

Attendees:

Name	Position
Linda Kincaid	FSC2
Jeanne Mitchell	Cost (T)
Judy Reynolds	FSC2 (Cost)
Laurette Gaylord	IBA (t)
Chuck Joy	Cost
Rich Persons	Time
Glenn Beagle	Cost
Kendra Sabo	FSC2
Sheila Miner	Time
Sherrri Bennett	FSC1
Lori Dunnagan	Time
Carole J. Staten	Cost
Darcy Crotteau	FSC2
Carol Bass	FSC1
Louise Greathead	FSC1
Cindy Higbee	Cost
Wendy Ambrose	Cost
Rich Tobin	FSC
Jeanne Pincha-Tulley	ICTI
Kim Ann Parsons	Cost
Charlie Bird	PTRC (T)
Keith Fletcher	Cost
Joe Molhoek	IC
Richard Andersen	Cost
Dennis Stevens	FSC1
Robin Nimura	FSC1
Patty Locke	Time/FSC2
Joan Disney	Cost/FSC2
Robbin Ekman	FSC1
Dave LeBlanc	EQTR/PTAC
Tami Spanel	Cost
Jennifer White	Time
Pamela Douglas	FSC
Irene Burkholder	FSC2
Brenda DeBerg	Time

Tina Ledger	R4-IBC
Brandi Van Kleeck	Cost (t)/PROC (t)
Carol Salo	FSC/IBA

The meeting began with Gina Bald and Donna Tate asking each attendee to introduce themselves and answer the following three questions:

1. What is your level of experience with I-Suite?

There was a wide variety of experience among the attendees, which included none at all, long time users and experts.

2. What do you like about I-Suite?
3. What do you not like about I-Suite?

NOTE: The answers to questions 2 and 3 are summarized in the following two sections.

I-Suite Likes (Question 2 Responses)

1. The I-Suite system has evolved through time. (i.e., I-Suite has gotten better and better as time progresses.)
2. More stable (i.e., The system has had fewer big changes in recent times.)
3. Integrated with the other functions (i.e., Cost now works with Time, Resources, etc., functions in I-Suite.)
4. Integrated with Albuquerque Service Center (i.e., Cost Exports.)
5. Reports (i.e., The reports are helpful and are widely used.)
6. Cost Graphs (i.e., The cost graphs are helpful and widely used.)
7. Analytical Reports (i.e., the analytical reports are helpful and widely used.)
8. Are you sure messages (i.e., messages that double check a questionable decision.)

I-Suite Dislikes (Question 3 Responses)

1. Incorrect Data
 - a. The system allows the user to input incorrect data. Incorrect data can be caused by:
 - i. Miscommunication during check-in (Internal Issues)
 - ii. Time Unit entry errors (Internal Issues)

- iii. ROSS data needs to come over correctly
- 2. Better Error Checking Compared with Normal (This item is linked to dislike number 1.)
 - a. There was a rather lengthy discussion as to what the system should prevent and what it should not.)
 - b. **Conclusion:** If the data the user enters seems questionable, the system should display a message asking the user if the data is correct. (i.e., Are you sure? Messages).
 - c. **Conclusion:** The system should include configurable validation parameters that can be set or turned on and off by the Cost Unit Leader.
 - d. **Conclusion:** The system needs better analysis tools that allow users to identify data that is incorrect.
- 3. Geographic Rates
 - a. The default rates in the system are the same for all geographic regions. If the user changes the rate for a position, that rate changes for all states. However, there are different rates for different geographic areas (e.g., California).
 - b. **Conclusion:** Rates need to be more granular (i.e., defined at a state or unit level).
- 4. Helicopter/Modules
 - a. Currently, the users cannot easily separate the operator costs from the helicopter cost in I-Suite. These costs are based on how the resource is configured during assignment in ROSS. There currently is no standard.
 - b. **Conclusion:** Make the Helicopter/Modules configurable (i.e., allow users to either combine aircraft and operators together or separate them.)
- 5. Cost is too complicated to use
 - a. The Cost area in the current I-System is confusing and complicated to use.
 - b. **Conclusion:** Make the Cost area in e-ISuite more intuitive to use. (May need more input from SMEs.)
- 6. Assign Date -vs- Check-in Date
 - a. When generating daily records, the system currently uses the latest date the user entered (e.g., if the user entered a later assign date than a check-in date, that date will be used in generating the cost daily records.)
 - b. **Conclusion:** The ultimate decision was that the user is responsible for entering the correct date in the system that will be used for cost generation.

7. Aircraft Cost Flow Down
 - a. The system currently allows aircraft costs to be “flowed down.”
 - b. **Conclusion:** The system should not flow down aircraft costs. (Note: this is a known issue in the existing I-Suite system and will be fixed in the e-ISuite system.)
8. Graphing Tool
 - a. The graphing tool is hard to use and does not include all of the graphs that the users need.
 - b. **Conclusion:** Although the users like the ability to create graphs in I-Suite, they would like the graphing tool to be enhanced for ease of use and increased functionality.
9. Version Control
 - a. Each team may use a different version of I-Suite. It is difficult to manage data when different versions are in use.
 - b. **Conclusion:** Due to the nature of the e-ISuite system, controlling the version of I-Suite being used between teams will not be a problem.
10. Difficult Custom Reports
 - a. It is difficult to create Custom Reports in I-Suite, because users must know the table structure and sql to create Custom Reports.
 - b. **Conclusion:** The creation of Custom reports must be more intuitive for users in the e-ISuite system (e.g., do not require the users to know sql in order to create a custom report.)
11. Unable to Compare Estimates with Actuals
 - a. There is no function in I-Suite that allows users to compare estimated data with actual data. There is currently no feedback to the users on what they need to do to make their cost estimates more accurate.
 - b. **Conclusion:** Users would like to be able to compare the cost estimates with the cost actuals to determine how well they are doing at estimating their costs. (NOTE: This may be a cognos function.)
12. Supporting Documentation for Changes (Accrual Matrix)
 - a. There was some concern that the government changes for accruals is not being communicated to the Cost users, which makes it hard for the users to know which costs to include in their accruals.
 - b. **Conclusion:** The attendees agreed that this is not an application problem.

13. Accrual Code Checks

- a. The system needs to ensure that the appropriate accrual codes are being used.
- b. **Conclusion:** The attendees agreed that the addition of the Jurisdictional Agency to the I-Suite system helped to correct this problem.

14. Projection Module Does Not Meet the Users Needs

- a. The attendees agreed that the current Cost Projection module is not meeting their needs.
- b. The users are currently doing this by hand, because it is easier than using the Cost Projection module
- c. **Conclusion:** The e-ISuite system must handle Cost Projections in a better manner than the client/server system. (Will need more input from the SMEs)

15. Weekly/Monthly Rates Not Calculated Correctly

- a. The current application does not allow actual Weekly and Monthly costs in the Time Module but does allow them in the Cost Module.
- b. **Conclusion:** Adding Weekly and Monthly units of measure to the Time module is on the list of changes for the client/server version of I-Suite. The e-ISuite System should also include Weekly and Monthly units of measure in the Time Module. More input from the SMEs is needed to determine the requirements for both systems.

16. Reports

- a. The current Cost reports are not flexible enough for the users. (i.e., users cannot print partial reports.)
- b. **Conclusion:** The Cost reports must make it easy for the users to obtain the data that they need. Some of the current reports provide this data. Other capabilities need to be evaluated.

Questionable Functions

During the course of the meeting, the IBA team reviewed the pre-work that was received prior to the meeting with the attendees.

There were several functional areas that were in question, based on the pre-work results. The following conclusions were reached during this review about those functions.

Function	Conclusion
Re-estimate Daily Costs	The attendees indicated that this was a

	function they currently do not use, but it may be used by other geographic regions.
Cost Divisions (In General)	The attendees indicated that this function is not used often, but they do need it for Cost share purposes. The attendees believed that this option may be used extensively in the Northwest Region.
Assign Rates to a Kind Code	The attendees indicated that this function is needed, but it should be re-worked to better meet their needs.
Acres Burned	The attendees determined that this could be useful in a simplified format. (Gina Bald will talk with Jeff Park and determine the original intent for the Acres Burned option.)
NVC FIL	The attendees indicated that this is a function they currently do not use.
Payment Agency Reports	The attendees indicated that they rarely use the Payment Agency Reports, but they may be used in other geographic areas.
Home Unit Reports	The attendees indicated that they rarely use the Home Unit Reports, but they may be used in other geographic areas.
Section Reports.	The attendees indicated that they rarely use the Section Reports, but they may be used in other geographic areas.
Acres Burned Reports	The attendees indicated that these reports are not currently used. However, if the Acres Burned area is re-worked in a simplified manner, these reports must also be re-worked for that area.

Meeting Conclusions

Each dislike was reviewed in detail with the attendees. For each topic, the attendees were asked to express any disagreements they had with the proposed conclusions.

From these discussions, the following 19 conclusions were reached. As far as could be determined, the entire group approved of each conclusion.

NOTE: No commitments were made indicating that the e-ISuite system will contain functions expressed or implied by these conclusions, nor is there a commitment on the part of the Incident Based Automation (IBA) Project Team to dictate or direct any necessary business changes. The IBA project team will take these recommendations into consideration as the e-ISuite functional requirements and design are developed.

It is the IBA project team's intent to have further meetings with this or similar groups in order to ascertain that the e-ISuite project in its new operational environment will meet the end users business needs.

1. The users would like the system to detect and respond to certain user errors. The system should issue an appropriate warning that allows the user to proceed with the action.
2. The users would like the system to include the ability to perform cost analysis of the captured data. It was noted that these tools would be inherent in the COGNOS tool at the enterprise level. The COGNOS tool will not be available at a Remote Site.
3. The users would like the system to allow them to define Cost rates at both a geographical and a unit level.
4. The users would like the system to allow them to separate helicopter costs from aircraft costs. Others would like them combined. The system should allow for both scenarios.
5. The users would like the Cost area in the system to be intuitive to use.
6. The users would like the system to provide a smooth parent/child relationship. (i.e., the system must correctly integrate costs for crews and crew members, as well as aircrafts and their operators.)
7. The users would like the flow down issues in the current I-Suite system to be fixed in the e-ISuite system. (NOTE: This change is in the list of changes for I-Suite, but it has not made it to the top of the priority list.)
8. The users would like the graph tool in e-ISuite to include enhancements that provide more options and allow for more intuitive usage.
9. The users would like the Custom Report creation in e-ISuite to be more intuitive than in the current I-Suite system. In particular, the use and understanding of SQL should not be necessary.
10. The users would like the ability to compare estimated costs to actual costs, particularly for past incidents. The hope is that this comparison will allow users

to more accurately estimate costs in the future. The data warehouse at the enterprise will provide this capability to authorized users.

11. The users would like an improved Cost Projection tool in the system. Specifically, the user should be able to include resources that are not assigned to the incident, as well as indirect costs.
12. The users would like the Time/Cost communication issue to be fixed.
13. The users would like the system to include enhanced options for reviewing report data.
14. The users would like the data entry for aircraft to be enhanced. Glenn Beagle has additional information on what this includes.
15. The users would like to increase the accuracy of mob and demob cost data.
16. The users would like the ability to capture cost data associated with rental vehicles and associate them with the appropriate resources.
17. The users would like the ability to correctly support cost shares.
18. The users would like to retain the Acres Burned functionality and have it significantly simplified.
19. The user community agreed that cumulative incident cost data should be captured for a specific point-in-time, massaged to enhance its accuracy and then regenerated using the changed values for that point-in-time without the data being otherwise modified during the process. (NOTE: This is the way in which the current I-Suite system operates.)