Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time	09 October 2025 09:00 PST	Meeting type	Zoom
Organiser	Mr. Rupesh	**Client**	Citywide

Attendees (Internal)

- Rupesh
- Jaspreet
- Ravinder
- Rahul
- Ajay
- Gurpreet
- Kapil
- Pankaj
- Akash
- Amit
- Gagan

Attendees (Client Side)

- Tom, Teresa, Randy

Agenda

- **Discussions on the following:**
    - Call Notification Feature Review
    - Scheduling & Analytics Discussion
    - Production Deployment & Testing Approach
    - Student Training Module Discussion

The following things are discussed:

1. **Call Notification Feature Review**
   a. **Discussion:**
      i. Jaspreet confirmed that the analytics demo was completed earlier; session resumed with **new updates** including the **call notification pop-up**.
      ii. Rahul demonstrated the new **modal-based call notification**, showing acknowledgment and redirection to call action form.
      iii. **Ravinder** added logic updates — prioritizing high-priority calls first in the notification list.
      iv. However, **Tom expressed dissatisfaction**, stating that the implementation was **not aligned with prior discussions** and was **missing key contextual details**.
      v. Tom emphasized this was not as per requirements and reiterated frustration about **lack of adherence to previous call recordings and instructions**.
      vi. **Teresa** reminded that Randy had earlier drawn and explained how the call notification pop-up should appear — including **call location, time, and related details**.
   b. **Action Items:**
      i. Team to **revisit previous Zoom meeting recording** and **rebuild the call notification UI** as discussed earlier.
      ii. Incorporate **listing of calls** with priority and details (location, time, acknowledgment button, redirect option).
      iii. Present a **corrected demo in the next review call**.
   c. **Cache Issue & Demo Clarification**
      i. **Issue:** During the previous demo to Tom, a wrong window was displayed due to a cache or UI error.
      ii. **Action Taken:** The issue has been rectified and re-demonstrated live by Rahul.
      iii. **Apology:** Rupesh formally apologized for the confusion and assured that such issues will not reoccur in future demos. Teresa was requested to pass this apology to Tom and Chief.
   d. **Call Notification Popup – Current Functionality**
      i. Rahul demonstrated the call assignment notification, where:
         1. When a new call is assigned, a sound notification plays.
         2. A popup modal appears at the center of the screen.
         3. The popup currently displays:
            a. Call message (e.g., "A new call assigned to this number on this site")
            b. Acknowledge button (to close/mark acknowledgment)
         4. Priority-based color coding: red for high priority.
         5. Clicking on the call number redirects the user to the Call Actions screen.
         6. "Acknowledge All" option allows clearing multiple notifications.
   e. **Feedback from CommandHub Team**
      i. Randy & Teresa: Mentioned that the current version only represents the first layer of what was requested.
      ii. Expected Functionality:
         1. **Popup Details:** Should display
            a. Call Number

b. Site ID / Site Location
                    c. Activity Code
                    d. TEN Code
            2. **Buttons Required:**
                    a. **Acknowledge:** To close the notification and mark that the call is seen.
                    b. **En Route:** To mark the officer as en route to the site.
            3. **Navigation Button (Future Wish List):**
                    a. A "Take Me There" or "Map" button to provide navigation directions to the call site.
            4. **Redesign Layout:**
                    a. Instead of a single line like "New call assigned on Site 01", the popup should have structured lines:
                    b. The **call number** should be a **hyperlink** redirecting to *Call Details*.
    f. **En Route vs Acknowledge Logic**
        i. **Jaspreet's Point:**
            1. Only one action should be performed at a time.
            2. Example: If an officer clicks "En Route," they should not be able to simultaneously acknowledge or act on multiple calls.
            3. This prevents logical conflicts (e.g., an officer being en route to two calls at once).
        ii. **Randy's Clarification:**
            1. The popup must enforce that the user either acknowledges (I'll do it later) or goes en route (doing it now).
            2. No 'X' button should be present — "Acknowledge" acts as the close function.
            3. Each new call must trigger its own popup.
            4. If multiple calls are received simultaneously, each should have its own popup window (similar to multiple alert boxes).
        iii. **Multi-Call Handling**
            1. Scenario Discussed: If multiple calls arrive simultaneously:
                    a. Each call triggers its own popup.
                    b. Officer can acknowledge or go en route individually per call.
                    c. Popups should not overlap critical information.
                    d. High-priority calls should appear on top of the queue/listing.
            2. Randy: Clarified that multiple popups are acceptable and necessary for accountability.
                    a. Each popup represents a unique call instance with individual acknowledgment/en route tracking.
    g. **Finalized Structure for Popup**
        i. White Popup Box – represents the Call Notification Window
            1. **Inside contains a Red Section,** showing:
                    a. Call Number (Hyperlinked to Call Details)
                    b. Site ID
                    c. Location/Address
                    d. Activity Code
                    e. [Future: TEN Code and Directions Button]
            2. **Action Buttons:**
                    a. Acknowledge (acts as close/X)
                    b. En Route (marks officer en route and closes popup)
            3. **Future Add-on:** Route/Directions button

4. Accountability & Workflow Rationale
   a. **Purpose:** Each popup enforces accountability by ensuring the officer takes one clear action per call (either "acknowledge" or "en route").
   b. **Outcome:**
      i. Helps dispatchers track response states accurately.
      ii. Prevents officers from missing or skipping notifications.

2. **Scheduling & Analytics Discussion**
   a. **Discussion:**
      i. Post notification review, **Jaspreet** moved to the next module — **scheduling and analytics**.
      ii. **Tom** questioned the delay in updating the **label "Site" to "Stationary"** and "Beat" to "Mobile."
      iii. **Rupesh** acknowledged and confirmed it will be fixed in the **next build**, apologizing for the repeated delay.
      iv. **Analytics Statistics Breakdown:**
         1. **Contracted Hours:** Derived from site notes.
         2. **Operating Hours:** Based on scheduled shifts within selected date range.
         3. **Staffed Hours:** Total assigned or completed hours for officers.
         4. **Open Hours:** Represented in yellow (unassigned shifts).
         5. **Unscheduled Hours:** Represented in grey (as per site notes).
      v. Tom reviewed the **percentage breakdowns and labeling** and confirmed they now appear correct.
   b. **Action Items:**
      i. Update the **label changes ("Stationary" and "Mobile")** in the next release.
      ii. Validate the **stat percentage calculations** for accuracy.
      iii. Confirm OT/DOT calculations before final deployment.

3. **Production Deployment & Testing Approach**
   a. **Discussion:**
      i. Tom instructed that fixes validated for **Citywide instance** should be **moved to production immediately** once verified.
      ii. Teresa will **monitor production stability** for a few days before extending to all instances.
      iii. **Break issue resolution:**
         1. Rupesh confirmed the fix is implemented and tested on the staging environment.
         2. Tom insisted that **critical issues must be fixed directly on production**, stating that users are facing real-time problems.
         3. Jaspreet clarified that staging validation is essential to avoid impact on other functionalities.
         4. Tom emphasized a **fast turnaround** on production deployment.
   b. **Action Items:**
      i. Push **Citywide stat code fix** to production.
      ii. Teresa to **monitor production** for a few days post-deployment.
      iii. QA team to **validate staging thoroughly but expedite** production releases for critical issues.
      iv. Kuldeep to verify OT/DOT workflows before final push.

4. **Student Training Module Discussion (with Randy and Teresa)**
    a. **Feature Overview Presented by Jaspreet:**
        i. Separate **Student Module** under the Training section.
        ii. Admin can **add or onboard students** (similar to employee creation) with minimal info:
            1. Name, SSN, Contact details, etc.
        iii. Option for **self-onboarding** via **marketing link**, allowing students to:
            1. Select a course.
            2. Enter personal info.
            3. Pay online or offline.
            4. Receive credentials via email.
        iv. Once logged in, students can:
            1. View **assigned or opted courses**.
            2. Take **tests or assessments**.
            3. Access **certificates** upon completion.
    b. **Randy's Queries & Discussion:**
        i. Asked whether this is for **CommandHub or Citywide**.
        ii. Clarified that the goal is to allow **non-employee students** (external users) to take training via CommandHub.
        iii. Compared the plan to **law enforcement training** and **academy events**, where students register and pay for courses via an external calendar system.
    c. **Teresa's Clarifications:**
        i. The **Student Module** will be a **CommandHub feature** accessible to any client academy (Citywide, KSMC, etc.).
        ii. Students are external users who can:
            1. Enroll, pay, and train on the CommandHub platform.
            2. Receive credentials for login and course tracking.
    d. **Key Points Discussed:**
        i. Course creation to allow selecting **target audience**: Employee / Student / Both.
        ii. Payment process: Currently **manual verification** preferred (no payment gateway integration yet).
        iii. Future enhancement: Integration with **payment gateway and public course listing** similar to job board.
        iv. Expiration policy: Students' **login should remain active post-course** (for certificate access or further classes).
    e. **Randy's Suggestion:**
        i. Replace their current **external calendar** with CommandHub's version for training signups.
        ii. Need clarity on **integration feasibility**.
    f. **Ditstek Response:**
        i. Confirmed similar approach possible using **marketing links and course listings**.
        ii. Payment gateway integration can be planned later once workflow is finalized.
        iii. Agreed to first **document complete workflow and confirm requirements** before starting development.
    g. **Teresa's Conclusion:**
        i. This is a **"want," not a current need.**
        ii. The feature can be postponed until **existing tickets and pending issues are cleared**.
    h. **Ticket & Sprint Focus**

     i.   **Teresa** suggested pausing future feature discussions to focus on resolving current open tickets that are blocking usage.

    ii.   **Randy** expressed that several features are still not functional, making it difficult to discuss or plan upcoming advanced features.

   iii.   **Jaspreet** clarified that the current discussion is part of *Sprint 5* planning (starting from **20th October**) and focuses on future implementation strategy, not immediate build tasks.

   iv.   **Teresa** emphasized prioritizing core functionalities first (like **upgraded geofencing**) before discussing lower-priority features.

i. Priority Re-Evaluation

     i.   Both sides agreed that the **priority list** needs to be re-discussed and updated, as some features have become more critical than originally planned.

    ii.   **Teresa** mentioned that certain future items (like *student-related features*) can be postponed until foundational functionalities are complete.

   iii.   **Jaspreet** proposed scheduling a **Monday meeting** to revisit the **priority list**, review all existing **Trello tickets**, and restructure the sprint plans accordingly.

j. Payroll Implementation

     i.   **Jaspreet** confirmed that the **payroll feature** has been implemented, and **testing is currently in progress**.

    ii.   **Ravinder** mentioned that testing is being done in **Riverside** and will be validated across other branches like **San Diego** before closing the ticket.

   iii.   **Tersa** verified that recent payroll updates, including **units display** and **hours/minutes segregation**, are correct and visible.

k. Branches Status

     i.   **Teresa** inquired about branch deployment.

    ii.   **Jaspreet** confirmed that **branches are up on CWP production**, though still undergoing testing.

   iii.   Minor issues were identified and are under review.