GA Editor AAR Action Items 2011

The following document notes action items either remaining from the 2010 list or new items added in 2011.

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Responsible Party</th><th>Due Date</th><th>Actions</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">GAE or Other Assignments</td></tr>
<tr><td>Communication about the role of fire manager’s in WFDSS</td><td>Harold</td><td></td><td>• Fire manager vs GAE role
• This may be incorporated in the IMT Role in WFDSS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• A continued ability to share information about roles in the system and the need for the fire managers to do WFDSS.
• Some forests have designated the resource specialist to complete the WFDSS so it freed up the fire folks to take care of the incident.
• We have to identify the difference between a mentor and the people at the local unit to complete WFDSS.
• <u>11/17 Update</u> – This task will be on hold until we see if the IMT Role document addresses or clarifies it.</td></tr>
<tr><td>IMT role in WFDSS (2010 List)</td><td>Harold (+)</td><td>Jan NWCG Mtg</td><td>• Draft review to Harold by December 9th – Target to have to NWCG by January. All GAEs need to grease the skids through their Fire Directors as well.
• Tom will grease the skids at the December meeting.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Draft document has been sent to some folks for review. It needs WFM RDA, Amanda, Linda to provide feedback and move forward from there.
• In the WFSA days we had teams of folks at each unit that would do the WFSA. What we are seeing now is that there is an abdication of responsibility to ensure that their team is putting together the decision document. There is too much reliance on the teams to complete this process.
• Need to describe the range of interactions that people might have.
• It needs to be provided before the team meetings in the spring.
• This will help everyone understand what the various roles will do and how it fits together.
• Other people interested in reviewing the document – Shari Miller, Nancy Lee Wilson, Amanda McAdams, Lisa Elenz
• 12/30 Update – The draft document has been provided to Lisa who will take it to NWCG in January.</td></tr>
<tr><td>ONA seems to overestimate organizational control required</td><td>Amanda / Nancy Lee</td><td>Dec 20</td><td>• Discussion with Tom to determine where this needs to go and discussing the impacts.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Agree completely and did a lot of justification of why they never used it. The unintended outcome is that nobody cares any more. It is felt that it is significantly higher. Not major overhaul but need to look at the scenarios. It seems to be assess whether it might be needed at some point instead of what is needed now.
• Often people didn’t discuss why they didn’t use the ONA suggestion.
• The Line Officer’s Authority is based on the complexity of that chart therefore having it be representative is critical. USFS – approval authority.
• Need to make sure that there is interaction with representatives from all agencies.
• <u>12/13 Update</u> – Tom is going to check at the NWCG meeting how feedback will be entertained.
• <u>12/30 Update</u> - If minor changes, we can revise and work with the NWCG to incorporate changes in documents.</td></tr>
<tr><td>State & Local Issues</td><td>Marsha / Lisa</td><td>Feb & Dec Ongoing</td><td>• Marsha will contact Dan to determine how best to move forward with this. Discussion item on the February call.
• Lisa to discuss with NAFRI folks about standard information to send to prospective non-federal students regarding security testing and contacting their GAEs</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Can WFDSS kick out folks if they haven’t used the system in a certain amount of time (even if they maintain their password)?
• Can WFDSS have an automated message that warns people they need to complete their security training and if they don’t automatically get kicked out? This would require some way to validate that they did do it, possibly through state reps or GAs for areas that don’t have it. Rob- any system still comes back on GA editors, which is what we are trying to avoid.
• In IQCS someone has to yearly validate users, this might be a large workload for GAs but maybe that is a possibility
• IMT’s to use BLM computers: they sign a piece of paper each year to note that they have given their employees security training. Could the agency provide this documentation? For many agencies yes, but for example CalFire doesn’t have a required security training. They have 18 non fed FB specialists, which although sounds like a low number but is actually a lot of work to maintain tracking of yearly security req.
• Can each state that wants to use it have a GA editor to manage it? The issue is not all states want to use it, but some individuals in the state do. If every state had a GA editor there would be more GA editors for states than there are for federal and might not make sense to go that direction rather than have a GACC person. From WFDSS standpoint adding more GA editors is not desirable.
• Common user authentication status: Rob can’t get an answer from anyone on this, likely it has fallen to a low priority. Tom did go to NWCG and brought it up as an issue.
• Rob- suggests talking to state NWCG reps and ask them for solution- this is not unique to WFDSS other fire applications have the same issue. ROSS has same issue and currently going down path independently. There needs to be a need identified by state folks. WFM RDA has brought it up but it needs to be brought up from states to push the issue forward.
Access to fire behavior tools
• If we don’t help them get in and get passwords they can’t complete training (like 495) and have difficulty learning the tools that are only in WFDSS.
• Can we require someone to have editor or owner role for an incident to also run FB analysis so the incident is cleaned up at the end of fire? Sometimes they have duplicate incidents when a FB person creates an</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">incident to run analysis without checking to see if incident was in system to begin with. Is there a way these incidents can be automatically declared out in WFDSS at end of the year?
• *12/13 Update – S590 students will be given the information to go to the IT Security if they are non-federal and who to provide that information to. A list of students will be forwarded to the GAEs in January by Lisa or Marlena.*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Need clear direction on security requirements for non-fed / tribal WFDSS access. (2010 List)</td><td>Marlena</td><td>March 1</td><td>• WFDSS develop an email reminder that indicates that the individual needs to provide their GAE documentation of the security requirements.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• There is concern that the website lists the due date of March 15th when that is not the security requirement due date for agencies (ex: FS is end of March and BIA is May/June). Marlena noted that the letter came from FAM security and they have pointed out in the past that the deadline and language does not line up. Two other concerns mentioned: 1) we need to change our references to tribes to reflect that they are their own governments and that their security is valid 2) Need to clarify that users with non federal.gov emails will be excluded from use in WFDSS, this is not acceptable to the BIA and that is what Rob has indicated in the past.</td></tr>
<tr><td>NFDSC Coordination</td><td>All GAE</td><td>Spring 2012</td><td>• Share information about GA processes being used within the GA to ensure communications is occurring or personnel in the field are getting help.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• If helpful, the WFM RDA can post GA information about how you are working when standing up decision support or on call.
• As you determine processes for the field to order assistance, please let the NFDSC know so they follow your procedures when requests come in.
• Add to list to a spring agenda to ensure GA's have a procedure list on the RDA site pre season or share their procedures among GAEs.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Planning Unit Awareness</td><td>Brett / Brenda / Mesia</td><td>Mar 1, 2012</td><td>• Likely could improve the help or provide additional guidance.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Raise awareness that managers can change planning units as the incident evolves and that they don't need to designate an enormous planning area at the start of the WFDSS.
• A neighboring interagency partner developed a WFDSS which included a very large planning area which included my agency's land. This led to a lot of work, meetings, time, etc for a fire that was many miles from my agency's land and never did reach us.
• When a planning area includes other jurisdiction you can document why you aren't addressing it yet.
• Do we need to look at how this differs from an MMA and why is it different? Articulate the different ways to do a planning area.
• *12/13 Update – Email the group sent on 12/7 has been forwarded to Marlena, Diane, & Tonja for consideration in updating WFDSS.*</td></tr>
<tr><td>WildCAD exports to WFDSS</td><td>Harold</td><td>1/15/2012</td><td>• Need to check if this is really an issue</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Program issue- for example the CC creates incident in wildcad and then export to WFDSS and then want to update confine/contain in wildcad and have it push through and it isn't.
• The process does work well to update fire status and have the two systems work together
• Summary- narrow concern from folks that are having an issue</td></tr>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Responsible Party</th><th>Due Date</th><th>Actions</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">**WFDSS Related – WRM RDA Considerations for Development (Top 5 Priority Order, then ranked as + or – order)**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fix known application issue & defects</td><td></td><td></td><td>• See notes</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Improving the flow of the decision process and issues that are known
• Shape Issues – sometimes you have to put them in twice or multiple times depending upon the glitch.
• If you time out - it pops you back to sign in and it makes you sign in twice.
• FB: in NT and ST, when input a different set of parameters you get a little red x and can't open/edit the section. If you wait for the 'Run' button to appear it should work. Rob will check on again, it might be fixed.
• In NT and ST- sometimes when you change things they don't save, if you use the Save at the bottom of the screen it appears to work better than the Save at the top- Rob thinks this has been fixed
• The naming box opens when you first open the page, once you save it you can't get back to that box again.
• The curser always moves to the top so you end up with things not pasted where you'd like them to be pasted.
• Problems with the Review/Reject Decision Screen not displaying correctly - Approve button doesn't always show up. Typically the approver was logged in and he tried to approve. He needed to log out and log back in. It gives a negative impression of the process, when we finally get them to engage and this doesn't work it turns them off. It is a stabilization thing. For publishing a decision you have to change the approvers back and forth to get to the publish button. The WFM RDA needs to hear about it if the issue keeps coming up.
• Improve the way Unit Shape Polygons display – fill in polygons etc. If you have shapes that are on a forest or district that are in different places, the label is out in the middle of nowhere and it is difficult to distinguish what they are. They are also the same color so it is difficult to tell which polygon you are looking at.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Decision process is confusing, not intuitive and needs to be remodeled. The flow needs to be right in your face. Confusion between COA, Obj, Req</td><td>Lisa

Rick / Amanda's folks / Shari /</td><td>Initially January</td><td>• First determine if the funding / contracting is available….
• Second get together a group of folks that are interested in assisting with making it more intuitive. Someone in the group who knows how to do user interface.
• Add rationale tab – move to a more prominent place
• RR and ONA as a flow – make them their own tab or fit in easier
• Get rid of validation tab
• Create a flow chart to allow people to understand where they are in the process.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Linda / Nancy Lee / Jan or FWS Brett ? / Brenda ?</td><td></td><td>Create drop downs from the tabs across the top so people can tell where they are and what needs to be completed
Add a fire behavior folder so people know where to put information
Add summary information or framework to the rationale tab
Create a risk assessment tab (potentially replace the validation tab with it)
Move SCI & MAPs from left menu
Need better information as to where the Unit ID pulls information from. Put a help icon there so people know where it comes from.
Automatically populate the rationale tab with some information RRRating, ONA, Fire Danger, et</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">NOTES:
It makes it confusing to have to move from left to right all the time, it isn't always in the side menu. When you are presenting material it makes it easier to have multiple screens.
WFSA was simpler to follow because you went left to right.
A color coded flowchart will allow people to see where they are and where they are going and what step they are at in the larger process and suggested items.
SCI should have a tab, nothing that needs done should be in left hand menu.
Harold- most users are fine and aren't having problems
Amanda- most users are used to the flow, but they have found that the people that have trouble are the ones that are trying to make a perfect document the first time
Is WFDSS helping us better document what is happening? Is there some data we can look at to determine how well it is working? For example some have a FB analysis completed, but don't know how to include it in their decision. Most just include the bare minimum to get the decision published and don't document what is going on with the fire.
We also have to change our culture- WFDSS is a great improvement over past methods, so we also need to focus on education of the program- completely changing the look of the program requires whole new training and education. Marlena is working this winter to improve training on where you are in WFDSS and how you complete what you need to do.
In high level tabs create a drop down that list the items that should fall under those tabs/most likely should be completed while they are working on that tab. Also when you open up a tab have a box open up that describes what the tab is for and suggest the items you should consider completing.
A group of people to work on it or engaging with the programmers on how the decision flows. Engage a group looking from the outside/perspective. Not involving folks that are really close to it. There are interesting way that people have learned about how people make decisions and take in information. Sometimes the programmer sees it differently than the people in the field. Have to blend the two.
Have a designated place so they know where the information might go. It would also prompt people to add the information if they aren't already.
There isn't a Fire behavior tab to have them document fire behavior so they don't, we need to give them a framework to fill in.
Rationale Tab
Line officers have a hard time figuring out where to enter their rationale - make a rationale tab.
What about having Rationale Tab replace the validation tab? And train folks to really describe the rationale for all that you have looked at and decided to do.
Automatically populate pertinent information. The RRRating summary, ONA, fire danger, etc.
Provide some framework in the rationale for the Line Officer to complete.
Validation Tab
This tab is confusing and the GAEs would like to see it removed.
Users don't see the point if you have to go back to answer it. Why would you develop a COA that doesn't meet your objectives, and would this question actually get them to realize it and rework what they are going to do if it doesn't?
What about changing name to Risk Assessment or something like that, and if agencies get on same page the questions could be listed here.
In CA they had good success with people answering the risk assessment framework in the rationale section- it added a lot of value.
Summary- this tab is not working as designed.
ONA / Relative Risk - It's on the left hand menu so you can get to it from any other page. Can be discussed for the future.
Getting these items in a flow instead of tabs from left to right and then left hand menu and then back to tabs across top</td></tr>
<tr><td>Print a Draft Decision</td><td></td><td></td><td>Provide the ability to print a draft decision.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Understand why we don't need this, but recognize that we work with a wide group of folks generationally. Having a hard copy in the hand is desired by some.
They want to be able to see whole picture in one spot without having to switch between screens.
Can we name the decisions? This might help in the reviewing process and how people talk about each decision.
Rob- to print something out you have to assume everyone could see it and you can't control access (to print it ends up as a .pdf and that could be sent out to anyone through email etc.). Lots of people want to make edits on paper and then hand to someone to enter- this slows down the process and gets rid of collaborative work b/c one person is working on at one time. We went to WFDSS to eliminate these issues.
Suggestion to add a 'Draft' water mark or say do not distribute- but that can't stop people from distributing
We print draft legal documents for other processes such as NEPA, why can't we print WFDSS documents?
From BIA many line officers are requesting to have a draft hard copy of a decision from WFDSS.
If we could print draft decisions potentially folks would see how lame the decision is so they may make a more robust decision.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Editing Strategic Obj/ Mgmt Req</td><td></td><td></td><td>Provide the ability to easily update these without retyping the information so the system can be uncluttered.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Edit and make a new version instead of having to completely retype and remove old information.
We don't want to clutter up the system with information we aren't using any more. The filtering, deactivate, etc is difficult to navigate.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Isn’t the old information already archived in the decision? Why does it all need to be saved?</td></tr>
<tr><td>Improve the Decision Editor</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Continue to improve the Decision Editor</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Information is not being included because of the difficulty with the decision editor. They don’t understand how to use it. These issues are anything from fire behavior to rationale.
• Get rid of the lower left hand pane. Include everything and allow information to be deleted that is not pertinent.
• The curser always moves to the top so you end up with things not pasted where you’d like them to be pasted.
• Saving when you’ve pasted, then you lose what you put in.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fire Behavior Analysis</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Allow incomplete fire behavior runs to be deleted
• Removing known mistakes from the system.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• When there are known mistakes made, it muddies the analysis that were made for decision by not being able to delete it. If they could be removed when there are known errors that would help. Maybe you just misnamed it or something then you are stuck with it.
• When there are multiple runs, it is really difficult to figure out which were used and which should be considered for the decision or calibration
• Maybe there is a process to make sure if deleted, it double checks with you.
• Happens a lot with short term. The naming box opens when you first open the page, once you save it you can’t get back to that box again.
• Clutter, keeping results organized. If you do make an error in the name and it gets copied, then it keeps bringing that error forward. Allow certain people to delete analyses that are in error.</td></tr>
<tr><td>FMU Displays</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Continue work on display of FMUs
•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• An issue for all agencies as you can’t view a neighbor’s FMUs while your FMU is being displayed.
• AK has statewide FMU's in which several jurisdictional agencies are in one FMU - Currently the way WFDSS displays the FMU's is by jurisdictional agency. Working with the statewide FMU's they are trying to figure out the best way to put in objectives - Unit - for us maybe Statewide and then tier down. Trying to determine this and what the issue is vs. training and understanding deficiencies.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Multiple Approver Issue with Periodic Assessment</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Design a way to determine which agency is responsible for the Periodic Assessment or who will get the email.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Provide the ability to toggle on/off who would receive the PA notifications.
• Put a check box (or some mechanism) to identify which person has the responsibility to do the PA.
• Suggestion- don’t have it be the last person to sign to get the reminder, have it be whoever the agency administrators decide (likely the largest land owner?). How can we make this more clear? It is easier said than done for all approvers to get together on this and decide.
• Note = anyone of the approvers can do a PA anytime- so maybe this just needs to be made more clear?
• Line officers are busy, and are unlikely to do something unless they are prompted that they have to do it
• Is there a way to elect who gets the email? Rob- this may add unintended consequences by adding more buttons that create more steps. On the contrary this might help clarify to the line officers
• The RDA will look into this and what ways there might be to help solve it</td></tr>
<tr><td>Line Officer Text Box</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• The ability to provide information when the decision is being published.
• Isn’t this the same as the rationale. Another way around it would be you can do a periodic assessment right away.
• No ability to accept it without being able to edit the document.
• Text box to identify who’s land they are adding the information for.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ability to upload PDF files</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• There is a desire to use WFDSS for long term assessments and to house information. We are finding people are building documents outside of WFDSS. This will continue without the ability to upload other docs.
• Examples – People creating word documents and then splitting apart to upload information. This would assist with building good decisions.
• Images in particular are difficult to upload one at a time.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ability to Prioritize Objectives</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• As Spatial FMPs evolve over the next year there may be better/more utilization of Unit shapes – may be an indication of needing to refine FMP objectives
• Still struggle with knowing which objective is more important than the other. Bigger than solving with FMUs. Particularly with multi-jurisdictional fires.
• Some forests were uploading their management areas instead of FMUs so their information was much narrower.
• This summer people stated specifically which management direction didn’t apply.
• This also applies to incident objectives and requirements being entered in to the system.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Planning Area Boundary</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Provide the ability to upload a shapefile for a planning area boundary.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• ie building the shape in GIS, then uploading for better accuracy
• Complex shapes created in GIS could bog down system. Use Nomogram philosophy – crayons vs. pencil</td></tr>
<tr><td>GIS Data – (2010 List)</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Concern was raised that this might be better served at the geographic or regional level. How do we work to ensure the data used in WFDSS is the best data?
• Noted that some didn’t understand initially that Unit Shapes could only be added by Data Managers, this inhibited units that don’t have access to many data managers, those units ended up having to use objectives</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">shapes and add them to every incident.
• 12/13 Update – The WFDSS GIS Team met in early December. WFDSS is committed to using agency or GA data where it is available and can be retrieved efficiently. Testing will take place as soon as feasible.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Jurisdictional Agency</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Populate automatically based on the planning area.
• At a minimum work on help and a ? icon that would explain it is within the planning area.
• Put a help icon so people know where the unit ID comes from.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• If we base it only on the perimeter then it isn’t a trigger for strategic level thinking. It starts bringing them in to the game before it gets there if it is based on the Planning Area.
• First choice to automate it, realizing there are higher priority items on our list. At a minimum work on help and a ? icon that would explain it is within the planning area.
• Tie in the unit ID – clarification of the Unit ID (jurisdiction versus protection). Unit ID pulls from the protecting agency – put a help icon there so people know where it comes from.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Value Inventory</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Simplify it as it is the first column that matters. Have a list, comma delimited, of what is queried and not used instead of a table.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Data Manager - Notice</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Add a notice at the top of the data manager tab to help remind data managers that the items on the data manager tabs are NOT incident specific but instead apply to all incidents for the selected unit</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Some data managers weren’t clear on that and thought “inactivating” strategic obj/mgmt. requirements on the data management tab would only inactivate them for the incident they were working on. This is somewhat of an education issue, but since there really isn’t formal training and since most people that are data managers probably already think they understand what to do (maybe they do, maybe they don’t) and wouldn’t go looking in help, maybe a NOTICE or WARNING of some kind at the top of the data management tab could help drive the point home.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Flame Act Report</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• A fair bit of copy and pasting is happening. It would be nice to have this automated but it likely isn’t a huge priority.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Super Viewer Role</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Fire Director’s meeting, agency administrators need to weigh in- we would have to have this to move forward
• Currently there is a work around so it fell to a lower priority
• Consider field perspective on this and how it might impact them</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Role GeoArea ‘viewer’ role for regional ops folks that are not GEs- to allow them to see Draft decisions in GA, a “Super Viewer”
• A role like this might make it easier to go in and help field write better COA/objectives etc.
• This would allow Super Viewers to view this information without creating more GAs and without having them be added to each incident
• Regional folks are there to help and this will facilitate helping</td></tr>
<tr><td>GA Editor ability to reset passwords</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Some folks would like to see it others would not.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• This would make you a “privileged user” IT security, password expiration etc.
• 24/7 password resets is being done by the Help Desk now.</td></tr>
<tr><td>RAWS Stations</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Display the list of available RAWS alphabetically rather than by number since most users know the name , not the number
• Default to the closest RAWS first</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• This would be helpful.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fire Behavior Models</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Rename the models, call them what they are: Near Term = FARSITE, Short Term = MTT.
• Teach the models behind the names.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• A modeler liked the model run in Near Term better. Yet he didn’t realize it was the same model. Calling them what they are would alleviate a lot of confusion.
• There are slight differences. Being that one was web based we wanted folks to know they are slightly different.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fire Behavior Analysis Info Download</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Ability to download the short and near term fire behavior results to put them in Arc Map.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Right now there’s no mechanism to download results like FL, ROS, etc.
• Would be helpful if we could download the landscape file that is generated when you complete an analysis.
• If you had the ability to use this in an ASCI format or raster they it could be used to consider the fire effects that are being modeled.
• Not sure if it will be in this release or next. It would be a KMZ file most likely.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Display COA on a map</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Is it possible to be able to display the CoA on the map?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• Example hold fire east of Road XYZ, south of XYZ River etc.
• Could represent information using both objectives shapes and MAPs depending upon your actions and how your plan is written.
• Would need to develop COA shapes, similar to points of interest and tied to the COA.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Canned COA</td><td></td><td></td><td>• Eliminate the canned COA</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">• The good thing about these is it facilitates ideas, but the bad is they just do them without thinking. By providing the canned COA to follow pre-planned response, users just leave it in there and move on and the canned one ends up being inconsistent. If you really are following the pre-planned response you likely aren’t needing a decision. By providing the canned option many people don’t include what they need to. It is not being used for its intended purpose
• Should canned info (monitoring fire and/or follow pre planned response) go away and it should be blank: more don’t want it to go away than do (but it was close)
• Rob-the reason the ‘follow pre-planned response’ is in there because it is agency direction for 96% of fires. The Monitor option was put in for convenience – concerns over putting multiple options (like from a pick list).</td></tr>
</table>

• Some FMUs allow a wide range of options- some folks are then going with the pre-planned response…however RDA suggests that a decision is being made and they should document this. • Suggestion- Maybe decision tab should come before COA so that when you go to COA there is nothing there and you actually have to think about what it is you are going to do. The process is currently set up for you to gather intel first and then decide if a decision needs made			
Copy Incident Objectives			• *Provide the ability to copy incident objectives between similar fires.*
• May be akin to copying analysis. • May be particularly useful when in a complex type situation. • Not applicable for COA.			
Fire Behavior Request Button			• See GAE notes • Add help icon about how the fire behavior requests work.
• Decision – the button will not go away at this time but continue to revisit the topic (FALL 2011) • The FB request button could provide info directing them to call their GA editor (need to identify that number and who will staff it per GA) OR direct them to follow up with the GAE per their GA direction and list NFDSC as a backup. • Can the WFDSS banner that says how many outstanding requests there are list out which GA they are for in the banner?			
WFDSS ListServ (2010 List)			•
• Available for users to choose to be part of in order to receive regular updates from WFDSS on releases, training, system updates etc. • Many GAs expressed that they like the idea of a list serve, as it allows you to subscribe to it, it comes in email form so can be forwarded on or deleted etc. If a list serve is created they would like it to include a link to where documents/notes on further info can be accessed.			
Pre-season training document			• Need to refresh documents used this season
• Continue to find good examples of long term information to put in the decision. Show these examples in the pre-season training documents. • Consider development of document showing how long term information was incorporated in various ways. Not at all, partially, entirely. • A few long term plans would be helpful – good examples as the fire burned on – how they did or didn't update the information and why they might do it one way versus the other. • Maybe a way would be to show them one that was made outside of WFDSS and put it in as an example. (Phase approach) • Modules – splitting out some of the smaller pieces based on the tabs and information they need to think about and do at each point of the decision. • Maybe having something that starts with the strategic objective create incident objectives from that, then determining the COA. • The WFM RDA is working on the various documents and training videos to be produced this spring.			
WFDSS training for Dispatch (2010 List)			• Develop a webinar for Dispatchers, how to navigate WFDSS, filter incident lists.
• More training is needed for dispatchers on how put fires in from different dispatch systems. WFDSS isn't in charge of those systems and the users/field should pass on to those system organizers that they would like more training. • Possibly could use more training on how to use Filters and how to create an incident from the Intel tab as to reduce data entry error for the items that can be queried from the layers (like responsible unit, etc.)			
Fire Behavior Legends (2010 List)			• The legend should have been fixed (double check is needed)
• When you bring a fire behavior analysis into the Decision Doc you don't get a legend –need legend for FB analysis, fuels data when you do a map capture.			
Fire Perimeters (2010 List)			•
• Agency direction is needed on uploading fire perimeters. • This issue is larger than just perimeters. The WFM RDA understands that different agencies have different repositories for this data and that some are in flux. The RDA encourages users to enter their perimeters in WFDSS while some of these issues are sorted out. When those repositories are sorted out for agencies WFDSS can go there to get the perimeter or share perimeters with them but for now it is encouraged to update perimeters in WFDSS. • *12/13 Update: The WFDSS GIS Team met in early December. The agencies will be providing an update to the historical fire perimeters. Please ensure your people are talking to their agency contacts about issues or updates.*			
Future WFDSS Development			•
• Acres burned report by agency. A cool thing to have. Several Line Officers would have liked to have this than information based on Planning Area. • Get rid of the Is This a fire of National Significance. Is this worth changing to "Does the fire meet the Flame Act?" And if that worked it would generate the report. • Transfer ownership – could this just link you to incident privileges so you go to one place to do it? • Is there a way to get an email notification when someone in your GA requests a log in? • An easy way to use this acre box and the cost so that you know where the projected cost came from. Projected acres burned is a key part in what is being decided on the fire. • Letting folks be in two GAs at one time. • On the Admin tab when you show role requests. Add the date of the request. Then the GAE can figure out if it has been sitting a while or which are new. Or put newest at the top. Should be with the new release.			
Issue	**Responsible Party**	**Due Date**	**Actions**
Done or Decision Made			

Fire Behavior Request Coordination	**Lisa**	**Complete**	• *List of names submitted in late December*
• *Contact Lisa if you'd like your name put in to receive texts. The list will be submitted on December 16th*			
Not WFDSS or WFM RDA Responsibility – Consider if someone from this group needs to push item forward			
How to Deal with Complexes?	• This is bigger than WFDSS, continue to make stuff up as we go along. It isn't pretty or consistent.		
NWCG Identifiers – more are needed	• Not a WFM RDA Issue		
• For the native corporations there aren't enough. • Trying to use the one that had been designated at the time wasn't working.			
Delegation of Periodic Assessment after Decision Approval	• Not a WFM RDA issue, should be agency direction.		
•			

Other Notes & Comments

- Is WFDSS in its current state meeting its objective of making better decisions? A lot of times when things are brought up to make things better there is push back because of the contract, etc. Creating documents outside of WFDSS or not putting Type III fires in to the system. May not be facilitating a risk based decision like it should. Because it is different we do need to make it as intuitive as possible so people want to use it. Linear thought process of what do we need and where do we go to get finished through the process. Maybe having someone look at the user interface.
- R4 WFDSS is working really well and they don't want to see a major revamp.
- Values – RAVAR – once analysis is requested it goes to the geographic then as a last resort comes to us. They trained up some analysts in R5 but they are likely pretty rusty. There isn't anyone who has taken the lead on it. It is important to have our group here to help review the work of the analyst. Is there something that should be developed for the teams to use? If developing a comprehensive plan then you might want the detail. Has evolved pretty well in WFDSS and since you can put your unit shapes in to WFDSS. It is just the display that is the issue. Commending the WFDSS development team for getting it all in there.