Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time	16 July 2025 09:00 PST	**Meeting type**	Zoom
Organiser	Mr. Rupesh	**Client**	Citywide

Attendees (Internal)
• Rupesh • Kuldeep • Jaspreet • Sangita • Vishesh • Akash • Puneet • Kapil
Attendees (Client Side)
• Tom, Teresa, Randy, Matt

Agenda
• **Discussions on the following:** ○ Updates on Oceanside Police Department (PD) Meeting ○ Analytics Demo Presentation ○ Shift Acknowledgement Notification ○ Payroll System Discussion ○ Exporting Payroll and Date Range Issue ○ Payroll Report Generation and Manual Check Process ○ Pending System Updates

The following things are discussed:

1. **Updates on Oceanside Police Department (PD) Meeting:**
   a. **Meeting Overview:**
      i. Tom met with the Oceanside Police Department, including the Chief and Assistant Chief. The system was presented and generally well received. However, significant adjustments are required to make the system compatible with law enforcement needs.
   b. **Key Changes Discussed:**

i. **Jurisdiction**: Need to replace “sites” with “beats,” as PD uses jurisdictional boundaries instead of traditional site-based models.
ii. **Beat Setup**:
iii. **Address Management**: Every address within the jurisdiction should be managed within the system, especially for commercial locations (e.g., McDonald's) where users may not have a precise address.
iv. **Integration Needs**: The system must integrate with various other software (including First2, NCIC, DOJ-based software, and Live911). APIs will be required for data import/export.

c. **Timeline:**
i. **Development**: A full system should be ready for staging within 6 months, followed by another 6 months of testing and refinement.
ii. **Challenges**: The Department of Justice has strict guidelines, and no foreign company can handle the development side of this project. Local US developers will need to be hired for some parts.

d. **Next Steps:**
i. Tom will continue meetings with Oceanside PD, focusing on refining requirements for the system.
ii. Follow-up with team discussions on the team structure and the integration of features.

e. **Team Division:**
i. Nidhi proposed splitting the team into two main segments: **Law Enforcement** and **Citywide Services (civilian side)**.
ii. Kuldeep and Jaspreet could lead both sides separately to manage different focus areas.

f. **Additional Hiring:**
i. Tom emphasized the need for additional resources for this project, as the current team will not be sufficient given other ongoing and upcoming projects.

g. **Database Segmentation:**
i. DITSTEK suggested separating the database for law enforcement and citywide services, considering the required changes in workflows and service segments.
ii. The back-end structure would need to accommodate multiple hierarchies (e.g., beats, officers, vendors, etc.).

h. **Action**:
i. Nidhi proposed scheduling 2-3 additional calls to clearly define the scope of changes, including code separation and database segmentation.
ii. Once these discussions are completed, DITSTEK will provide a more precise resource estimate.

i. **Software Integrations:**
i. The integration of external systems (First2, NCIC, DOJ software, Live911) will be a significant part of the project. Detailed planning for APIs and data migration is necessary.

j. **On-Site Development**:
i. Due to DOJ requirements, all work related to the police department's system must be handled by US-based developers.
ii. Team discussions around this restriction will continue to ensure

compliance with legal requirements.

k. **Project Scale**:
    i. Tom mentioned the possibility of tripling the size of the team, especially with three large upcoming projects: Oceanside PD, BCI, and Kaiser.

l. **Follow-Up**:
    i. A follow-up call will be scheduled in about two weeks for progress discussions before the major meeting with Oceanside PD.

2. **Analytics Demo Presentation:**

a. **Overview of Analytics Demo:**
    i. The analytics feature was demonstrated, showing various filters (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, etc.), revenue comparisons (e.g., petrol vs. standing services), and total call response times.

b. **Feedback:**
    i. **Tom** emphasized the need for clear and easily interpretable data, advising against showing negative trends (e.g., in red) as it could have a negative psychological impact.
    ii. **Teresa** agreed, commenting that the "downward" trend representation could create negative associations.

c. **Call Response and Invoice Data:**
    i. The system shows both current and previous data (e.g., total calls received, revenue comparison, etc.).
    ii. **Tom** suggested renaming some elements, such as “both” to “comparison” or using abbreviations for clarity.

d. **Next Steps**:
    i. The team will continue refining the demo based on feedback.
    ii. **Tom** requested a clearer distinction between data sets to avoid confusion, especially regarding time periods.

e. **Call Count and Search Filters:**
    i. A unified **call count** for all sites is required on the analytics screen.
    ii. Users should be able to **search/filter by single or multiple sites**.
    iii. **Combined results** for selected sites should be viewable.

f. **Call Response Time Analytics:**
    i. Call response to be shown at:
        1. **Company-wide**
        2. **Per site**
        3. **Multiple selected sites**
    ii. Break down response into:
        1. **Overall response**
        2. **Emergency calls**
        3. **Non-emergency calls**
    iii. Emergency to be mapped with **high priority activity codes** (e.g., shots fired, stabbings).
    iv. Non-emergency as **low priority codes**.
    v. Need **average response times** for each category and per activity code.

g. **Graph Requirements:**
    i. Emergency/Non-emergency breakdown to be in **separate graphs**.
    ii. Allow selection of:

    1. **Activity codes**
    2. **Sites**
  iii. Multiple search boxes proposed.

h. **Client vs Company Analytics:**
  i. Analytics must be visible:
    1. **Company-wide**
    2. **Per client**
    3. **Multiple clients**
  ii. Teresa emphasized the importance of **client-specific reporting**.
  iii. **Default view** should show company-wide total calls and response times, with drill-down via filters.

i. **Incident Frequency Comparison:**
  i. Incident graph to show:
    1. Current period vs previous period count.
    2. Works based on **selected activity codes** (e.g., 5150).
    3. Can run for **multiple activities**.

j. **Service Hours Comparison:**
  i. Should show:
    1. **Scheduled hours**
    2. **Actual service hours**
    3. **Split of regular vs overtime**
  ii. Needs to be reflected both **client-specific** and **company-wide**.

k. **Activity Tracking:**
  i. Should include:
    1. **Time spent per activity**
    2. **Regular vs Overtime hours**
    3. **Client and company views**
  ii. Teresa emphasized the ability to **filter activity time spent per site** (e.g., University Square).

l. **Time Range Filters:**
  i. Every graph must support:
    1. **Custom date range (e.g., 51 days)**
    2. **Predefined filters:** Weekly, Bi-weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, Yearly
  ii. Jaspreet confirmed this is implemented; Tom emphasized **flexibility and precision**.

m. **OPS Report Integration**
  i. Based on CSV shared via Slack.
  ii. Should include:
    1. Weekly comparison of hours per department.
    2. Indicators missing from current graph (e.g., hours, dollars, etc.)
  iii. **Proper chart titles and descriptions** required to make graphs self-explanatory.

n. **Download Options:**
  i. CSV download option implemented.
  ii. Additional visual representation to be included.

o. **Zero Data Handling:**
  i. If no data exists, the system should show **"0"** instead of **"No Data"**.

p. Calculation of Overtime and Double Time:

  i. **Tom Tamar** requested the inclusion of **regular time**, **overtime**, and **double overtime** in the report, based on the shift hours.

  ii. **Jaspreet Kaur** inquired about how overtime and double time should be calculated based on shift times (arrival and departure) and activity codes.

    1. **Tom Tamar** clarified that if a guard works overtime, the activity they are engaged in during that period should be marked as **overtime**.
    2. However, the overtime calculation will depend on the specific shift and guard involved, as not all guards will have overtime at the same time.

q. Clarification on Weekly and Monthly Overtime:

  i. **Kuldeep** asked about tracking **weekly** and **monthly** overtime.

  ii. **Tom Tamar** emphasized that overtime, based on system rules (e.g., after 40 hours), should trigger automatically. The key is determining what activity caused the overtime (e.g., during the last hour of the week).

  iii. The system should track **regular hours**, **overtime**, and **double time** with clear percentages and breakdowns.

r. Client-Side Analytics:

  i. **Teresa** clarified that **client-side analytics** should track activity and incidents, but clients do not need to see detailed **overtime** or **pay** information.

  ii. **Tom Tamar** agreed that client-side reports should be high-level analytics, while internal company reports need detailed information on overtime, pay, and activity breakdowns.

s. Graphs and Visual Analytics:

  i. **Tom Tamar** requested that all graphs should be **comparable with previous periods** to allow trend analysis.

    1. He specifically mentioned that **graphs and charts should be easy to understand** and offer a breakdown of the data.
    2. Every graph should have the option to dive deeper into specific data points, similar to **QuickBooks**: clicking on a number should open a deeper breakdown of that data.

  ii. **Jaspreet Kaur** showed graphs comparing **previous and current periods**, seeking feedback on their usefulness.

t. Incident Reporting and Activity Codes:

  i. **Jaspreet Kaur** demonstrated how the system tracks **incident types** by date, e.g., hit-and-run incidents on specific days.

  ii. **Tom Tamar** asked if there could be a **spike analysis** for activities, such as increased **vehicle break-ins** on weekends. He also requested that the system be able to show **activity breakdowns** for specific periods.

u. Improvements in Reporting and Graph Design:

  i. **Teresa** raised concerns that some graphs were too **small** and difficult to read, suggesting that the graphs should be larger for better visibility.

  ii. **Tom Tamar** recommended using a **candle chart** to represent activity breakdowns:

1. A **candle** should represent the total activities for the day, with each **color** representing a different activity. Hovering over a color would show the activity details.
2. This method would make the visual easier to interpret for **trends and spikes**.

v. Feedback on Analytics and Reports:

i. **Tom Tamar** emphasized that when presenting analytics:
   1. The data must be **accurate**.
   2. There should be **comparisons** with previous periods.
   3. **Graphs** and charts should have **clear explanations** and be easy to read.

ii. **Tom** also mentioned that, while **graphs are secondary**, the **data breakdown** is the most crucial part. Every report should offer an **option to click** for deeper insights.

w. Action Plan Moving Forward:

i. **Teresa** to send the **supplemental report** on **complaints** and **ratios**.

ii. Work on implementing the design changes requested for the graphs, including **candle charts**, and ensuring that all reports have **comparison periods** and **clickable data points**.

iii. Provide **weekly** reports on activity tracking, with a focus on spikes in activities and overtime data.

3. Shift Acknowledgement Notification:

a. Discussion Points:

i. **Jaspreet:** Explained the notification setup for end-of-shift acknowledgements. The notification triggers if the shift brake acknowledgment is not made.

ii. **Teresa:** Clarified that the notification for "End of Shift" should be triggered if a user selects the "No" option on acknowledgment. This would send a notification to the supervisor.

iii. **Acknowledgment Button Issue:** Teresa pointed out that the button labeling for "Acknowledge" is incorrect and should be changed to "Alternative Message."

iv. **Jaspreet:** Confirmed that the notification is set to be sent to the appropriate people based on the notification type and employee selection. Also, the email notification requirement was discussed.

v. **Resolution:** The system will send notifications for shift acknowledgment with the proper updated button labels.

4. Payroll System Discussion:

a. **Teresa:** Reported an issue with the payroll system:

i. Unable to see correct data when adjusting the employee filter or page size (e.g., 100, 50, 25).

ii. Some pages show "No Data" despite having data available.

iii. The July 4th holiday pay is not reflected yet in the system, making it difficult to verify the payroll against the current records.

5. **Exporting Payroll and Date Range Issue**

a. **Teresa:** Experienced issues when trying to filter payroll by specific dates. When exporting, it still showed data from May and July instead of just July.

b. **Kuldeep:** Suggested using the filter option to generate the correct date range. The issue will be resolved once the system is updated.

i. Waiting for the build update to resolve this issue and generate the correct CSV file.

6. **Payroll Report Generation and Manual Check Process:**
    a. **Teresa:** Requested a way to generate a printable, one-page breakdown of an individual's timesheet for manual checks.
        i. Currently, the report is not easily printable and needs adjustments for a clearer, one-page format.
    b. **Kuldeep:** Confirmed that in the breakdown view, users can see all details of the timesheet, including regular hours, overtime (OT), and double overtime (DOT).
7. **Pending System Updates:**
    a. **Kuldeep:** Informed that the final system update is pending for the payroll and report generation features.
        i. After the build update, the CSV file will be correctly generated, including allowances, OT, and DOT times.
    b. **Teresa:** Will review the new system output and compare it with previous records to ensure accuracy.