Resource Ordering and Status System
(ROSS)
Functionality Review for 2012

November 5, 2012

Revision History

Date	Version	Description	Author

Table of Contents

Revision History ..... **i**
Overview **1**
Summarized Results **1**
General Review Topics **1**
Current Functionality 2
Screen Usage *2*
Security and Disaster Recovery *2*
Search Functions *2*
Resource Tracking, Assignments, and Reassignments *3*
ROSS Web Page and End User Documentation *3*
ROSS Reports and Reports Training *3*
Contacts *4*
Web Status and Computer Aided Dispatch *4*
Dispatch Messaging System (DMS) and Citrix *4*
Opportunities for Improvement of Current Functionality 4
Connectivity, Speed, and Reliability *5*
Interactivity and Intuitiveness *5*
Interface to Other Systems *5*
Simplified and Combined Screens *5*
Consistent and More Informative User Error Messages *6*
Roster CWN Resources *6*
Search Functions *6*
Helpdesk Responsiveness *6*
ROSS Reports *7*
Training and Documentation Availability *7*
Other Suggested Enhancements, Concerns, and Comments *7*
Appendix A. Interview Method and Process **9**
Interviewers 9
Geographic Area Coordination Centers 9
Interview Dates and Locations 10
Appendix B. Interview Questions **12**
ROSS General Questions 12
ROSS Application Specific Questions 12
Office Procedures, Documentation, and Training Questions 13

Overview

This document (the "Review") is an assessment of the functionality, usability, and level of satisfaction of the Resource Ordering and Status System (ROSS) application. Periodic ROSS reviews are conducted after the implementation of significant updates and enhancements to the ROSS application. This Review summarizes the results of end user evaluations conducted during 2012 for ROSS version 2.14.1, in accordance with Section 5.0, "Performance Goals and Measures," in the "Operational Analysis Review (OAR)," dated April, 2012.

For more information about the dates and locations of the interviews, see Appendix A, "Interview Method and Process." For a complete list of interview questions for this Review, see Appendix B, "Interview Questions."

Summarized Results

Overall, the results of the survey showed very favorable opinions of ROSS and ROSS functionality. End users were able to effectively use ROSS for creating, placing, receiving, and filling resource requests. The survey also showed positive responses for end users to track resource requests and agreements. Rosters were frequently used by many respondents, and were updated primarily on a daily basis during fire season. Some respondents indicated that Rosters were updated weekly. About two-thirds of respondents used ROSS for Initial Attack.

A majority indicated that they do not enter all incidents into ROSS. Particularly, several respondents listed specific types of incidents including medical aids, public assists, non-aircraft related fires, and most vehicle accidents as not being entered into ROSS.

Most respondents accessed and had a positive response to the ROSS Web Page for downloading new releases of the ROSS application, accessing Web Status, and locating Helpdesk contact information and tips. Those who access Standard and User Community ROSS Reports were most often respondents from a Geographic Area Coordinating Center (GACC). Both Standard Reports and User Community Reports were mentioned equally as being used the most. The majority of these respondents agreed that ROSS Reports suit the majority of their reporting needs.

By far, speed, connectivity, screen refresh, and being logged off of ROSS after 15 minutes of inactivity were the most prevalent issues expressed by the majority of respondents. Two respondents voiced the concerns, "When it is working" and "After reconnecting it does," when queried about effectively using the ROSS application.

End users also expressed frustration with the lack of informative error messages and were not satisfied with Helpdesk performance in quickly resolving concerns. Many respondents wanted ROSS to be more user-friendly with the ability to customize screens.

General Review Topics

The following Review results are grouped into following topics:

- Current Functionality
- Opportunities for Improvement of Current Functionality
- Training
- Suggested Enhancements
- Other Comments and Concerns.

Current Functionality

Nearly all respondents expressed overall satisfaction with ROSS 2.14.1, its functionality, and its usefulness in managing resource requests. Currently functionality was evaluated using the following categories:

- Screen Usage
- Security and Disaster Recovery
- Search Functions
- Resource Tracking, Assignments, and Reassignments
- ROSS Web Page and End User Documentation
- ROSS Reports and Reports Training
- Contacts
- Web Status and Computer Aided Dispatch
- Dispatch Messaging System (DMS) and Citrix.

Screen Usage

Predominantly, respondents equally identified the Request Status, Resource Status and Pending Request screens as being used the most as well as the most useful. The Incident Resources screen and the Search for Resources screen were also frequently mentioned. The Quick Fill screen was rarely or seldom used by a majority of respondents.

For a list of proposed screen combinations identified by respondents see, "Simplified and Combined Screens," in the section, "Opportunities for Improvement of Current Functionality," later in this Review.

Security and Disaster Recovery

The inclusion of the ROSS application in the NAP environment has provided increased security for user accounts and more robust requirements for user account passwords. Some respondents mentioned that the NAP environment, and in particular password requirements, were "too restrictive," "too difficult," and "too constraining." Many respondents from Emergency Command Centers (ECCs) in Northern California Operations (NOPS) voiced concern about the new restrictions for ROSS Account Managers and the constraints for adding new NAP user accounts to ROSS. Respondents complained of slow Helpdesk response when attempting to create new user accounts for militia and expanded dispatch operations. Many respondents cited the increased difficulty in having to manage three user accounts and passwords.

Many respondents, particularly those located at NOPS, were frustrated with Forest Service (FS) laptop security and troublesome log in issues for militia and expanded dispatch personnel. One respondent specifically complained that, "If a user has never logged in to an FS laptop, the Helpdesk must be contacted to gain access." While FS laptop security is outside the scope of this Review, the issues related to user log in to FS laptops affect the overall user experience of the ROSS application.

A majority of dispatching centers have an identified Disaster Recovery Plan, although respondents did not indicate whether this plan only addressed ROSS or the entire dispatching center operations. Several dispatching units were unaware of or do not see the need for a Disaster Recovery Plan.

Search Functions

The search functions available in ROSS had favorable and unfavorable comments. The majority of respondents found the search functions useful but extremely slow. Several respondents mentioned difficulties in locating/searching for a specific ROSS Report. Other respondents wanted a faster way to view pending requests from different fires without the requirement of performing a search every time.

One respondent mentioned that using the Search for Resources utility to locate reassigned resources is "time-consuming." Another respondent reported that, "The Close button on the query bar doesn't work." Still another respondent did not like to use the asterisk (*) to perform wildcard searches.

Resource Tracking, Assignments, and Reassignments

The majority of respondents uniformly agreed that ROSS allows end users to track resource requests and assignments. Although respondents were generally satisfied with the ROSS application, the most prevalent issue was the difficulty to releasing/tracking prepositions and reassignments. A CalFire respondent mentioned using Rosters when "engines are sent out of the county."

Several respondents mentioned that tracking Incident Management Team personnel was "problematic." When resources are reassigned by another dispatch, the ability to "see them on their new assignment is lost." Another respondent stated specifically that a dispatcher must print out "one page of paper for each person reassigned."

Most every dispatch center reverts to manual resource ordering when the ROSS application is unavailable. Respondents used binders with qualifications and users, hardcopy Resource Order Forms, and the Incident Command System (ICS) form ICS-209, "Incident Status Summary."

Depending on current incident activity, some respondents choose to "wait it out" until the ROSS application becomes available again.

ROSS Web Page and End User Documentation

Nearly all respondents were aware and familiar with the ROSS Web Page to access the following information:

- Downloads for ROSS Production and ROSS Practice
- Instructions for using/accessing NAP
- Quick Reference Cards
- Instructions for changing/resetting a password
- Helpdesk telephone contact information
- Helpdesk tips.

In the survey, several respondents were unaware of the term, "Quick Reference Card." Of those who did understand this form of end user documentation, most indicated that Quick Reference Cards were not available in printed form at each dispatch desk. Several respondents knew that Quick Reference Cards online on the ROSS Web Page.

Approximately one-half of respondents were familiar with the Interagency Standards for the ROSS Operations Guide (ISROG). Of those who have read the ISROG, nearly all respondents read it while in training only.

ROSS Reports and Reports Training

ROSS Reports utilizes IBM® Cognos® software to enable users to view, schedule, and create informative reports from the data stored in ROSS. Nearly two-thirds of respondents said that ROSS Reports meets the majority of their reporting needs. While many of those who frequently used ROSS Reports were satisfied for decision-making support, several respondents indicated that there were "too many" reports or that it was "too complicated." Other respondents indicated that obtaining the right report was too difficult and required too many steps and clicks. Several respondents mentioned "getting lost" and "forgetting where they started" when completing report filter criteria.

Some respondents mentioned difficulties in locating/searching for a specific reports and frustration with the inability to print specific pages of a single report. Respondents at one Emergency Command Center (ECC),

for example, identified the inability to print specific catalogs, all catalogs, or only subordinates within a ROSS Report. ROSS Reports should be more user-friendly and simplified.

*A ROSS User Guide, several Quick Reference Cards outlining how to work with ROSS Reports, a ROSS Reports Index, and information about the management of ROSS Reports and Reports Training are available on the ROSS website at **http://ross.nwcg.gov**.*

Contacts

While most respondents knew of the Helpdesk and the contact information available online, many respondents were unaware of the existence of their GACC ROSS Subject Matter Expert (SME) or whom to contact for specialized assistance with the ROSS application and business rule information. Additionally, while several respondents knew their ROSS Reports Committee contact person, many were unaware that the ROSS Reports Committee existed.

Web Status and Computer Aided Dispatch

Nearly half of the respondents were confused about the survey question terminology regarding "Self-Status" versus "Web Status." Web Status is available by accessing the ROSS Web Page. Of those who understood the question, nearly one-half of the respondents indicated that their dispatching units allowed their resources to self-status, including team members, vendors/best value, ADs, fire department personnel, and non-fire personnel. The remaining one-half indicated that the resources were statused by their managing dispatching center. The primary reason for not using Web Status was due to time constraints associated with resetting an expired password and/or obtaining Helpdesk support.

Nearly one-half respondents used Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) to ROSS instead of the ROSS Tactical Aviation Module. One respondent stated that the "ability to do CAD to ROSS helps tremendously." A respondent dispatching from the Mendocino ECC (CA-MNFC) uses "Altaris CAD to ROSS when CAD to ROSS goes down."

Dispatch Messaging System (DMS) and Citrix

A majority of respondents were unfamiliar with DMS and its usage. Very few respondents used DMS for reports.

Respondents who used Citrix to access ROSS were primarily CalFire users, and some indicated infrequent use of Citrix. One respondent stated that, "FS does not update it all the time and so we can't use it." Of those who did use Citrix to access ROSS, most reported connectivity issues as the chief complaint.

Opportunities for Improvement of Current Functionality

Respondents identified many areas within the ROSS application that could be improved. While some concerns are independent of ROSS, this Review highlights many areas of improvement that are addressed in the release of ROSS version 3.0. Opportunities for improvement with ROSS current functionality are grouped and summarized into the following categories:

- Connectivity, Speed, and Reliability
- Interactivity and Intuitiveness
- Interface to Other Systems
- Simplified and Combined Screens
- Consistent and More Informative User Error Messages
- Roster CWN Resources
- Search Functions
- Helpdesk Responsiveness

- ROSS Reports
- Training and Documentation Availability.
- Other Suggested Enhancements, Concerns, and Comments.

Connectivity, Speed, and Reliability

By far, the majority of respondents specified application connectivity, slowness, and reliability as the most difficult parts of ROSS. Most respondents believe their jobs would be far easier and more efficient if these issues were resolved. Many respondents also cited faster refresh speeds as increasing their productivity. Respondents wanted to be able to "work faster."

Many respondents wanted improved reliability and complained about system crashes during peak fire season that "led to the creation of incorrect requests." One respondent at the Washington State Department of Natural Resources complained that "system maintenance and upgrades should not be done during fire season."

Interactivity and Intuitiveness

End users wanted more screen features, buttons, and dialog boxes (pop-ups) added to increase user friendliness and overall interactivity and intuitiveness. Several specific improvements related to interactivity and intuitiveness includes:

- Remove the Go To button from the screen when it is unavailable for use.

  In ROSS 3.0, buttons, check boxes, and other screen components appear dimmed when unavailable for use.

- Employ "drag-and-drop" functionality to speed up the completion of screens.
- Allow printing from more screens and dialog boxes.

Interface to Other Systems

Many respondents wanted improved interfaces between other systems including ICBS and IQCS. Specifically mentioned was the tie with Qualifications and that the "IQCS/ROSS interface does not display enough information." Other suggested improvements included correcting issues with transfers and adding new resources from IQCS and the Resource Clearinghouse. One specific example was cited about the following missing ICBS information in ROSS: A supply item request was listed as pending, even though that request was placed and the cache had returned the request as Unable To Fill (UTF).

Several respondents mentioned a specific need/improvement for the following interfaces with ROSS:

- Virtual Incident Procurement (VIPR)
- Wildcad
- Fire Code
- Other CAD-type programs.

Simplified and Combined Screens

There was consensus among respondents for improving and organizing specific ROSS screens. Most respondents commented about the need for all ROSS screens to be simplified so that there was less "jumping around to accomplish a task" and "less clicking." Respondents generally identified combining screens that pertained to request information and combining screens that pertained to resource information.

Of those respondents who identified specific screens that could be combined to improve the user experience, the Request Status, Resource Status, and Pending Request screens were mentioned most frequently in combination with other screens. Other suggestions included changing the Travel screen to a dialog box

(pop-up) within the Pending Request screen. The majority of respondents wanted ROSS screens to be combined to improve program navigation and functionality, and increase the ability of end users to quickly locate the needed information.

Of those respondents who identified specific ROSS screens, a majority listed the Request Status screen with the following combinations:

- Request Status and Incident Resources screens and able to release and reassign resources
- Request Status and Pending Request screens
- Request Status, Pending Request, and New Request screens
- Request Status, New Request, and Incident Resources screens
- Request Status, New Request, and Tactical Aviation screens
- Request Status and Travel screens.

Respondents also identified the Resource Status screen with the following combinations:

- Resource Stats, Pending Request, and Resource Item screens
- Resource Status and Roster screens
- Resource Status, Incident Resources, and Release Resources screens
- Resource Status and Resource Item screens.

Several respondents identified other combinations of ROSS screens and dialog boxes (pop-ups):

- Pending Request and Incident List screens
- Navigation and Reporting Instructions dialog boxes
- Travel screen displays as a dialog box within the Pending Request screen
- Incident Resources and Travel screens.

Consistent and More Informative User Error Messages

Many respondents wanted improved error messages that better indicate how to resolve ROSS connectivity issues. Other respondents wanted better notification when a ROSS screen is loading or "stuck." Many respondents expressed confusion or were unfamiliar with how to resolve an issue based on the information contained on the error message.

Roster CWN Resources

A majority of respondents indicated a great need for the ability to roster Call When Needed (CWN) resources. For example, when a helicopter returns from an incident its status is automatically set to "Available," but the CWN resources on the assignment roster are not. While creating support requests works adequately on assignment, CWN resources "get lost and are extremely difficult" to reassign. These resources cannot be matched to the parent request and the home dispatching unit cannot easily and quickly track these resources that need reassignment.

Search Functions

One respondent wanted the ability to query for specific blocks of "S" (Supply request) numbers on the Request Status screen. One respondent suggested that the Request Status and Resource Status screens should be combined as well as simplified. A third respondent mentioned that the Request Status screen still lists reassignments. Many respondents agreed that requiring a search each time when viewing pending requests from different fires needs to be improved.

Helpdesk Responsiveness

Nearly all respondents were aware and very familiar with the ROSS Web Page to access the Helpdesk, including Helpdesk telephone contact information and Helpdesk tips. Respondents voiced good and bad

remarks about the Helpdesk, although several respondents mentioned they never contacted the Helpdesk for problem resolution.

Some of those respondents who contacted the Helpdesk expressed dissatisfaction with response times and how their issues were automatically elevated to a Tier 2 team. These respondents further complained of never receiving a call back for issue resolution. In particular, one respondent stated that, "The Helpdesk doesn't know how to do ROSS." Many wanted Helpdesk personnel to be trained by SMEs to develop the Helpdesk "skill set."

ROSS Reports

A majority of respondents wanted more guidance and clearer direction from their dispatching unit for producing reports in ROSS. Those who use ROSS Reports on a regular basis expressed a need for clearer definitions for completing the field entries for User Community and Standard Reports.

Training and Documentation Availability

A majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with existing training when allowed to attend the session(s). However, most all believe that additional, more in-depth and localized training is needed in the ROSS application. Many respondents, while satisfied with their dispatching unit's "drills," also wished to perform "full-scale drills" before the start of fire season. Other respondents wanted a resident trainer at each unit. Suggestions for additional training included:

- Online training
- Video training, including videos available online
- Weekly training in ROSS Practice
- AgLearn training
- Reports Training, specifically how to locate and complete appropriate report criteria on the screen.

In addition, many dispatch centers were unaware of documentation of ROSS Business Rules, Release Notes, and Standards Documentation available on the ROSS Web Page. Some respondents mentioned that since the skill set of temporary dispatchers is lost from fire season to fire season, access to training should be available on a more frequent and regular basis.

Other Suggested Enhancements, Concerns, and Comments

Some respondents suggested specific enhancements, concerns, and comments, including:

- A ROSS user should be able to have multiple profiles through a single login.
- "If a dispatch center is responsible for the Ops Area also, it would be nice to be able to manage resources for both on one screen and share resources without having to transfer them."
- The Set Travel Complete process on the Travel screen should be changed or eliminated.
- Two respondents expressed a need for "Marsh Master," a wetlands access vehicle, to be included in the ROSS catalog so that requests can be filled and/or tracked.
- ROSS should include more options for non-NFES supplies, such as for office supplies and fuel. One respondent in Redding ECC noted difficulty in creating requests for Non-NFES – Not in Catalog requests. Shipping units of measure for these items, such as "BX," "Pallet," "Case" are not currently identified.
- Performing a search on every request and function slows the process considerably. "If the user knows the unit, resource or mnemonic you should just be able to enter the information and skip the search step."

- Tool tips should display when a user "hovers" over a button. Buttons should display on the screen only if available for use.
- A check box should display on the screen to "auto place up" once the request is created.
- A check box should display on the screen to identify Supply requests that are for fire replacement.
- ROSS should provide an address book function.
- End users should be able to open and view multiple ROSS windows at the same time.

Some respondents also identified enhancements to CAD, which are not addressed in this Review. These respondents, primarily from NOPS, wanted the ability to fill strike teams from CAD and create service requests, such as IR Flight Requests, in CAD.

Appendix A. Interview Method and Process

Beginning in August, 2012, ROSS Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) conducted extensive interviews of end users to assess the functionality and usability of the current ROSS application. Responses included candid remarks based on end user experiences as well as suggestions for improving the ROSS application for future releases.

Questionnaires were emailed in advance of the interviews, which were scheduled from one to two hours and conducted on-site at the end user's location. While most questionnaires were completed during the interview process, some interviewees elected to complete the questionnaires prior to the interview. These responses are also included in this Review.

Respondents included all levels of the dispatch community from federal, state, and local agencies. Respondents were not preselected. Instead, respondents consisted of ROSS end users who were currently available when the SME(s) arrived on site, independent of their position held within their agency.

Due to several regional contacts on leave or otherwise out of the office, not all review centers received adequate time to review and complete the questionnaire prior to the review team's arrival. To mitigate this issue, respondents were encouraged to email their completed forms to individual review team members.

Interviewers

The following SMEs conducted the interviews for this Review:

- Traci Beaudin
- Annette Box
- David McCoy
- Mary Gausen
- Chris Starnes
- Dennis Derr
- Jerry Clements
- Steve Tarver
- Gina Papke
- Jon Skeels
- Beth Spencer
- Beth GreyCloud

Geographic Area Coordination Centers

The following Geographic Area Coordination Centers were included in this Review

- Eastern Great Basin Coordination Center (UT-EBC)
- Northern California Coordination Center (CA-ONCC)
- Northwest Coordination Center (OR-NWC)
- Southern California Coordination Center (CA-SAC)
- Southwest Area Coordination Center (GA-SAC).

Interview Dates and Locations

Date	Location
August 19, 2012	Prescott Dispatch Center (AZ-PDC) Williams Interagency Dispatch Center (AZ-WDC).
August 20, 2012	Albuquerque Interagency Dispatch Center (NM-ABC) Boise Interagency Dispatch Center (ID-BDC) Columbia Cascade Communication Center (WA-CCC) Los Angeles City Fire Department Dispatch Center* Los Angeles County Emergency Command Center (CA-LACC) Northwest Coordination Center (OR-NWC) Santa Fe Interagency Dispatch Center (NM-SFC) Taos Interagency Dispatch Center (NM-TDC) Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WA-WAS). **Agency has staffing in CA-LACC.*
August 21, 2012	Alamogordo Interagency Dispatch Center (NM-ADC) Central Washington Interagency Communication Center (WA-CWC) Eastern Idaho Interagency Fire Center (ID-EIC) Orange County Emergency Command Center (CA-ORCC) Monte Vista Interagency Command Center (CA-MVIC) Riverside Emergency Command Center (CA-RRCC) Southern California Coordination Center (CA-OSCC) South Central Idaho Dispatch Center (ID-SCC) Southwest Area Coordination Center (NM-SWC).
August 22, 2012	Angeles Emergency Command Center (CA-ANCC) Blue Mountain Interagency Dispatch Center (OR-BMC) Central Oregon Interagency Dispatch Center (OR-COC) Fresno Emergency Command Center (CA-FICC) Kern County Emergency Command Center (CA-KRCC) San Bernadino Interagency Emergency Command Center (CA-SBCC) Santa Barbara County Emergency Command Center (CA-BDCC) Show Low Interagency Dispatch Center (AZ-SDC) Sierra Interagency Emergency Command Center (CA-SICC) Silver City Interagency Dispatch Center (NM-SDC) Teton Interagency Dispatch Center (WY-TDC) Tucson Interagency Dispatch Center (AZ-TDC).

Date	Location
August 23, 2012	Burns Interagency Communications Center (OR-BIC) Camino Interagency Emergency Command Center (CA-CICC) Central Oregon Interagency Dispatch Center (OR-COC) Color Country Interagency Fire Center (UT-CDC) Flagstaff Interagency Dispatch Center (AZ-FDC) Mariposa Emergency Command Center (CA-XMPC) Phoenix Interagency Dispatch Center (AZ-PHC) Richfield Interagency Fire Center (UT-RFC) San Andreas Emergency Command Center (CA-TCCC) Stanislaus Emergency Command Center (CA-STCC).
August 24, 2012	Eastern Great Basin Coordination Center (UT-EBC) Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center (UT-NUC).
September 17, 2012	Redding Interagency ECC (CA-RICC)
September 24, 2012	Red Bluff ECC (CA-TGCC), Mendocino Interagency ECC (CA-MNFC)
September 25, 2012	Howard Forest ECC (CA-MECC) St. Helena ECC (CA-LNCC)
September 26, 2012	Morgan Hill ECC (CA-MCCC), Felton ECC (CA-CZCC)
September 27, 2012	Grass Valley Interagency ECC (CA-GVCC), Oroville ECC (CA-BTCC)
September 28, 2012	Plumas ECC (CA-PNFC), Susanville Interagency ECC (CA-SIFC)
October 12, 2012	Yreka Interagency ECC (CA-YICC)

Appendix B. Interview Questions

Interview questions were categorized into three areas:

- ROSS General Questions
- ROSS Application Specific Questions
- Office Procedures, Documentation, and Training Questions.

ROSS General Questions

ROSS General Questions reviewed the end user experience of the overall functionality and usefulness of the ROSS application.

1. ROSS provides me with the ability to create, place, receive, and fill resource requests.
2. ROSS enables me to track resource requests and assignments.
3. Which 3 screens in ROSS do you use the most?
4. Which 3 ROSS screens are the most useful to you?
5. Which ROSS screens, in your opinion, need the most improvement? How would you improve them?
6. Which ROSS screens do you think could be combined to reduce the amount of screens?
7. What is the most difficult part of ROSS to you as a user?
8. If you could remove one thing out of ROSS, what would that be?
9. If you could have ROSS do one thing better then it currently does, what would that be?
10. If you could have ROSS do two things it currently doesn't do, what would it be?
11. Do the Resources your office dispatches use the Self-Status function? If not, why not?
12. Is there anything you still do manually that ROSS does, but you are doing it because of direction you have been given either locally or from the GACC? If yes, please explain.
13. Do you use ROSS for Initial Attack?
14. Do you enter all your Incidents in ROSS?
15. Do you use the Dispatch Messaging System (DMS)? If DMS were to be removed from service, how would your office be affected?
16. Are you familiar with the ROSS Reports Committee? Do you know who your committee contact is?
17. Do you know who your GACC's ROSS Team SME is?
18. Do you utilize Citrix to access ROSS? If not are you aware that it is available to use?
19. Do you utilize the ROSS Web Page? What areas do you use most often?

ROSS Application Specific Questions

ROSS Application Specific Questions reviewed the actual usage of specific ROSS screens, dialog boxes, and functions.

20. Have you used the Tactical Aviation Module? If not, why not?
21. Do you use Rosters? If yes, how often do you update them? If no, why not?
22. Do the ROSS Standard and User Community reports meet the majority of your reporting needs? If not, what improvements can be made?

23. Which do you use more…. the Standard or User Community reports?
24. Do you use the Quick Fill Screen?

Office Procedures, Documentation, and Training Questions

25. Does your office have a Disaster Recovery Plan for ROSS and/or procedures if and when the network or ROSS becomes unavailable? Please show us your plan?
26. When ROSS becomes unavailable, do you use hard copy resource orders in your dispatch operation? Please describe your procedures..
27. Are copies of Quick Reference Cards available at each dispatch desk?
28. Is the Helpdesk support meeting your needs? If not, why not or what could be improved?
29. Does your office practice using the ROSS PRACTICE Instance? How often?
30. Do you follow the established resource naming standards for data entry?
31. Have you read the Interagency Standards ROSS Operations Guide? (ISROG)
32. Have you read the Release Notes for version 2.15?
33. Have militia or expanded dispatchers been brought on early for a ROSS refresher of some kind? If so, list what or who is used to provide the training? List any products that could be developed that would help this training.
34. Given budget and travel restrictions, what would you suggest is the best way to provide user training?
35. Other Comments.