Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time	04 June 2025 09:00 PST	Meeting type	Zoom
Organiser	Mr. Rupesh	**Client**	Citywide

Attendees (Internal)
• Rupesh • Kuldeep • Jaspreet • Gurpreet • Sangita • Vishesh • Avinash • Kapil • Amit • Neha
Attendees (Client Side)
• Tom, Teresa, Randy, Matt

Agenda
• **Discussions on the following:** ○ Site Area and Lockup/Unlock Information ○ Site Sidebar Menu Customization ○ Payment Section Enhancement ○ Dispatch Function Fix ○ Site Search by Address ○ OmniGo System Feature Analysis ○ Call Creation UI/UX Improvements ○ Real-Time Call Creation Visibility ○ AI Integration Suggestions ○ 10-Code Directive Templates ○ Priority Settings for Activity Codes ○ Clarification on Templates ○ Subject Classification Enhancement (Liability-Related) ○ AI Integration ○ Open Calls Display (UI/UX Improvements) ○ Ticket 872 - Repeat Caller Identification Feature ○ Clarification on Matching Logic ○ Caller vs. Site History

- Purpose of Displaying Caller History
- Frequent Caller Labeling
- Incident vs. Caller Overlap
- Call Notes Visibility
- Grace Periods in Fleet Management
- Email Removal (Lucas)
- Payroll Week Cutoff Clarification
- Auto-Deactivation Logic
- Split Beat Not Functioning as Expected
- Enhanced Call Notes Logging
- Grace Period Settings
- Payroll Report Improvements
- Split Beat UI Enhancement
- Issue Identified by QA Team
- NFC Tag Integration
- Progress & Priorities
- AI Report
- Report Approval & Mobile App Hours
- Client Demos

The following things are discussed:

1. **Site Area and Lockup/Unlock Information:**
    a. **Problem Identified:**
        i. The current site view is cluttered and confusing due to numerous "N/A" entries for lockup/unlock fields.
        ii. Site area information becomes lost if lockup/unlock is not applicable.
    b. **Proposed Solutions from the dev team:**
        i. If some areas have lock/unlock info, display them first, followed by those without.
        ii. If none of the areas have lock/unlock data, hide that table entirely and show only area descriptions.
        iii. Explore separating lock/unlock into a distinct table or section.
        iv. Consider a tile view or availability-like time boxes (as used in employee profiles) for compact visual display.
        v. Create 2–3 design variations to review and finalize with the client.
2. **Site Sidebar Menu Customization:**
    a. **Problem Identified:**
        i. The sidebar displays all options even when corresponding data is missing, which confuses field agents.
    b. **Suggestions from Teresa:**
        i. Implement dynamic sidebar options based on available data.

    ii. Only display sections like "Property Access," "Parking Enforcement," etc., if data exists.
    iii. Default mandatory sections:
        1. Site Details
        2. Post Orders
        3. Site Photos
        4. Site Documents
  c. **Proposed Solutions from the dev team:**
    i. Add radio/check box configuration for sidebar sections (similar to the mobile toggle feature).
    ii. Ensure mandatory/default sidebar items are always shown.
    iii. Optional tabs (e.g., Temporary Post Orders, Site Reports) should be displayed based on configuration/data availability.

3. **Payment Section Enhancement:**
  a. **Discussion Points:**
    i. Need the ability to **bill separately by service type**, such as **Mobile** and **Stationary Officer** services.
    ii. Currently, billing is either *Projected* or *Actual*, but not both for different services under one site.
    iii. Teresa highlighted that **each service** (e.g., Fire Watch vs. Standing Officer) may have different billing preferences (actual vs. projected).
    iv. A requirement to **map billing type (actual/projected) per service line item** instead of a global billing method.
    v. The dev team confirmed this logic and agreed to **remove global billing control** and **implement billing on a per-service-type basis**.

4. **Dispatch Function Fix:**
  a. **Discussion Points:**
    i. Dispatch issue was previously reported.
    ii. CommandHub mentioned they had shared it already, but the fix is **still pending**.
    iii. Kuldeep acknowledged the issue and confirmed a restart may be needed.

5. **Geofencing Call Arrival Automation:**
  a. **Discussion Points:**
    i. When a **call is assigned** to a geofenced site, the system should **automatically mark the agent as "arrived"** upon entering the geofence.
    ii. However, **manual override must remain** available for users accessing via MBTs/laptops/web (due to location limitations).
    iii. This ensures flexibility for both **app users (automatic)** and **web users (manual)**.
    iv. Dispatch should also be able to mark an agent as "arrived".

6. **Site Search by Address:**
  a. **Issue Identified:** Current version lacks the ability to search sites by address, which existed in V1.
  b. **Impact:** Dispatchers must switch between tabs to match addresses with sites, slowing down response time.
  c. **Proposal:** Implement search by address feature, similar to how V1 allowed auto-linking addresses to sites.

    d. **Future Vision:** Address ranges (e.g., 3430–3630 Marin) should auto-resolve to a site even if the exact address isn't entered.

7. **OmniGo System Feature Analysis:**
    a. **Video Review:** All team members to review the OmniGo system demo shared by Teresa.
    b. **Goal:** Replicate functionality such as:
        i. Address-based site lookup
        ii. Historical calls by site
        iii. Dispatcher prompts based on call type
        iv. Unit dispatch integration
        v. Post-call email functionality
    c. The dev team created flow diagrams and an understanding document outlining implementation challenges and suggestions.
8. **Call Creation UI/UX Improvements:**
    a. **Concerns Raised:**
        i. The current UI is crowded and difficult to navigate, especially with high data density.
        ii. Activity code is a critical input and should appear at the top of the form.
    b. **Suggestions:**
        i. Use a step-by-step guided UI for call creation.
        ii. Split screen layout for call intake and dispatcher guidance.
        iii. Implement collapsible sections to reduce visual clutter.
        iv. Show related call history, responding agencies, and site details in expandable sections.
9. **Real-Time Call Creation Visibility:**
    a. **Functionality Needed:** Other dispatchers should see high-priority calls as they're being created to initiate quicker dispatch actions.
    b. **Implementation Note:** Activity code entry should trigger visibility and associated guidance for other dispatchers.
10. **AI Integration Suggestions:**
    a. **Proposal by Tom:**
        i. Use **ChatGPT API** to auto-generate dispatcher questions based on the call description (e.g., burglary).
        ii. Suggestions should be editable and customizable by the admin.
        iii. Provide real-time, smart prompts for dispatchers during call intake.
        iv. Make the system smarter and faster, improving user experience.
11. **10-Code Directive Templates:**
    a. **When creating or configuring 10-codes, include:**
        i. Description
        ii. Priority
        iii. Dispatch directives (questions dispatcher must ask)
        iv. Officer directives (questions shown in officer's report)
    b. **Officer & Dispatch Directives Functionality**
        i. **Objective:** To distinguish between *officer directives* and *dispatch directives* within activity code templates.
        ii. **Dispatch Directives:**
            1. Will function as form builders driven by AI-generated suggestions.

2. Should prompt dispatchers with relevant questions based on the TEN code.
3. Needs ability to customize/select AI-suggested questions per incident.

iii. **Officer Directives:**
1. One-liner **actionable notes** (e.g., "Call emergency maintenance").
2. Will appear under the activity code when selected.
3. Should be editable and visible only if the activity code is selected.

12. Priority Settings for Activity Codes:
- **a.** New priority levels requested: Low, Medium, High, and Critical Incident.
- **b.** Each priority should allow custom color coding (e.g., orange, red).

13. Clarification on Templates:
- a. **Activity Templates**: Multi-question forms tied to incident types.
- b. **Officer Directives**: Simple instruction/notes, not full forms.

14. Subject Classification Enhancement (Liability-Related)
- a. Replace the label "Suspect" with "Subject".
- b. Add classification dropdown for Person Type:
  - i. Options: Witness, Victim, Suspect, Reporting Party, Person of Interest, Patient.
- c. Marked as Top Priority due to potential liability/legal concerns.

15. AI Integration
- **a. AI to be leveraged in:**
  - i. AI to be leveraged in:
    1. Dispatch directives (question generation).
    2. Language barrier mitigation during reporting.
- b. The dev team to create a **POC (Proof of Concept)** for internal review.

16. Open Calls Display (UI/UX Improvements)
- a. Current display on **laptops vs. monitors** lacks consistency.
- b. Request to:
  - i. Restore column customization for users (post-default setting).
  - ii. Fix **auto-expanding/collapsing UI behavior** (especially frustrating during updates or uploads).
  - iii. Improve responsiveness for **admin/supervisor dashboards**.
  - iv. Allow **admin-level control** over view formats if patrol control is restricted.

17. Ticket 872 - Repeat Caller Identification Feature:
- a. **Requirement:** If a site and person name or phone number match past calls, system should show matches and allow dispatchers to click and view past call records.
- b. **UI/UX Suggestion:** Display something like "12 matches found," with a clickable link to open the history in a new window or pop-up.

18. Clarification on Matching Logic:
- a. **Primary Matching Field:** Phone number only.
- b. **Name Matching:** Avoided due to ambiguity and common names.
- c. **Potential Future Expansion:** Include name + date of birth for better accuracy (especially for PD use case), but not required at this stage.

19. Caller vs. Site History:

  a. Focus is on the **caller's history specific to a site**, not across multiple sites.
  b. Matches should be shown **only for that site** using the phone number.
  c. Exception may apply if neighboring properties are involved, but generally very low probability (<1%).

20. **Purpose of Displaying Caller History:**
    a. Helps dispatchers quickly assess the nature and pattern of the caller's previous complaints.
    b. Aims to support better decision-making and communication with property/account managers.
    c. Can assist in tailoring a more informed and personalized response.
21. **Frequent Caller Labeling:**
    a. **Terminology Change:** Avoid calling it "frequent caller." Use neutral phrasing like "12 records found."
    b. **Dispatcher Discretion:** System will **not dictate priority** based on call frequency.
    c. Priority assignment (Low, Medium, High) will remain manual per dispatcher judgment and company policy.
22. **Incident vs. Caller Overlap:**
    a. New point raised: **Multiple callers** might report the **same incident** (e.g., noise complaint, security issue).
    b. **Action Item:** No ticket exists for this scenario yet. Needs to be logged separately.
23. **Call Notes Visibility:**
    a. **Request**: Add ability to log and **label follow-up calls** (e.g., "second call" or "additional call") and make them **visible to property managers**.
    b. **Current Issue**: Only the agent sees the updated call notes.
24. **Grace Periods in Fleet Management**
    a. **Request**: Add **grace periods for service (mileage and time)**.
    b. **Rules**: After the grace period ends, **the vehicle should auto-deactivate**.
    c. **Clarified**: No grace period should be allowed for **insurance** or **registration** — driving without either is illegal.
25. **Email Removal (Lucas)**
    a. **Request**: Completely remove **Lucas' email** from all system notifications and records (excluding his profile).
    b. **Method**: CommandHub will send the email address to Ditstek to remove it manually.
26. **Payroll Week Cutoff Clarification**
    a. **Issue**: Hours worked on weekends are showing in **next week's payroll** due to cutoff logic.
    b. **Request**: Need **clarification** on whether hours from Sat/Sun should be carried forward or logged in the same week.
    c. **Comment**: There's **confusion** about overtime calculation if work spills into next week.
27. **Auto-Deactivation Logic:**
    a. **Reported**: System **may not actually deactivate** vehicles even if registration or insurance is expired.
    b. **Required Behavior**: Vehicle must be deactivated if grace period lapses.
28. **Split Beat Not Functioning as Expected**
    a. **Issue**: Multiple hits can't be properly split between different sites.

   b. **Expectation**: User wants to **assign specific hit numbers** to multiple sites **via multiple dropdowns** in one go.

29. **Enhanced Call Notes Logging**
    a. Add capability for **multi-caller tracking** and **call versioning** with visibility beyond the agent role.
30. **Grace Period Settings**
    a. Add UI to set **grace mileage/time** for **services**.
    b. Implement logic for **auto-deactivation** post grace period.
31. **Payroll Report Improvements**
    a. Flexible **week cutoff handling** for hours worked on weekends.
    b. Overtime logic should not **overlap between weeks** (e.g., no carry-over of overtime from late Sunday).
32. **Split Beat UI Enhancement**
    a. UI should allow:
       i. Multiple dropdowns
       ii. Manual hit count input
       iii. Assigning hits to different sites in one go
33. **Issue Identified by QA Team**
    a. Time entries in reports (start/end of shift) were recorded in the **future** (beyond current actual time).
    b. Verified on multiple officer entries—times appeared inconsistent or incorrect.
    c. Geofencing data is also not populating correctly, possibly due to incorrect timestamps.
    d. Teresa's Analysis:
       i. Attributed one case to a user (agent) error: the agent submitted reports after midnight and **forgot to adjust the date**, even though they corrected the time.
       ii. Teresa confirmed the issue may not be system-wide as other agents' entries appeared correct on her end.
    e. Further QA Observations
       i. Officers appeared to have **future timestamps** for both start and end shifts consistently.
       ii. The dev team requested Teresa to test on their end by creating and submitting a shift to cross-verify.
    f. Testing and Confirmation:
       i. Teresa created and submitted reports on her side; **timestamps were correct**.
       ii. This suggests agents might be **manually updating shift timings** post-event, which is causing discrepancies.
    g. Officers with Noted Discrepancies:
       i. Badge IDs: **1720**, **1980**
       ii. Examples reviewed in detail; one entry showed the start time of 9:55 PM with the report finishing into the next day, which aligned with expected behavior.
       iii. One record had a valid shift duration that crossed midnight, likely entered without adjusting the date field, confirming **manual entry error**.
34. **NFC Tag Integration**

a. Teresa asked if it's possible to support NFC tags, should it become a must-have feature.
b. The dev team has started R&D but needs clarity on what's expected (e.g., linking NFC serial numbers to the system).
c. Teresa is unsure how NFC would tie into their system—whether they sell them, users buy them, or how mapping would work.
d. The dev team confirmed they'll research this further and discuss.

35. Progress & Priorities

a. The dev team mentioned that most of David's priority items are complete except for form changes and scheduling tickets, which are being targeted for next week.
b. Teresa will review and confirm if there are any other priorities.

36. AI Report

a. **Teresa** wants to discuss the AI report.
b. **Rupesh** suggested discussing it tomorrow after internal evaluation (e.g., need for an AI developer, feasibility, scope).

37. Report Approval & Mobile App Hours

a. **Approval from Tom** is pending for pushing the production build.
b. **300 hours for mobile app** discussed — already in conversation with Nidhi but written confirmation is needed.
c. **CommandHub** texted Tom to expedite the process.

38. Client Demos

a. Two large client demos went well; these are early-stage contacts, and decision-making will take time (likely 2+ months).
b. Teresa emphasized that this is a long-term pipeline, but it's a strong foot in the door.