followed, since we were initially engaged 10 months ago. We have done a lot of work between last April and now. We will bring you up to speed on the steps that we have gone through. We will take a look at the document that we have compiled to date. Giving you all an opportunity to ask any clarifying questions about that document. Also, to provide additional input. We will close with the future steps. We have a lot to cover. We have plenty of time to get it done. We will try to make it as interactive as possible. First, let me provide an overview. The request for information process describes business requirements in a structured manner all potential vendors have an opportunity to respond and ask questions. This process is procurement sensitive, which means that all deliberations and information is under a nondisclosure agreement. No vendor has an unfair advantage versus another vendor, as the information is being compiled. Not only does this apply to vendors, but it also applies to the dispatch community. Which is why, until we put information out through an -- a RFI to the world, we cannot tell you what is going on. Because we just put out a second RFI request, we can bring you into the game, and incorporate your comments and feedback. That is background for you. To give you some background for what we have been doing over the last 10 months -- last spring we had a CAD carnival. We viewed six different computer aided dispatch systems currently in use, trying to understand the various attributes. We could figure out what system attributes seem to be appropriate if we were going to build the best system out of all of these systems. What with that system look like? Hopefully, that is what we will share

with you on the RFI. With our means, we determined what advantages were for each system. That is what the CAD carnival with about. The team met in Boise last May, and we compiled our first request for information document. It contain the business elements. The business elements moved into 13 categories. There may be some discussion between whether or not a particular element along in this category versus another category. We will not get into those today. To let you know, as we go through this document -- hopefully you have gone through the document, you may think things are out of place. We are trying to make sure that we have all the attributes and features correct. Last summer, we worked with a contracting officer to put the first request for information out in a pre-solicit Tatian -- solicitation package. We had a good response. We had half a dozen documents that came back to us from industry. Five of the six provided us exceptional comment, which basically alerted us to the fact that the vendor community is very interested in helping us build the best CAD product that we can. We incorporated comments that we received from the vendors, as well as comments that we received from the dispatch community. As you may recall, we solicited an email request from all of you, to provide comments on the first RFI. Did we miss business features, are the things you want to see in a future CAD system? We received 40+ responses. We incorporated those comments, as well as our responses from the vendors, into our second RFI document. We also made sure that the second RFI document contained all of the necessary attributes related to system architecture. That is the hosting environment. Federal security requirements and 508 compliance requirements. The second RFI document, which recently went on the street in January -- it was early in February. It included all of the comments that we got on the initial RFI. This is where we stand. We got our second RFI posted on Federal business opportunities. Ultimately resulting in additional vendor comment. What we are hoping for -- because the second RFI included the opportunity for vendors to participate in industry day. That is coming up in March. We put the second RFI on the street. And allows us to talk about all of the elements to the world. That is what we are doing in our virtual roadshow today. I want to let you know that we have been talking to others who systems need to be integrated into our future CADS, to make sure that everything will work together. Related to IRWIN, IROC -- they all work together. We are thinking into the future, and not about how they worked in the past. Technology is moving, and we want to make sure that we keep up with technology. We wanted to be good five years out. We want it to be enhanced, as our technologies continue to improve. I want to go into detail about industry day. It will be coming up in a couple of weeks. It is a closed meetings -- meeting. Vendors can't respond to the contracting officer, advising her that they have a lot of interest. They want to come. Our intentions are for industry to demonstrate what their commercial off-the-shelf application can already do, to meet the business requirements included on our request for information document. Ultimately, they will be doing a demo and we will be at that meeting. We will have some interaction. We will have questions and answers, so that we can fine tune those enhancements that we require to be incorporated into their off-the-shelf products, to make it the best dispatch product we can use going into the future. Another main element of that vendor day is to get cost information from the vendors, so that we understand what kind of a ballpark we are in. How many millions of dollars what cost us? We will be talking about what tactics they currently use. What the best fit will be for the dispatch community going forward. This industry day is something we look forward to. I know we have had responses from a couple of the vendors, who actually responded to the first one. They want to demonstrate their product. The goal for us is that we will find out what vendors are serious about providing us their products as we move forward. This will be a great heads up opportunity for us. The last thing I want to talk about -- the second RFI is on the street, how long do we have to comment until we go forward with our next step? We're asking the dispatch community and

vendors to provide comment by the end of the month. Again, if something comes up, we are not moving at lightning speed, so that we cannot go back and try to incorporate another comment. We are asking you guys -- you have 30 days to comment on the second RFI document. In addition to the comments, we are putting forth today. Again, nobody will miss the boat. We want to make sure that we build a product that meets everybody's needs. The address to send your comments to is CADS@fs.fed.us. Based on that, we are ready to get into the RFI document. I want to give a bit of guidance. The request for information consists of 13 individual sections. These 13 sections -- I will list them quickly. They include elements of an initial report of an incident, mapping, resource management, system administration, mobile CAD, reporting, system integration, system features and function, information security, communication, vendor services, as well as system architecture. The one hope that we had, is that everybody had a chance to look at the document before the session. I am not going to go through each element individually. I want to visit this document section by section, and I want to ask for input from those out in the dispatch centers listening in on this call. We will give you an opportunity to ask any clarifying questions, or to provide additional input. Additional business elements that you think we might have missed. I do not expect that I will be typing any input into this document live on the screen. This session is being transcribed and recorded. We will pick up all of the relevant comments after this meeting. We will generate a new document and you will have the opportunity to make sure that we got it right. Based on those grounds roles, I want to start off with the initial section on the initial report. Can you scroll back up? Want to add one more clarification. You will be allowed to ask a clarifying question or provide input. I will not be answering the question. We have our subject matter experts on the line. As the question comes in, we will assimilate what the question is. I will direct your question to an individual to provide a response. You will know that you are talking to a dispatcher that knows what is going on. You are not just talking to me. Based on that, we will take a look at the initial report. Please open the lines for input.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you have a question, please push star 1. You will hear a tone. You may remove yourself from the queue, by pressing pound. If you have a question today, please push star 1. One moment, what we wait for the first question. At this time, I am showing no questions.

Scroll into the incident area. What I want to point out, is that a lot of the elements that we incorporated, came about through our discussions with the IRWIN group and data management. We put a lot of thought into making sure that this future product incorporates all of the relevant elements. To create an incident, record -- we're talking about data standards in the glossary. We want to make sure that we are all on the same page, as we developed this new product. If you have any concerns, know that we are trying to make sure that everyone understands what we are doing before we go down the wrong path. Keep scrolling. Again, the footnote currently on the screen, refers to the discussions that we had regarding data standards. We provided a link so that they can understand what we are talking about in greater detail. I realize the scrolling is tedious. I am not sure if folks listening in have a hard copy of this document near them. If you have any questions, feel free to interject as we continue to scroll through the incident business elements. Shone, please open the lines again.

If you want to ask a question, please push star 1 on the phone. At this time, we do have one question in the queue. Please go ahead.

I am wondering if they are going to be noted with eight required fields?

I did not understand the question.

I was wondering if there is going to be a visual notation for a required field for an incident?

Barry, can you respond?

I think that is a great comment. That would be appropriate. We did not mention highlighting those key fields. The required field essentially for data exchange and working in the IRWIN environment. System lies, I think that is a great -- system why -- wise I think that is important to note that you have met all of the required fields.

I was thinking with the Asterix.

You bet. We will get a note on that.

Great question and exactly the type of input we are hoping to incorporate into our final document. Excellent. Any additional questions?

There are no questions at this time.

We will scroll through the rest of the incidents in the incident section. We will move down to mapping. They mapping integrates all of the essential elements -- geo Spanish -- geospatial elements for sure. Andy Bailey worked on just that in one of our calls. Clearly, we are hoping that the business elements related to mapping will include the latest and greatest that are out there. Data layers and standards that currently exist. Are there any specific questions related to the mapping elements?

I have a question from a Joe?

Will we be able to merge incidents with multiple offices? This would be under incident.

We have had a lot of discussion about murdering -- merging and transferring. Transferring an incident was initiated -- we ended up posting the incident. We talked about merging. Merging becomes challenging in maintaining data standards. We have tried to accommodate that using the best business practices. We connected with the NWCG standards. Does that answer your question?

It is being discussed?

We have included merging, but which type of incidents can be merged which what -- with what type of incidents is a business practice. We have allowed the system to do that. We might have to develop new business practices.

For clarification, within the incidents, I know we spent a lot of time talking about merged incidents. Where specifically in the document, does that live? Do we need to revisit to see our current language? One that help? Number 12, an incident. Could you back up?

We will hit on it in system integration, when we talk about CAD to CAD. That is the umbrella that that falls under. CAD to CAD and operability between neighboring dispatch centers. Also, going along with that, is an element under incident that talks about conflict detection and resolution. Went to neighboring dispatch centers launch an incident and it is the same thing. The system being able to detect that and provide options for resolving between the centers.

Excellent. Ultimately, we have good coverage on the subject and stay tuned. We will get into that will be get to system integration.

Number two, check for duplicate.

Excellent question.

From the line of Brad Schmidt.

I had a question under mapping. You discussed that the new system will have the ability to identify and trap ground resources. Have you identified specific vendors for tracking products that you are going to build into the system? Is it going to be more of an open platform, similar to AFF where a variety of different hardware and subscription services are compatible?

Jen, can you respond?

I will try. I'm going to ask the group to help me out. I believe we were doing an open platform on that. Does anybody have anything to add?

I believe that is correct. This is Ray we are trying to keep it as open as possible going through the process.

Number nine, under mapping, talks about the ability to track ground resources. We give examples of the ABL technology, personal locator begin devices. They are out in the industry. Like you mentioned, there are multiple vendors out there providing the technology. We certainly -- I think we have it under resources category. The system would be able to accept input from multiple sources. We would not limit ourselves to a single vendor. The question then leads to a discussion agency wide -- enter agency wide really. In terms of purchasing, to support the CAD requirement. There is a big investment required on the agency side for this hardware, and what vendor we should go with. That is a discussion down the road and separate contracting mechanism. For this purpose, we wanted to make it so that any current vendor out there has a seed into the CAD system.

Let me follow up with you Brad, did that address the bottom line element of your question? Is there additional language it needs to be incorporated into number nine, to better ask the world what they can do for us in this realm?

As the development proceeds, asking what they are using and ensuring that it will be compatible, would be important. At this early stage, I think that is fine. I work for the state of Colorado, and we along with other states, are evaluated -- evaluating and procuring funds for the purchase of these ground tracking subscriptions and hardware. Ensuring that it is compatible with your work is crucial.

I think that is a word that might be missing here. Compatibility element. We will review the document and see how to incorporate that concept. Thanks so much for bringing that to our attention.

I think that is great to note 2, can. When we look at the success stories of purchases that have occurred in that arena, and use those as benchmarks moving forward. We will keep that on the list. Hearing from Colorado on successes and things that have gone better. I like that

We will move on. Any other questions?

From Renée Isaacson.

Good morning. I have my staff here and we were looking at this earlier. In the location for actual and initial, is there any way that it could be displayed and acres. The reason we ask is that it changes multiple times when you put in the log. And is not logged as how many times it changes.

And make sense to me. Let me verify that this is more related to how we break this down in an incident, or is it related to number 12 in the mapping for perimeter information for geospatial depository? Where does your question fit better?

We were looking at that. I think it may be number 16, where it says incidents. We were looking at the history of multiple changes in location of an incident.

This is the last. Under incident, number four talks about having a trackable history of coordinates throughout the incident lifecycle. I think Renée, correct me if we are not getting out what you are talking about with that.-Think I was the intent behind that. The CAD system itself, would track each time the incident coordinates were changed.

It would be acres, it would fix it in the log. That is how it would work?

Yes. Both under number four. The tracking of coordinates through the lifecycle falls under that number.

I was wanting to verify that that is how that works.

Great question. Again, I think the language is six feet -- succeeds. Any other questions?

From Deborah Hines.

This is Ian Mills. Is there any intent of putting a WebCam integration from local and state agencies available on the map?

Norval, can you respond?

We spoke to the ability to import other maps I need to look to see exactly where that is?

The last one in mapping is the ability -- yes we talked under mapping about the ability -- it is under six. Map capable of accepting layers in multiple formats. I think at is a great comment. We have not talked about WebCams.

And 17, we spoke to it -- multiple means, by text, email. I think we could expand on the language there, to include that.

That is how we get mapped out to folks. I think at is a great idea, under six -- the system is capable of accepting WebCam functionality. Identifiable WebCam location -- you can click on that and see in real time what the ground looks like. It is a great idea.

I am looking at the way we currently have it. We are talking about accepting layers. Clearly information from a WebCam is not a layer. This is a new thought. We will definitely get that in there. EN, thank you for the comment.

We have a question from Chris.

I had a question about that also. If someone is on the ground and they can map the fire, as well as give us pictures on a smart phone with an app, is that possible to have the map sent to CAD and used for

real-time mapping? If they can map the origin and perimeter. The other question I have is what about changes? The first few years, once you get a system in place, I think there will be a need for real-time changes. Not put it on a board and wait six months for someone to talk about it and approve it. It would be implemented six months later. I think there will be a need for quicker action. We want to make improvements.

Chris, I will respond to that question first. You will be part of that system. You just signed up for that. We will be hitting on that.

This is Susie Stingley-Russell and I can speak to that because of my experience. Basically, the way that you are talking about the system being developed and computer terminology. I had to look this up. It was the waterfall method where we work and then roll something out. The thing that they have talked about, and I caution with IROC. Would you make major changes or rollouts? It has to be around our season. The latest method that we will be employing in the development of this is called agile development process. Used Sprint and play with it for two weeks and in the programmers go back and deal with the issues for two weeks. It is a rapid method of trying to fix and implement problems in the development stage. How many times and when we were all those out will be up to the business community, as well as the fire activity. Does that make sense?

Yes.

Chris, to back to your question as far as the mobile applications for our product, we do have a section coming up on our mobile CAD. I will throwback to the group, whether we should answer the question now, or wait until we get onto mobile CAD section. Celeste?

I know that we did talk about that. As we get to that section, -- I will wait until we get to that portion.

Chris, is that okay to differ?

Yes.

One more part of that, in the mobile part will be the self-staffing of resources. Is there going to be a mechanism for that?

Yes, we have addressed both of those issues in the mobile CAD. If you do not think it covers it in the way that you want, please come back on an address it.

Any other questions?

No.

Note to group, this is exactly how we wanted the session to go. Everything has been germane to the topic at hand. Great clarification and input. Let's keep this up. We are bound to build a product that everybody will be happy with. We are ready to move onto resource management. We have 15 elements. Other any questions?

We have a question from Nick Jonah.

Number five, says ability to add roster to resources. One thing that is missing is the flexibility to change the roster on-the-fly throughout the day.

Nancy, do have input?

I do think that is a good point. I think it is a place where we can be attuned. When you are rooting it, if you do not see that, we can make changes. We can add some verbiage to that element. That was always our assumption, we want the ability to add the roster, change updates, swap people in and out at any point during the day or the life of the mission.

Could you please scroll down to elements five and six. I'm wondering if six addresses this.

Six is talking to rotations. I think Nancy was right on. Nick, does that sound reasonable for what you are talking about?

Yes. It was not clear in their -- there..

It is exactly the kind of thing we're looking at. A lot of times they seem clear, or really cover everything. If it is not fully covering something, or you do not understand it, bring it to our attention.

For sure, feedback.

Deborah Hines, please go ahead.

This is EN again, with regard to number six, with resource rotation, with that be a standard for everywhere? If there was a local weight of doing engine rotations for example, would we be able to build that in? Or will it be a standard?

On number one, there was a way to build that a system administrator. You could create resources appropriately.

Okay, thanks.

Does that get it for you EN – Ian?

Let's move to system administration. If there are any questions related to system -- business elements, please ask them now. Are there any questions on the phone?

Question from Chris.

I did have one question related to the admin and adding resources. We do have a need, especially on the aircraft, to add resources on-the-fly, when we get transient aircraft coming through. We need to track them in CAD. Will there be a mechanism where you do not have to go into system admin and type in all their information, in order to put them in CAD? It would seem like there would be a simpler temper -- temporary ran the -- transient screen where you can add them. To put them on and off of an incident as you need to, and delete them once the day is over, once they leave the area. Also, I guess that would come into play with cooperators, as well as contractors. Went to get a cooperators is on an incident and you want to put them into CAD for a short time, and take them out without having to go into the system admin mode.

Barry, can you respond?

The ability to add resources to the system is something we spent a lot of time on. You will notice the options starting at one and two, the ability to import from a master list or integration list. Without that

was important to bring in lumps of resources and reduce the amount of data entry that up with on the system administrator, creating all your resources and reduces the total nonstandard way of entering resources. Hopefully that will help capture most of our resources in a standard fashion. A little farther down, we talked about the ability to add, remove and track temporary resources. That might be getting at what you are looking at or give examples of administrative volunteer, severity, pre-position and great examples that you mentioned. There are crap -- cooperators, transient aircraft under the temporary resource section. That click add and remove of resources that are used for short duration.

I want to make sure. It seems to me that your comment pertains to the section on resource management and not system admin. Can you scroll back up so that everyone can see? Barry, that is what you just talked about.

Under resource management, 1, 2 and 13.

Chris, does that address what you are talking about? Or do you think we need to add additional language?

No, that will cover it. The other part that will help a lot will be that CAD to CAD feature. Take your neighbors resources and put them on your incident on-the-fly. Thanks.

Fabulous. We will get into the CAD to CAD later on. I'm sorry normal -- normal.

Number seven, when you can request other resources to bring them over quickly.

Excellent.

There is another question. From Nick Jonah.

One thing that we were talking about is the ability to have widgets identified. Right now and WildCAD we have foreign resources. We can archive it and then the next time we end up putting it in a visual indication. Is there a visual indication that it may be a resource you already have? Back Nick --

Nick, is that something you have? Norval?

413, I think it is a great idea. I -- it is not something we have talked about. I think it is a great idea. You create something on a temporary basis, and then it is used six months or one year later and you totally forget about it. You re-create it. I think we could enhance 13 a little bit to capture temporary resource may already exist.

Is it archived and being able to retrieve from archive? Is that the function we are talking about?

Yes. Move and track day she would be able to move and restore. That is something we could add there. When you go to restore, you are looking for it.

Sounds good. Does that cover it Nick? Will that address your need?

Yes.

I am glad this is being transcribed. I hope that part of it works.

It is working.

We have to throw in some humor.

This is Jen, from E ECC. Under incident number two, we talked about automatic system check for duplicate incidents. We could add that verbiage to resources to include -- said that the system notifies the dispatch of any duplication and provides solution. It is something else to think about for that one.

Sounds good. Keep that in your back pocket and we will improve on that statement. Anyone else with questions?

Not at this time.

We will move into mobile CAD. Chris, this will give you an opportunity to see what we have, and comment.

Did we get a chance to spend time on system administration?

I thought we did. Most of the questions were on resource management. Are there any questions on system admin or mobile CAD?

If you want to ask a question, please press \*1 on your phone.

While we wait, we can make sure the previous question about mobile CAD was covered.

Yes, I asked if there was still a question.

Nancy, do you want to speak to the two elements that were brought up?

I was thinking that we could point out that number three and four address the issue. We also try to cover the issue in number eight. If there is anything more or anything that we missed, let us know.

Anybody out there with a question?

There are no questions.

We must have nailed the elements. If anybody has any questions regarding anything that has been covered, please ask we will now go to reporting.

We do have a question from Brad Schmidt.

I wanted to get clarification on number eight for mobile CAD. Are you talking about uploading pictures or spatial data that has been captured in some other app on a smart device? Are you interested in having the functionality of mobile CAD app to collect data within the app and do a one-stop shop instead of going elsewhere and trying to capture pictures? Trying to get a sense of how comprehensive you're trying to go.

I think -- I do not know that we thought about it that far. We did not talk about being able to take pictures. We did talk about this -- that a mobile app would store all of the features and transfer them and pass them to a standard CAD. If the resources in the field, IT could send pictures, videos -- if they map the fire. If they dropped the shape file into the app, it would automatically go to our CAD system and go to dispatch. They would not have to email it. Does that answer your question? Or do you think we need a more comprehensive app?

I was just curious to see where you are at. My personal opinion is that everyone has a different preferred tool. As long as this is a mechanism to upload it to dispatch, and make since to me personally. I think you addressed my concern.

We may talk about this more. You made a good point. We are trying to accommodate all kinds of tools and platforms. The apps are a mechanism to transfer, and upload the information.

I agree. You're going to have users in the field that per firm -- prefer different apps. There are a lot of great apps on the mobile technology side that are in development or being used in the field. We want our system to be a recipient of whatever good work people are doing in the field. Like Nancy said, this would be to upload mechanism for however it is generated.

Fantastic. Under any other questions pending?

Question from Renée Isaacson.

My question is in reference to the mobile CAD. Is is going to be automatic, or a roll associated with this excellent be able to turn it on and off and give my folks field access? Can I restricted?

Celeste?

May need help with this. I know that we did talk about efferent roles and user roles and being able to assign that I do not believe it is in the mobile CAD function. I will look for it under a different category. We did talk about that.

Nancy?

My take is that we did talk about roles. The way I look at it is that they can send a picture to your CAD and you can say it is not related and remove it or not accept it. I can see it coming into the queue and you can designate relevancy. Control of the CAD is up to the dispatcher and not the user. I do not know that we have clearly Delhi donated that.

I am referring to number four, being able to change resource status. If they have access like that. Is there a way that I can restrict some of them? Is it all or nothing? The picture thing is fine, it is about access in my CAD.

We want to make that so that it is useful to you. It has to be flexible, that is the type of verbiage we will incorporate. You tell us, at the way that it is written does not work, then we will approve it expect I think Renée brings up a good point. Some of these abilities, we want to be able to grant permission or restrict. We do not want anybody having access to go and do that. I do not think we clarified that in any of this. We can add that verbiage.

My only point again, would be whether it belongs in our system admin -- even though it relates to our mobile. It is probably a system admin element. Good point.

I think we can both do that in system admin. It is a role of a supervisor or dispatcher. I think we can strengthen that element and it will probably be the right place. Restrictions will not only apply to mobile CAD.

That a system admin number two. Did catch. That is where we will do it. Thank you Renée.

Question from Nick Jonah.

Number nine, another big concern in the field unit. If they are able to initiate, you will probably never hear anything until well after the fact.

Specifically, what are you suggesting? Number nine is too broad and we need to restrict the language?

It would be a role, field units can only do certain things and cannot initiate -- that type of thing.

If that them at the previous discussion that Renée brought up. Resources available to put in service and show themselves committed or on scene at an incident. The ability for a resource to initiate a resource -- incident. It is the same discussion of the ability to restrict that access and those actions. When we were building this, we were thinking along the lines of how do we and able and open this up to these types of things. We did not think about potential for restricting that same type of stuff. I think it is a good discussion.

Barry, in your mind, you know the best place to incorporate these changes. Is that here in mobile or system admin?

Like you were talking about --

Is that admin also?

Have mobile, essentially as a rule. Get down more in detail in access and restrictions..

Nick, does that take care of that for you?

Yes.

Awesome. Thanks for your input. Any other questions?

No.

Let's go to the reporting section. Again, generating reports from the CAD system basically evolved into quite a discussion. If there is any input or feedback on what we have, please let us know. We will keep scrolling to system integration.

A note there, between six and seven there is a bullet. It is a formatting thing. Primary dispatch forms are shareable within the system. It is a standalone feature, not a bullet of number six. We were trying to build into the system is primary dispatch forms that we use. They are fillable and shareable throughout the CAD system.

We will fix that before it goes out any further. System integration, a very important element of CAD. Take a moment to review these business elements. We will open the lineup for additional clarification or input.

If you want to ask a question, please press \*1 on your phone. There currently no questions.

We are either getting tired or hitting a home run. We will go to systems features and functions.

Renée Isaacson, go ahead.

Reporting, we are trying to evaluate if anything was identified about being able to do a report and transfer it into a spreadsheet form or document, where we can delete what we need and add what we need? We can take information and put it into a spreadsheet form and use it how we need to is that possible?

Normal -- normal.

Six does. We spoke to being able to export it. We have it where you can have a copy function and import it. We may need to speak better to that in six. Be able to say pull data from CAD and be able to have a copy feature. That is a great idea.

What that cover your concern Renée?

Copying may not work. We need a spreadsheet form where I can click a button and open a spreadsheet function.

May be we can talk about the output format of the reports. Have a bullet under there that captures the system's ability to generate reports and output in various file types. If some examples of PDF, spreadsheet and various ways. We did not touch on that at all. We talked about reports quite a bit, but we did not talk about how they come out to the end-user.

Okay, very good. We will create a new element underreporting for output. Sounds good. Renée, you sound satisfied with the answer?

Yes.

Question from Nick Jonas.

Early in the meaning, it was brought up how the CAD system had work for all the cooperators, for example law enforcement and search and rescue. One way to do that is to have modular. We do hardly any search and rescue or law enforcement here. Have a list and if you need to turn on the law enforcement module, you can turn it on. Instead of having it on everyone screen. You can turn the feature on and off. Also, have it so that if you do have law enforcement, you can turn it on for the incident and in turn it back off when you do not need it.

Nick, we can respond to that. We talked about module extensively. Ray, can you respond?

We did quite a bit in Alaska. You have the forest service who does law enforcement in Southeast Alaska. Keeping that in mind, all of the different functions, we were trying to incorporate -- if you dispatch office to search and rescue or deals with hazmat, tried to build that in. So that you do not have to look at how we do things up in Alaska versus your office. To that answer it?

I am scrolling ahead, because we talked about the specific module that you're talking about Nick.

I think the overall bullet we looked at for this topic is system features and functions number one. That is the overall category that we are in. CAD must be scalable, flexible in order to accommodate unit needs. Also, accommodate for bandwidth and connectivity. The third thing is to have the ability to turn system features on and off, based on what fits their needs and complexity. I think that is the umbrella that we are talking about. Certainly the modules -- each specific module will need to be identified, if it truly is a module that is be turned on or off. The second bullet there. The ability to turn certain features on or off.

Nick, D.Phil. at that covers your concerns?

Yes, very well.

We could put examples if necessary. We wanted to keep it general enough, to see what the vendors have out there. This is not a quest for quotations. This is to see what is out on the street. There is a certain level of generalities that we need. Great common.

I think for the dispatch community as a whole, it is important that the feedback that we get, in terms of modules, is what qualifies as a module? What functional area within the dispatch environment would be a module? Law enforcement is one that we have looked at, in terms of being an actual module that you get or not get him a based on what you do. Are there other things that are an active module? In her incident category, we talked about incident types. If you want to maintain that incident of range, such as hazmat, the things that we are accustomed to seeing. If there is feedback out there for what is an actual module, that as a dispatch center you would turn on or off, that would be good to get.

Is there anybody out there who has output towards that, please provide that out -- input. Please send it to CADS@fs.fed.us. We will take it in consideration as we move forward for the next step. Great response. Any other questions?

Question from Chris Nightingale.

Adjoined the call late. I think my question was answered. Once the incident starts, having a lightning and whether data. Instead of going in and day later and having to search for the lightning and whether data. I think you talked about it.

Can we confirm that we have had that discussion and it was addressed in the document?

If you look at number three underreporting, ability to separate active data and historical data, I think that was the intent there. To pull back and get a snapshot for what you want, either active data, or go back and hit historical. Be able -- I think that speaks to this.

Also, under the mapping section, number six talks about some of the various layers that we are looking at. Weather has a map layer. Within the CAD layer -- is that what you were thinking of Chris? Real time, hazardous weather information, lightning section?

Yes, that is good stuff to have during incident. Having that from the get-go, once you have put your spot on the map -- that can be saved for numerous things. Law enforcement, fire reporting, etc. when they do their fire reports.

Would it be beneficial if we added in the real-time and historical verbiage? If we put that in there, with that meet the needs?

Yes. I think having it right off the bat -- a lot of times that people -- if there is something intuitive that you can hit right off the bat, you can get that for the fire reports and law enforcement.

We also talked about incident attachments. Whether you'd generated -- we will talk about a lightning map for example. If you are ideally in the CAD system to get the lightning map created PDF -- we have the ability to add attachments and multiple file types to the incident record. It will go down historically with that as an attachment.

And five, it says custom user reports, we could speak more to that to say to capture a snapshot real-time with different components such as Chris was speaking to.

Does that address your question?

Yes. That is awesome to have the other feature to add files that have in CAD like lightning and whether.

We are confident for where the tweak those?

Yes.

I wanted to make sure. Great discussion. Are there any of the questions?

No.

I think we were in the system features and functions. That is our laundry list of things we want to make sure the system can do for us. If there are any questions as we scroll through, we will take them.

Question from Deborah Hines.

I was commenting on the recording. I am talking about number seven, underreporting. It is regarding the phone list. And maybe captured in verbiage in mobile CAD. Having the ability to have a phone list available on the mobile CAD, for an on-call dispatcher.

You are looking at reporting, number seven, and you want to make sure it works with the mobile CAD?

Yes.

Can you comment on whether we had thought about that or if we have that already?

The intent of six was for an on-call dispatcher to be able to utilize all of the functions in CAD.

Yes, that is what I was looking at. All the key functions of CAD, all the dispatchers on-call or away from the office have it available at their fingertips.

And you go to mobile CAD number six. What is written there, does it address what you are talking about fully? Me to look at it again?

Yes. It covers it.

Thanks for the comment. Moving on to systems features and functions. We're still looking for questions.

Question from Renée Crippen.

I was curious if you guys had discussed any type of speech recognition or data logging?

Barry?

No. We talked about the integration -- the radio system.

Number 11?

Interface with radio console, push to talk and mobile. No, I do not recall specific discussion or elements in these requirements that talk about speech recognition.

As I am sitting here watching the logging of our comments on the right-hand side of the screen -- I know is I have moved up from an IE dispatcher to a manager, I have gotten old and I cannot type anymore. The value of having the capability to do this type of logging on the dispatcher side and I did not necessarily have to type in what they were logging. As we move forward into the future, it would be valuable. We have people talking into the phones on the texting and what we are seeing on the right-hand side of the screen -- I think it will be very valuable.

Let me ask -- it seems to be a system feature to me. It has nothing to do with the running notes feature that we have already incorporated. Nancy, can you, to that?

No, this is truly a new thought. As it is not the running note that we discussed. I do not know -- I am running through it in my mind right now. I do think that it has some benefits. I am trying mentally quickly to go through drawbacks. It is something for us to take note of and discuss. You are right, it is a technology that is out there that we do want to use.

This has nothing to do with 508 compliance rate tax

I think actually, it might be helpful.

I'm not discounting the idea, but I'm wondering if it is covered in the general subject heading?

No.

Great. Renée, excellent. Buck I think at potentially stands alone. It would be a turn it on, turn it off preference. Dispatch center to dispatch center. What type of radio and phone system and things like that that they are using. To have it -- the technology exists. We should harness that if it is out there.

Okay, we will do that.

The other thing I was wondering about, again it might be in here. I apologize if I missed it. Real-time incident sharing, based on the roles that we provide to our firemen. As far as them in able to pull up information on web, that will show where resources are currently found, and what is going on based on the dispatch centers footprint.

Renée?

If my fire manager wanted to see what was going on, he will be able to go to the web and pull up my site, and see what resources I have assigned specifically throughout our footprint. Also, what incidents we have going on.

We did talk about that one and it was from a tier two dij world. We're trying to get it to wherever the tier 3 Ord 4 were dealing with the public facing. Or were you thinking agency only?

Agency only, and it would have to be role-based. I do not want my fire managers to be able to get into the incidents. It is an invaluable tool and helps with our communication when they can go in and see what is going on, without having to make those phone calls.

Copy that. Situation awareness.

Communication section is coming up and I think that is where this belongs. Let's look at the seven elements of communication. Save your question, if we do not address it.

Communication number one is exactly what we're talking about.

Renée, it is on the screen. We can address it right now. Does this cover your thought?

I think it is real important that we have the capability of our public to view a certain amount of information. We need to go be on the -- beyond that with the capability of our fire men to see. I do not want the public to see which resources are assigned. I do want the capability form fire managers to see what resources I have assigned. So that we can be thinking about having to provide additional resources.

Role-based?

I do think where we concluded -- the public safety website would be public safety. Are fire managers, who need the additional information would be working off the mobile CAD function. If we were to go back there, we have talked about various roles that we would be assigning. Read only would be one of those functions. You would a sign that role to your fire manager. You could give them the read only function and they could see almost everything involved in an incident. We spent a lot of time thinking through this. That was the conclusion we came up with. With that cover your needs?

Yes. I think that would work fairly well as long as we have the capability to assign roles and have it enter agency based. I think that would meet our needs.

Administration number two is hitting that point.

System admin number two?

Yes. It is role-based. The example we gave there is supervisor, dispatcher, law enforcement, expanded, read only and fire manager. Those were the examples. Between the public and in the role-based nature of the system, we can cover both our internal fire managers, partners and in the public with lower-level detail into the data.

I also think we can beef up element number five for resource alerts. We allude to mobile technology -- we can put some role-based elements within the already existing piece. Renée, I think we can address that.

Sounds great. You guys are doing an awesome job.

Thank you for the comment. We are not debating the merits of that whatsoever. We're trying to figure out where it fits in trying to avoid duplication, if we already have it. Again, we're having a great discussion. We appreciate everybody's input. Let's keep moving. Let's talk about information security. We skipped over that. I want folks out there to know that we brought in some security folks who know what is going on with Norval a -- 28, and they are more savvy. Chuck Davis was going to be providing input, but he had to step away. We can field any questions, but we may have to get back to you.

I am here.

Everybody, fire away at chip about information security.

Question from Kevin.

This is Frank from the Southwest coordination center. A lot of times I am on call at home. I do not have a government laptop, but I have my home computer. I have Windows 10, is that compatible with what you are building? At the Forest Service, we are at Windows 8.

It will span a couple of different areas. One, is government property. Would they be able to open up your CAD account over a government computer? There has been discussion about that. The public facing over a website. The role-based stuff they talked about in system administration -- between some of the other security stuff with a are looking at authentication and how you would authenticate. We have discussed it, but there is no specific answer on whether we be able to do that just yet. We are waiting on some of these security. -- Answers.

What is the best way to address the answer in regard to the elements we already have? Are we addressing that had on? Are we avoiding it?

I think we are. The one above what we are talking about the public facing website. You will be able to do some things. The question came back with the role-based access. Would anybody in the public able to update any information, or when a person be able to sign on? I think we have that covered. I know Dan and us talked about that, as far as the flexibility. We do not have an answer just yet.

I am on your radar.

I am also thinking through where to put that in here. I do not know that that is a vendor question. That will be a US DA security type question.

Frank, provide that question to our CADS@fs.fed.us address. We can archive it until it comes up later in the process.

Okay.

Any other questions regarding information security.

We have Bernie Alvarez.

This is not related to information security. I am wondering about complicity and easy use. In her current CAD we use a dispatcher to run the incident and keep up with CAD. It is fairly easy to do. As we create all of these features -- it will add to the complexity and ability for our dispatcher to use the program. Can somebody address whether that is being considered? Perhaps give some examples of how you are weighing the balance.

We have consider that and we have -- for us it was about finding the balance in making consistent, user-friendly systems. Having good training is one of the things we have come up with. We will help dispatchers and system administrators get comfortable with the program. We have also tried to make sure, throughout the document, to make features optional. There are core things it has to do. You need basic mapping. We do not want to exclude any of the new technologies. Hopefully between the training, we have not come to yet and some online tutorial trainings -- and affect were trying to make it scalable, will address the issue. It will lead to quick learning of the program and we are trying to keep it as simple as possible with optional tools. Does that address your thought?

Yes. I think having is being able to switch things on and off -- as people skills developed there will be a bit of an evolution.

Absolutely.

We definitely wanted to focus on the foundational elements. The core duties of the initial -- in terms of incident creation, resource management, a phone directory etc. That is where we started. When we first met, we thought what is the foundation? Like Nancy said, the coolest stuff and the bells and whistles, their deadly abilities there. We just want you to know, that that is where we started. With the foundational elements.

Bernie, our system feature number one, CAD must be scalable and flexible to accommodate areas and unit needs. That is about as broad-based as we can possibly word that. Hopefully that will play out. The key is the functionality. We appreciate your input. Are there any other questions?

Question from John Ortiz.

Good afternoon. This goes back to features and functionality. Number 18 on the timer functionality. There are a lot of time -- times we have multiple aircraft errors in the dispatcher has logged in. Is there a functionality we could insert where you could have a queue of aircraft that you are working with, and at the push of one button, CAD be able to extract information from your aircraft and automatically insert the information? Usually when there is a lot of aircraft, they are typically trying to get the aircraft timers at the same time -- it is usually done anyway. Is there a way for the aircraft to gather AFF data from the aircraft into the queue?

Bernie, I appreciate the question. Can we scroll to system features number 18? We have seven bullets under their -- there. I want to know which bullet does not address the issue.

As far as the AFF integration tool with the timer?

Yes.

I think we did speak to AFF. Barry, you know where we were talking about that with the features?

It is and mapping.

Number 10 talks about AFF functionality. Hopefully, that will lead to what you're talking about. We did not get to that level of detail. There is a description there. That ability with a single click --

We can barely hear you.

AFF functionality is captured under the mapping section. Based on that, hopefully that will lead to a good end result in the timers and specifically, with a single click of a button, getting aircraft the information logged automatically. The fourth bullet talks about that mutation for timers, associated with an incident, to be automatically logged. We certainly wanted that. We can go further and talk about a single mouse click, or a hotkey. Something like that that would grab the information. We definitely want to get away from the manual entry. Even take it a step further from a copy and paste. I think it is a great idea to list fewer keystrokes, mouse clicks etc. to list fewer keystrokes, mouse clicks etc.

I really think that being able -- as the timer goes off, there is a duty for the dispatcher to ensure that we are monitoring AFF. I do not know if we wanted to be automatic. I think there is due diligence in ensuring that the aircraft is active on AFF. At the click of a button, you would manually do that, ensuring that you are covering your duties as a dispatcher. I do not know that we want to be automatic.

I think you are right on.

I was going to say the same thing. You are right on. We can add on to that requirement. You can automatically pull from AFF and do a true check.

Absolutely.

Correct.

Thanks for the question. We will insert an additional element into 18 on timer functionality. Is that where it's going to go?

I believe so

Are there any other questions?

No.

We will go ahead to communication. We have talked a little bit about this. Are there additional questions? I will say that we have captioning for another 8 minutes. I do not want to go faster than we can provide for it good input. Technology will do what it needs to do. We will keep going through this. I think this is a good opportunity. Go ahead Barry.

We can take notes passed the top of the hour to capture any good comments the common. If you want to ask a question, please press \*1 on your phone

I'm not sure if it is in here. One of the concerns is the ability to search through your incident log, instead of having to read through the entire log to find a specific item.

You are looking for a search function?

Yes. Right now if you are looking for your incident log, and you see a long incident, you do not have the ability to identify a specific item. You have to read through the entire log. The ability to search through the log, using a key word.

I am taking a look at system features number 23.

23 speaks to that. I think we have the concept covered.

We definitely wanted a search functionality across the entire database. Incidents, resources etc. Check that out. Number 23. What I envision is my Outlook inbox. I can go to the search function and type a keyword or name, and get all of the hits for that entry.

I was not able to see 23 prior. That definitely speaks to what I was looking for.

Barry, we need to add what you just said. Search for the keyword. Being able to type a word in there.

Also, under the examples, add logs. We are searching incidents, but I like the idea of searching logs as well. Incident log or daily log.

That would be important. Logs in general, daily logs.

Yes, it is so long in some cases we definitely want to capture the logs, in terms of the search functionality.

Great question. Hopefully we address that to your satisfaction. Any other questions?

Question from Nicole.

This is Tiffany. I might have missed this. I missed the first part of the presentation. Will there be a notification system? If somebody updates information, whether it be resource -- like the Roth feature. A blinking light on top where we are notified when information is changed, so that we are aware of it?

Nancy?

I think that is a good point. A couple of things have been brought up regarding mobile CAD and functionalities that we can flesh out more it was an assumption that we made, but we have not clearly defined it. We need to go back and look at the roles that we were talking about in the mobile application. We can strengthen it just a little bit on how the information is going to be received in the type of notification that will over test to new information. I do not think we want to let somebody change something. We want the change to come in and we want to accept it. I do not think -- maybe that is based on role. I think those are two sections we need to look at to strengthen it.

Both in system admin and in the mobile CAD area.

Correct.

Perfect. Thanks Tiffany. We will take heed of your comment. Will get the language in there.

You see value in getting notified, is that what you are saying? You prefer not to have a Bellore whistle, up timely severe is changed? What is your thought there?

Some notification where does we need to ask that -- except. Where somebody does initiate an incident, that we are aware of it. If we are at home we get a text message, or on the computer a message of those across the screen. Something where we are aware that somebody is changing something.

Got it.

Any other questions?

Question from Andy.

This is Angie. With already have all of the data in different CAD systems. Is there a way to import that data into the new system? Do we have to start from scratch? You touched on it, but can you clarify?

The last -- Celeste?

I am looking in the RFI document to see where we addressed it. We did have a lengthy discussion about taking what we currently have and transferring assets to the new CAD.

It is in 12 and 13 in system integration.

Like Chip said, the best reference is in system integration in 12 and 13.

Angie, those are on the screen. Do they adequately cover your concern?

I am concerned about the archive data in the history we have in the system. Being able to utilize that for things such as workload, or whatever may come of that. We do not want to have two systems where we pull old data. With interface -- will it interface?

Barry, do we think about that fully?

Yes, the intent was to import data from what of her legacy CAD system is in use. To the extent for your reporting needs moving forward. Data retention and the ability to look back. It should be seamless -- that is our intent.

I think we can strengthen our verbiage there if we need to include storing archive data.

That also includes all of our resources? Suddenly said data, we were talking about just that.

Anything that is in the current CAD system -- incidents, resources, it would pull all of that. It would definitely be something that we look at moving forward when we go to pull that legacy data. We will have to define what we are after to meet your needs Angie, and make sure that we get everything out and into the new system for what we need, moving forward.

Okay.

Norval, you mentioned -- what were you thinking?

That is what I was thinking.

What number?

Looks like seven, ability to archive CAD space.

Angie, that is what we were after moving forward. You have brought over the legacy data. You have not lost anything. Moving forward, we have the ability to retain the ability to archive the database and move forward.

Okay.

We decided we do not need to define the data and 12 and 13. We can leave it generic for now and is clarified in the other area. Is that how we are leaving it?

Yes, the data definition will be a big deal, no doubt, as we move forward. That comes at a later time. We definitely need to get that right.

Duly noted. Any other questions.

Question from Renée Isakson.

Have a question pertaining -- a lot of this goes back to the program itself in the future. Have you looked at the ROSS basis and the access we give? That goes to a strong dispatcher. Is there a thought of doing this and WildCAD, and all I want is personnel logging and not entering data? Is that optional?

I think it is in system admin number two.

I do not know that we have thought any further than dispatcher and system admin, in terms of being inclusive of the dispatch center. I believe the question is breaking out dispatcher into 2 various roles. We have not discussed that. Unless anyone remember something different there?

We discussed doing role-based. I took the comments -- notes about making different roles customizable by center. One center may want the dispatcher to be able to do certain things and have certain bells and whistles. Another center may not want the dispatcher to have all of those. I took note for us to discuss and maybe make that role-based -- something that could be taking care of as a system administrator feature, but each center. To determine how many roles they actually want to use. I think that is something we talked about, not every center is going to have to use every role that is out there. Centers can decide which roles they will use to assign to people.

That was part of my next question. If the option is there, each center can do it how they want to. The ones that don't, will have the option. It would be great.

We can certainly do that. We will beef up the system admin role-based element. We will make sure that it consists of the needs that you just put out there.

Another thing related to that, is that we spent a quite a lot of time about how accounts are established. We used ROSS as an example. When a new person shows up at the center, or on assignment, they will have the ability to plug them in and assign a role. Is that something we are looking at?

Are there any other questions?

No.

We will go forward to vendor services. Want to alert those on the line that vendor services covers broad topics without a lot of detail. We are on a fishing expedition, trying to understand what commercial vendors already provide. We know that we can better define these elements. We don't want to get into the weeds on this right now. Are we missing any major components? To bring us up to speed, to incorporate enhancements down the road, etc. We're trying to look at it from that angle. Are there any questions?

Richard Wilson, go ahead.

On vendor services, specifically, when you talk about training IT staff?

Way through it out in broad strokes. Multiple training provided online. We were looking at them to come to us.

Is there any other comment?

It goes to the architecture as well. The agencies will have to be dialed in, especially on the IT side, with the vendor, in terms of rolling this out. Within each agency's system, and the architecture involved in the security requirement. The IT staff, across the interagency spectrum, is going to have to be 100 percent plugged in and tied in with the vendor. I am not sure how we communicate that in the business requirements. I think it is assumed by the vendor, that each agency will provide support and contacts for how to get plugged in, into the infrastructure and the network.

Thanks for the comment. We are thoroughly developing for me go out there. There will be a chance for you to make sure we got it right. We appreciate the question. Any other questions? Question from Sean.

Under vendor services, number two, what happens if we have had issues? Will we still maintain our own backup?

That is a hot potato. Colleen?

We need to have the ability to have a backup, both locally and somewhere beyond your local server. We are looking at backup capability. Does that answer your question?

That answers it for now. Since we do not have vendor specified. I was wondering if that was going to be an option that was included in the contract.

We need to have backup somewhere else. The CAD to CAD capability has to be somewhere else. We will have to have a local copy. If you have an iPad for example, and you are working on something you cannot connect online we want to get the data out of the cloud and use it. That is Colleen's view of how it might work. May be chip has a better answer.

This is Nancy, I think we addressed quite a bit of this and system architecture. We talked about it being hosted locally or on the cloud were at another location. We talk about how to access it. I do think that we threw out language to the vendors, making it clear that we wanted the ability to store on clouds, but also the store -- ability to catch. Every gall off-line, we want the ability to work there. A bit smaller scale with basic stuff, and we came back online, the ability would be pushed up to host the platform, cloud, or whatever the office has chosen.

That is a good catch. System architecture is the next section that we will take a look at. If, when I go through that, your question was not answered, we will revisit it.

We also have backups mentioned under system features and functions, number eight. It talks about the ability for automatic or manual database backup options. We want to retain the ability of the dispatch level to implement automatic backups. If I want one right now, I can make it happen right now.

Sounds like we addressed the topic. Will make sure we addressed it as fully as we need to. Anymore questions.

Question from Andy.

Angie, under vendor functions, number three, you talk about -- does that also include training for GIS individuals? To help us getting the layers that we need?

Barry, can you address that?

The main point we were striving for in the mapping section was to reduce the workload and strain for GIS and met -- mapping capabilities, certainly at the dispatch center and for your local GIS shot move more. Mapping talks about the sponsored respond to Tory -- repository program that is in the works right now. The CAD with link to the commonly stored database of layers that would be the same across the board. We would all be looking at the same jurisdiction layers and most updated stuff. Have more of a cloud-based system that puts less of a burden at the local level.

Angie, does that answer your question? We're trying to make it so that you can pull the data and will not need that individual one that you referred to.

Yes. It does answer my question. As long as it works in the layers that are utilized in whatever format, are the most current.

Along with that, we put in that the maps capable of accepting layers in multiple formats. So that at the local level, as needed, or as far as you want to take it, you could supplement your map with any and all of the local stuff that you want. As we move towards a common storage area, we did not want to eliminate the ability of the local level to do awesome stuff.

I could technically take my files for the islands of Nebraska national Forest and put them into the new system?

Yes. We will require that the system accepts those inputs at the local level.

Okay.

Just to be clear, as far as the elements of training, that is something that can evolve. Your point is well taken. We have noted in need, and we will make sure that the training is open ended. We are not dismissing your comment whatsoever.

At this time, there are no questions.

We're going to system architecture. This is the last of the 13 questions -- sections. We will to questions on any of the sections. To give you an idea of where we are heading, we have a couple of slides to wrap this up. We are open for comments over the next month this is not your last opportunity. Are there any questions?

There are no question that this time.

The clock is ticking down. Thank you for your input on the various business elements contained in our RFI. Colleen, we can close the document.

Let me see if I can master the technology.

You are doing great.

I promised you that we would talk about the next steps. If you have any comments that you did not think of during this conversation, please send them to [CADS@fs.fed.us](mailto:CADS@fs.fed.us). It is an email. Get them to us by the end of the month, March 29. If on April 1, you think of them, we will still take them. We are out on the street for our second request for information. We have our industry day at the end of the month. Vendors will respond to our current document. We will decide at that time, whether based on those comments, and the input that we continue to get from you, whether we need to put together a third RFI or whether we proceed directly to developing our acquisition strategy. There is a major document that we need to complete by the summer of 2016. It basically validates the business need for this capital investment. It is a lengthy document, it is an OMB requirement. We have to support that are dispatch or need these needs these tools. They need the standardized software to get their job done. Those are the types of things we incorporate into this document so that fire management will give us the millions of dollars that we need to get this product will for us. Ultimately, after we have completed the need for the

capital investment, this RFI or development acquisition will be handed over to the wildlife fire information and technology unit, and they will find a managing partner. Whether it be the forest service, or the agency, that will be determined at that time. They will find funding to support this acquisition. Then it will go through the procurement process. Whether it is a request for quotation or whatever, then they will award the contract itself. Let me assure you, that we have control over steps also. Once the product is awarded and the solicitation is in the vendor's hand, there is product development, beta-test, and phased-in integration to dispatch. There is control on item for, because it is written into the contract. You are all concerned about the timing. How long does it take? We have some control over steps two and four. We have little control over step three. Finding the money and managing partner, and advertising for the award. It could take six months, less, or more. It is not in our control. Ultimately, steps two through four could take to -- 2 to four digit years. I would like to say takes longer so that we are surprised. What happens quicker, everybody is happy. Clearly, once the product is developed, it gets incorporated into her day-to-day operations. There will be a need for ongoing support. Operations and maintenance, as well as enhancements. As good of a job as we are doing thinking of what we need, we will have forgotten something. Something will not work as well as we had hoped. There will be future enhancements to our piece of software. Hopefully, there will be a team to help sort these things out and work with the contractor that we have, who will take the product forward into the future. I am laying out a general sense of what the next steps are. We should be concerned right now about making sure that we put together the elements for the best product to keep us best operating the best that we can. Colleen, I do not have any other comments. Do a closing remarks?

Thank you everybody. I am thrilled with the way that this has gone today. Your interest and input and the work done by the CADS team -- this is exactly what we need to do to make sure we have input from everyone and come up with the best possible solution out there. My hat is off to each and every one of you for a great job. Thank you for participating and I hope you feel the same way I do we need your input. That is why we are here. It is important. Place in your additional comments and suggestions to CADS@fs.fed.us by March by March 29. If you questions in general about the project, it is IDIP at FS& US. This is how we make sure that we are on track to provide something useful. Unless there are other questions or comments -- is there anyone on the queue?

Renée, please go ahead.

I will type my response up, because I do not take up anyone's time. I wanted to tell everybody thank you for doing this and thinking outside of the box and taking us into the future. This is a big deal for us, and I appreciate everyone's hard work.

Thank you René. Is anybody else?

At this time, there are no additional questions.

Anyone else have a comment?

I think it was an excellent interaction today. Everyone is passionate about this subject and it shows.

Thank you Susie. Is there anyone else? Let's call it a wrap. We will have this available, if you did not get to listen. We will have the recording available on the website. We will get that out as soon as the server brings it available. Keep your eye out, as we will have more of these webinars. We will include

opportunities for training in FEMA. We appreciate your support and interest with that, have a great day everybody.

That does conclude our conference for today. Thanks for your participation and using AT&T teleconference. You may now disconnect.

**[Event Concluded]**