

Minutes of Meeting

Date and Time	5 August 2025 09:00 PST	Meeting type	Zoom
Organiser	Mr. Rupesh	Client	Citywide

Attendees (Internal)

- Kuldeep
- Jaspreet
- Sangita
- Vishesh
- Akash
- Ravinder
- Gurpreet
- Amit

Attendees (Client Side)

- Tom, Teresa, Matt, Randy

Agenda

- **Discussions on the following:**
 - PSSP Issues discussion

The following things are discussed:

1. PSSP Issues discussion

a. Launch and Prioritization

- i. **Launch Date:** Confirmed as **August 10th** (not 15th).
- ii. All work for PSSP must be completed by **August 10th**, as their current system goes offline by **August 15th**.
- iii. The team agreed to **prioritize PSSP issues first** before moving to the other agenda items. Any remaining topics would be handled in the next day's meeting.

b. Shift Scheduling Issues & Enhancements

i. Repeat Shift vs Repeat to Next Week

1. Issue identified with the **"Repeat to Next Week"** functionality related to **timezone discrepancies**.
 - a. For some PSSP users, shifts were being copied incorrectly due to the server using IST rather than the client's selected timezone.
 - b. Team will fix the timezone-based issue on **priority**.
2. Discussion on merging/removing **"Repeat Shift"** and **"Repeat to Next Week"**:
 - a. **Tom's Recommendation:**
 - i. **Remove "Repeat Shift"**: It's redundant; users can right-click and paste.
 - ii. **"Repeat to Next Week"** should:
 1. Automatically copy the current week's schedule to the following week.
 2. Additionally, allow users to **select a future date range** for copying.
 - iii. The action should maintain the structure of Mon–Sun weekly repetition, only copying scheduled days.

ii. Date Range Selection UI

1. Teresa's Input:

- a. The current dropdown structure for selecting sites and shifts works well.
- b. Suggested adding a **date range selection** below the shift/site selection box for more flexible scheduling.

iii. Notifications

1. **Incorrect Notification Messages** have been **fixed on staging**.
2. These changes will be included in the **next production build**.

iv. Copy-Paste Overtime Shift Issue

1. **Bug Identified:** When an **overtime shift** is copied to the next day, it's still being treated as **overtime**, which is incorrect.
2. This issue will be **resolved before the next release**.

v. Drag-and-Drop Scheduler Usability

1. Issue discussed regarding the **dragging behavior** of shifts in the scheduler UI:

- a. **Dragging should scroll** the view when moving shifts beyond the visible area (e.g., down or right).
- b. Currently, this is **not functioning properly**.
- c. Needs to be fixed for better user experience when moving shifts.

vi. **Shift Copying and Officer-Site Alignment**

- 1. **Issue:** Currently, only officers assigned to a site appear in the employee section.
- 2. **Concern:** If a shift is copied for an officer not aligned with the site, it should not proceed silently.
- 3. **Proposed Solution:**
 - a. Display a prompt: *“Officer is not assigned to this site. Do you want to assign them?”*
 - b. Upon confirmation, automatically assign the officer to the site and update their access in the employee profile.
- 4. **Reasoning:** Avoid unnecessary navigation to the employee profile just to grant site access, improving scheduling efficiency.
- 5. **Adding Officer to Site from Scheduler**
 - a. **Problem Identified:** Current workflow is inefficient — schedulers must leave the scheduling page to grant site access.
 - b. **Decision:** Enable adding an officer to a site directly from the scheduling interface to streamline operations.

c. **Beat/Hit Assignment and Splitting**

- 1. **Use Case:** Multiple officers may run the same route (beat) at different times; hits need to be split accordingly.
- 2. **Current Scenario:**
 - a. If the shift has started, hits are auto-assigned and uneditable.
 - b. Officers see all hits in their report unless manually reassigned afterward.
- 3. **New Requirement:**
 - a. A feature in the **"Agents"** section to assign specific hit counts manually.
 - b. Checkbox or input box next to agent names to allocate hits manually before the shift starts.
 - c. Default behavior: system splits hits equally (e.g., 10 hits among 3 agents → 3,3,4).
 - d. Manual override must be supported even if auto-assignment exists.
- 4. **Post-Login Restriction:**
 - a. Once a shift has started, the hit assignment should become **non-editable** to avoid conflicts and overlapping reports.
 - b. Overwriting reports may risk deleting already written reports; hence manual reassignment after shift start is discouraged.

d. Shift Confirmation & Rejection

- i. **Request:** Remove "**Reject**" functionality but retain "**Confirm**".
- ii. **Current Logic:**
 1. If no action is taken, and the officer starts the shift, it is auto-confirmed.
- iii. **Clarification Needed:**
 1. Do we keep both **Confirm** and **Reject** buttons?
 2. Or simplify the workflow by just using **Start Shift** (auto-confirm)?
- iv. **Decision:**
 1. Keep **Acknowledgement (Confirmation)** option as mandatory.
 2. Rejection can be optionally enabled based on a **sub-setting**.
- v. **Analytics and Hour Tracking**
 1. Request to show scheduled hours at the top of the scheduling screen is pending production deployment.
 2. Enhancement: Allow real-time hour visibility for:
 - a. Individual employees (based on selection).
 - b. Individual sites.
 3. Analytics should update based on any search/filter criteria applied.
- vi. **Filter Selection and Removal Bug**
 1. **Identified issue:** Selected employees or sites cannot be deselected/removed once added.
 2. **Action:** Bug to be fixed to allow seamless removal of selected filters.
- vii. **Employee-Site Assignment Through Multiple Interfaces**
 1. The current method requires assigning sites through employee profiles.
 2. Clients requested additional methods:
 - a. Assign employees via **Site Profile** page.
 - b. Assign employees via **Beat Profile** page.
 - c. Assign during **Scheduling**.
 3. This will result in **four access points** for site assignment:
 - a. Site Profile
 - b. Beat Profile
 - c. Employee Profile
 - d. Scheduling Interface

e. Patrol vs Standing Officer Access Logic

i. Current Behavior Clarification

1. Patrol Officers Assignment:

- a. Currently, patrol officers do **not require specific permissions** (like "change site" or "vehicle inspection") to be assigned to a site.
- b. Officers with "change site" permission are considered field officers and can be assigned to a site.
- c. Officers with "vehicle inspection" permission are treated as patrol officers and can be assigned to BEATs (patrol routes).

2. Stationary Site Scheduling:

- a. Patrol officers can currently be scheduled for stationary sites without needing to perform vehicle inspections.
- b. However, if a patrol officer has vehicle inspection permission, the system currently expects them to perform a vehicle inspection regardless of whether a vehicle is required for the site or BEAT.

ii. Concerns & Issues Raised

1. Tom:

- a. Raised concern about **redundancy** in permissions and assignments.
- b. **Frustration** noted over the requirement to provide additional permissions or vehicle inspection logic just to assign patrol officers to standing sites.
- c. Emphasized that patrol officers should have **access to all sites** by default, whereas standing guards should have access only to assigned sites.

2. Teresa:

- a. Highlighted that patrol officers can be scheduled on standing sites, but not vice versa (i.e., standing guards cannot be scheduled for patrol BEATs).
- b. Agreed that the current logic tying **vehicle inspection to patrol access** is flawed.
- c. Mentioned the “**hang tab**” of the vehicle inspection button is cumbersome and should be moved.

iii. Agreement on Revised Logic

1. Vehicle Inspection Logic Update:

- a. Vehicle inspection should **not** be a base requirement for patrol role assignment.
- b. **Vehicle inspection should depend on vehicle access**, not on role type.
- c. If the officer (standing or patrol) is assigned to a shift with a vehicle, **only then** should vehicle inspection be mandatory.
- d. If the site or BEAT does **not require a vehicle**, vehicle inspection should be **skipped entirely**.

2. BEAT Configuration Enhancement:

- a. During BEAT creation, a new field should be added: **“Does this BEAT require a vehicle?” (Yes/No)**
 - i. If **Yes**: officers will see available vehicle lists and be required to complete vehicle inspection.
 - ii. If **No**: officers will not see any vehicles nor be prompted for inspection.
- b. This simplifies logic and ensures realistic behavior aligned with operational flexibility (e.g., foot patrols, bicycles, etc.).

f. Vehicle Inspection Sheet Behavior

- i. **Observation:** Vehicle inspection option was not visible to Teresa.
- ii. **Clarification:** Users must start their shift for the Vehicle Inspection button to appear.
- iii. **Tom's Feedback:**
 - 1. The vehicle inspection prompt must **remain visible and annoying** until it is completed.
 - 2. After completion, it should **disappear** until the end of the shift.
 - 3. At the **end of the shift**, it must **reappear** and not allow logout unless final inspection is done.
 - 4. Avoid permanent placement on the site – guards may forget or overlook it.
- iv. **Current Functionality (as per Jaspreet):** The button disappears once the inspection is completed.
- g. **Action Items & Priorities for Delivery by 10th**
 - i. **Must-Have Items (to be completed before August 10):**
 - 1. Approval process for reports.
 - 2. Critical bugs (unspecified, but acknowledged by team).
 - ii. **Lower Priority (can be addressed post-deadline):**
 - 1. Refactoring vehicle inspection logic.
 - 2. BEAT configuration update for vehicle requirement.
 - 3. Relocation of vehicle inspection UI element.

