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1 Abstract / Résumé

Under a Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) targeted investigation (TI) project (CSSP-2012-TI-1108), Defence Research and Development Canada’s (DRDC) Centre for Security Science (CSS) led the automation of the All Hazards Risk Assessment (AHRA) process and tools, including the automation of scenario development and capability assessment. This report discusses the design objectives and approach that was used for gathering requirements to support the development of the Capability Assessment Management System (CAMS). The CAMS web-based application, which was developed to support the AHRA and systematize capability assessment, is described in greater detail along with the options analysis. Functions that enhance the utility of CAMS software are described. These include the ability to characterize scenarios and maintain an inventory of “master events” and scenarios; the ability to catalogue tasks and maintain a historical record of assessments; and the ability to capture subject matter expert judgement and facilitate comparison and analysis of capability gaps and requirements across the emergency management spectrum.

Dans le cadre d’un projet d’enquêtes ciblées du Programme canadien pour la sûreté et la sécurité (PCSS) (CSSP-2012-TI-1108), le Centre des sciences pour la sécurité (CSS) de Recherche et développement pour la défense Canada (RDCC) a dirigé l’automatisation des outils et du processus d’évaluation tous risques, y compris l’automatisation de l’élaboration des scénarios et de l’évaluation des capacités. Le présent rapport traite de l’approche et des objectifs de conception qui ont été utilisés pour rassembler les exigences nécessaires à la mise au point du système de gestion de l’évaluation des capacités (Capability Assessment Management System [CAMS]). L’application Web du système CAMS, élaborée pour appuyer l’évaluation tous risques et systématiser l’évaluation des capacités, est décrite en plus amples détails avec l’analyse des options. Des fonctions qui améliorent l’utilité du logiciel CAMS y sont décrites. Il s’agit notamment de la capacité à caractériser des scénarios et à tenir à jour un inventaire « d’événements principaux » et de scénarios, de la capacité à cataloguer des tâches et à tenir à jour un historique des évaluations ainsi que de la capacité à consigner le jugement de spécialistes et à faciliter la comparaison et l’analyse des écarts et des exigences en matière de capacité à l’échelle du spectre de la gestion des urgences.
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4 Report Details

4.1 Background

4.1.1 General

The DRDC CSS Risk Assessment and Capability Integration (RACI) Section undertook a multi-year, multi-faceted targeted investigation (TI) project (CSSP-2012-TI-1108, ending in 2014), aimed at further exploiting and applying the All Hazard Risk Assessment (AHRA) and building on the AHRA framework thru a multi-year spiral development approach.

Several teams were formed to further the implementation of the AHRA framework. This report specifically deals with the functional requirements evolving from work stream 2 (Capability Assessment) and related automation design and implementation.

4.1.2 Historical evolution

DRDC CSS implemented its first automation tools to support Consolidated Risk Assessment (CRA) in the mid 2000’s. The following figures (1 and 2) provide a visual on CRA functionality.

![Figure 1 - PSTP FSSSMS CRA Vignettes by Lead Cluster and Threat](image-url)
In the late 2000’s, DRDC CSS furthered the implementation of the CRA by implementing its first Full Scale Scenario Management System (FSSMS) along with supporting tools such as the CRA, Vignette Management System (VMS) and Document Management (DM) all integrated into a suite.\(^1\) The following figures (3 and 4) provide a visual on FSSMS functionality. Some of this work is being pulled into this initiative, where CSS demonstrated a capability assessment was a natural extension of the AHRA Framework.

Figure 3 – PSTP FSSMS Chain of Events

Figure 4 - FSSMS Tool Kit Modules
In the late 2000’s work began on the AHRA. The AHRA was developed by Public Safety (PS) Canada in close partnership with DRDC CSS, and follows an annual business cycle (see figure 5).

The AHRA in the end leveraged the expertise of DRDC CSS as well as knowledge gained through the design, development and implementation of the CRA and FSSMS. Simple tools were created to assist with documenting scenario’s (Risk Event Scenario Template in word format) and Scoring Tool in MS Excel and are currently in production.
4.2 Design Objectives
A need was identified to augment the established AHRA process to address Full Scale Scenario’s and Capability Assessment. Note the additions of the Full Scale Scenario and the Capability Assessment modules to a more comprehensive AHRA generic model below (figure 6).

The original FSSMS was deemed to be technically correct however not suitable to a general user community therefore, simplicity in usability was a primary design objective for the Capability Assessment Management System.

Other design objectives included:

- A SharePoint / Web Based Approach
- Use of MS SQL as repository
- Ability to generate analytical reports and graphs
- Minimal maintenance and development costs
- Ability to integrate with other applications and data
4.3 Approach

4.3.1 Requirements Gathering

Requirements gathering followed two parallel streams. IM/IT related requirements and Functional Related Requirements.

4.3.1.1 Functional Requirements

4.3.1.1.1 Capability Assessment Framework

As part of the AHRA Transition targeted investment project, a pilot capability assessment was conducted to implement concepts we had developed/nurtured over the years. Monitoring the development of the capability assessment framework was key to understanding requirements and opportunities for automation.

The approach taken by DRDC CSS to develop the framework including the selection and development of a full scale scenario (Pandemic), the identification of a master events list, the identification of capabilities associated to the master events list buy DRDC / CSS and SME’s and the identification of tasks associated to the capabilities.

DRDC in partnership with SME’s (PHAC, Health Canada and others) conducted a table top exercise (TTX) to rate the tasks associated with the capabilities and events along the full spectrum of time defined in the full scale Pandemic scenario. Simple spreadsheets and associated charting tools. Pencils and pens and scotch tape were used to conduct the table top exercise, record the ratings and report the results.

Of significant value in terms of requirements was gaining the understanding that a simple spread sheet like interface would gain highest acceptance with the user community and that by allowing for multiple user to rate tasks on line enabled on line reporting of results in real time during an exercise. Other anticipated benefits would be the significant time saving for the facilitators by ensuring that data relationships be maintained from scenario development, thru capability and task development then on to rating.

4.3.1.1.2 Exercise Perseverance – Capability Assessment Table Top Exercise After Action Report

The results of the TTX were documented in the After Action Report by co-authors Peter Avis, Doug Hales and Shaye Friesen. The following extracts confirm the overall acceptability of the Framework:

1. The proof-of-concept capability assessment confirmed the requirement, and appetite, for a formal process to link risk assessment to investment planning. In the case of national level risks, investment priorities and planning, public and private, authorities are fragmented and programs and decision cycles are rarely fully aligned. A common planning framework offers the opportunity to promote integration and a common process the opportunity to develop best practices.

2. The capability assessment methodology proposed was based on experience to date. It was generally well accepted by the HP community, notably core concepts such linking capabilities to the EM pillars, adoption of mission/function/task analysis and communal ‘ownership’ of task inventories. A number of refinements to the scoring schema were suggested and should be trialed.

Within the report, many visualization of the data related to the Pandemic Scenario and Capability Assessment are included and formed a significant input to the required reports and visuals for the Capability Assessment Management System (CAMS).

Of interest is the visible mapping between the logic model presented in the report and the AHRA generic capability investment model. The logic model (figure 7) details the relationships further which were identified in the AHRA vision (see figure 6).

![Figure 7 - Capability Framework Logic Model](image-url)
Breaking things down in to business processes the resulting visual is (figure 8):

![Image of ARHA Business Process Break Down]

*Figure 8 - ARHA Business Process Break Down*

From the above and the User’s Guide which was prepared for the TTX the application of the capability framework was identified as a multiple step process as follows (figure 9):
4.3.1.1.3 Validation via Prototype

To validate the requirements a prototype Capability Assessment Management System (CAMS) was created in MS Access and all data from the Pandemic Scenario and TTX was imported. Reports were produced and compared with the published Pandemic TTX results and validated.

The following is walk-through of the use of the prototype CAMS.
Scenario creation in CAMS is accomplished by creating a new scenario then filling in the title and an outline of the scenario.
4.3.1.3.2 Create Events

To create an event, one selects the Event Group then the point in time then enter the event description and timings selecting red or blue from the pull down to identify the event a malicious or not. This replaces the Master Events List shown in the TTX After Action Report (AAR).
4.3.1.3.3 Create Capabilities and Tasks

Figure 12 - Create Capabilities and Tasks

To enter a capability first select the reference Event to which it is associated then select a Capability Group and enter a capability and task. This replaces the Capabilities and Task List in the TTX After Action Report.
4.3.1.3.4 Rate Tasks

![Image of Rate Tasks](image)

**Figure 13 - Rate Tasks**

To rate a task, the user must identify themselves then rate the selected task by using the pull down menu's. During the TTX, users used pencil and paper to rate the tasks.

4.3.1.3.5 Produce Reports

The following are visuals of the automatically generated reports from the prototype CAMS (figures 14 and 15).
Figure 14 - Produce Reports – Graph View
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability Group</th>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Assess risk</td>
<td>Asses Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Assess risk</td>
<td>Balance investment and allocate resources according to priorities (across EM stages and capabilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Assess Risk</td>
<td>Conduct rapid assessment - identify, characterize and evaluate (specific) risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Assess risk</td>
<td>Establish/oversee employment of risk framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Conduct strategic planning</td>
<td>Develop and publish national Health Portfolio Public Safety/Security strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Identify, characterize and assess longer term (e.g. social/economic and environmental) risk(s)</td>
<td>Identify and track long-term health-effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Identify, characterize and assess longer term (e.g. social/economic and environmental) risk(s)</td>
<td>Restore community trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage communications</td>
<td>Develop and maintain public outreach program i.e. public education &amp; awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage communications</td>
<td>Develop tailored targeted public education &amp; awareness program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage Communications</td>
<td>Notify internal authorities and partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage Communications</td>
<td>Public Communications and Alerting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage communications</td>
<td>Re-establish community trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information and intelligence</td>
<td>Determine information requirements/reporting thresholds (indicators &amp; warning levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information and intelligence</td>
<td>Develop information and intelligence vertical and horizontal sharing protocols (i.e. within GO, with HTM, with private partners and with global community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information and intelligence</td>
<td>Develop protocols, information and intelligence sharing protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information and intelligence</td>
<td>Establish information and intelligence priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information and intelligence</td>
<td>Establish SME communities and IT networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information, intelligence and knowledge</td>
<td>Access/spot specialist expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information, intelligence and knowledge</td>
<td>Manage data, information, intelligence and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage data, information, intelligence and knowledge</td>
<td>Share information with peers and partners. Manage data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage Human Resources</td>
<td>Address and administer compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage Human Resources</td>
<td>Augment information collection, analysis and EOC staffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Manage Human Resources</td>
<td>Demonstrate/evaluate resources (including deactivation of volunteers as required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15 - Produce Reports- Dashboard View**
5 Conclusion

This report was conducted as part of a larger targeted investment project in order to document and describe the evolution and design objectives of the Capability Assessment Management System (CAMS).

The CAMS application contains may features and functions that were not in the original version of the FSSMS. The FSSMS database architecture focused on deriving gap descriptions from task lists, while the CAMS links gaps to capability elements (PPT: People and Organization; Policy, Processes and Procedures; Infrastructure, Technologies, and Tools) that are related to tasks and capability requirements. This results in greater emphasis being placed on characterizing the type of capability gaps at the task level. For instance, improving the capability to “manage data, information networks and knowledge” might depend on the specific emergency management pillar (prepare/mitigate, prevent, respond, recover), which can change over the course of an event. There is also the question of which capabilities, tasks and elements might be a concern, based on the results of a capability assessment that would help focus attention on the need for a balanced versus more targeted investment approach. This highlights the importance of designing a framework that allows for the elicitation of expert opinion from a wide range of SMEs (management, operations, policy, science and technology, etc.), reflecting a holistic approach to the various stages of a scenario.

The development of CAMS provides a comprehensive, unified and tailorble framework that takes into account many dimensions of a scenario in terms of mapping it along a continuum of response. Structured analytical techniques can be used to analyze capability gaps across the emergency management pillars, better determine the implications across organizations, and understand where to focus planning, programs and investment decisions. Like FSSMS, CAMS uses the principle of cataloguing, where each domain will have its sub-set of scenarios. The idea is that when planners have assessed a number of scenarios from various domains, they can then start to analyse the implications across domains, organizations and capabilities.

The CAMS application, like all decision support tools, is only effective as the information to which it was programmed to prioritize capability gaps. In this vein, while it is becoming a mature solution, the scenarios, capabilities and task lists need to be designed (and reviewed) by SMEs prior to rating. Clearly, it is not a substitute for critical thinking, and should be used with other complementary analytical tools and techniques. This would be consistent international security risk management principles and guidelines.
6 Appendix A

6.1.1.1 IM/IT related requirements

6.1.1.1.1 Identification of possible approaches

On startup of the project to automate AHRA and Capability Assessment, contractors researched and reviewed available technology options and tested to confirm viability and applicability.

Options Identified for CAMS included:

- Use of MS Access
- Use of SharePoint, MS SQL and InfoPath
- Use of ASP.Net and MS SQL in a SharePoint Window

With the DRDC/CSS spiral development approach risk associated with development projects has been mitigated with the use of MS Access to prototype applications.

Cost associated with prototyping in this manner are controlled and well understood, business process and requirements are better defined as a result of the prototyping and in the end this approach facilitates and removes significant risk and effort during production development. Prior to production development target architecture analysis can be conducted to determine the best architecture to implement an application.

Below is a visual of the spiral process.
6.1.1.1.2 Exploration of possible approaches

For production implementation of CAMS, two approaches we considered. The fundamental technical design requirements included:

- Application Supportability (Low overall cost of ownership)
- Application must handle multi-level data relationships.

6.1.1.1.2.1 General

1. Advantages gained thru automation should include:
   a. Increased throughput or productivity.
   b. Improved quality or increased predictability of quality.
   c. Improved robustness (consistency), of processes or product.
   d. Increased consistency of output.
   e. Reduced direct human labor costs and expenses.

2. Collaboration can be described as follows
   a. Collaboration is working with each other to do a task.
   b. It is a recursive process where two or more people or organizations work together to realize shared goals.
   c. Teams that work collaboratively can obtain greater resources, recognition and reward when facing competition for finite resources.

3. Knowledge Management is:
   a. Knowledge management (KM) comprises a range of strategies and practices used in an organisation to identify, create, represent, distribute, and enable adoption of insights and experiences.
   b. Such insights and experiences comprise knowledge, either embodied in individuals or embedded in organisations as processes or practices.
4. Information Management is:
   a. The collection and management of information from one or more sources and the distribution of that information to one or more audiences.
   b. Involves those who have a stake in, or a right to that information.
   c. Organization of and control over the planning, structure and organisation, controlling, processing, evaluating and reporting of information activities.

6.1.1.2.2 Integrated Architecture

An integrated Architecture involves hardware and software assets working tightly coupled to support end users application needs. Integration is not “out of the box” and usually requires the skill of integration specialists.

Making assets available for re-use is a major objective of an integrated architecture. The following assets must be able to work together to deliver the need of the AHRA/CAMS automation project.

1. Technology Infrastructure
2. Access Controls
3. Document Management
4. Knowledge Management
5. Development Environments
6. Standards
7. Skill Sets
8. Data Architecture
9. Business Intelligence

6.1.1.2.3 Target Infrastructure Architecture

1. The current target infrastructure is a model Microsoft infrastructure
   a. Office Enterprise 2010
   b. SharePoint 2010
   c. Windows Servers with IIS
   d. MS SQL

2. DRDC CSS application consistency in presentation and remote partner / user access requirements support SharePoint as the required application interface.

6.1.1.2.4 Asset Positioning

1. MS SQL
   a. Suitable for Most Multi-User DBMS Needs
   b. Is also the SharePoint back end DBMS

2. SharePoint
   a. Workgroup Focus (Small or Large, In House or Multi – Organizational)
   b. Workgroup Multi-User Simple Apps
   c. Simple Spreadsheet Like Lists
   d. Discussion boards
e. Workgroup Calendars
f. Work Flow Applications
g. Centralized / Corporate Document / Knowledge Management and Work Flow

3. Info Path on SharePoint
   a. Use for Browser Based Forms Only
   b. One Form Per Forms Library
   c. One Form Per List
   d. No Support for Document Libraries
   e. Keep Forms Simple So Data Collected Can be Surfaced in Forms Library (Fields in List Equivalent) and be Passed on to BI tools
1. **Info Path for Complex App / Data Base Integration on SharePoint**
   a. Use of InfoPath forms In Forms Library, Not Suitable for Complex Applications.
   b. Does Not Support Parent Child Implementations involving Multiple SharePoint List or Library Browser based Forms
   c. SQL Connected Forms
      i. Require Significant Investment
      ii. Multi-Disciplined Team to Develop and Implement and Support,
      iii. Has an Increased Data Path,
      iv. Potential for Data Duplication
      v. Significant Change Impact.

2. **Notes on Data Base Design for InfoPath Using MS SQL Server Studio**
   b. Involves creating a data base, creating tables and primary keys, fields and relationships, queries
   c. Involves set up relative to authentication
   d. Involves design relative to data access controls/roles/security
   e. Comment - SharePoint, InfoPath and SQL have more features apart than when integrated. Goes to getting three systems to agree on something hence features which may be desirable in a specific environment are not supported in the integrated environment

3. **Notes on Info Path / Data Base Integration**
   a. Design and Deploy Info Path Form
      i. Involves creating a new info path form using the Web Service Template
      ii. Includes creating the data connection to the web service. Many data connection may be involved
      iii. Includes creating a data connection library on the SharePoint site
      iv. Includes Creating a form library to store the form on the SharePoint site
      v. Includes converting InfoPath data connection to a data connection file which is stored on the SharePoint Data connection Library
      vi. Includes having the SharePoint Farm Administrator Approve the Form
   b. Comments
      i. A single Data Connection library can be used to store all the applications data connections
      ii. Each InfoPath form requires its own form library
      iii. Update function implementation requires passing parameters (not magic) and process documentation is poor to non-existent on web
      iv. Once connection file is stored in data connection library it is not modifiable.
      v. Testing and change implementation requires all above steps (save for creation of libraries) to be taken so there is an impact end to end on the time frame to produce a form
vi. SharePoint Site Admin privileges are required for the developer SharePoint farm admin approves these forms.

6.1.1.2.6 Change Request Scenario – Info Path – MS SQL

1. Add field to MS SQL table, Web Service and IP Form
   a. Add field to MS SQL table using SQL Designer
   b. Amend Web Services (Record Locking Controls Implemented in Web Services by Developer)
   c. Re-create Info Path Form (due to data connection recreation)
   d. If form data were saved to form library by users then there would be some conversion issues as well. (Likely these function would have to be disabled)
   e. Notes: As complex a procedure as creating all from scratch.

Figure 17 - Info Path / MS SQL Integration
6.1.1.2.7 **CAMS (Complex) Application Requirements**

1. Well Designed DBMS
   a. Relationships via Foreign Keys
   b. Advanced Field Types Flexibility
   c. Scalability
2. Well Designed Application
   a. Tight Relationship With MS SQL (Short Data Path Length)
   b. Web Based Deployment
   c. SharePoint Integration
   d. Minimized Change Impact
   e. Optimized User Experience
      i. Master Slave Forms
      ii. Minimal Paging
      iii. Record Edits “in Place”
      iv. Multi Data Source Integration
      v. Minimum Screen Real Estate Used
      vi. Complex Calculations and Controls Available

6.1.1.2.8 **Best of Bread Approach – The Right Tools for the Right Job**

The following is the recommend Architecture for AHRA/CAMS

1. Infrastructure
   a. Windows Server, IIS, SharePoint, MS SQL, SharePoint Client Object Model
2. Integrated Application Deployment (Development Environment)
   a. Visual Studio and SharePoint Client Object Model for Complex Apps
   b. InfoPath for Simple Browser Based Forms in Libraries (not to be used for SQL integration)
   c. SharePoint Project Sites / List Apps
3. AHRA Scenario Library
   a. InfoPath Form
   b. Surfaced Data
   c. Work Flow
   d. Low Complexity
4. ARHA Scenario Rating Forms Library
   a. InfoPath Form
   b. Surfaced Data (SP)
   c. Work Flow
   d. Low Complexity
5. CAMS
   a. MS SQL DBMS
   b. Visual Studio / SharePoint Client Object Model
c. Medium Complexity
d. Reporting Via SQL Reports
7 Appendix B

7.1 Development and Testing

7.1.1 CAMS Data Model

The CAMS data model represented below shows that for a Scenario there can be many associated events and for an event there can be many associated capabilities and tasks and for a task there can be many associated ratings. The Ratings table is the child of the Capabilities and Tasks table which is parent to ratings and child to events. Similarly the Events table is child to the Scenario table which is parent to the events table.

![Figure 18 - CAMS Data Model Visual](image)

### Scenario Table

- **Id**: int
- **Scenario_Title**: varchar(250)
- **General_Outline**: varchar(MAX)
- **[Created By]**: varchar(250)
- **Created**: datetime
- **Modified**: datetime
- **[Modified By]**: varchar(250)

### Chain of Events Table

- **Id**: int
- **FSS_ID**: int
- **[Event Group]**: int
- **Time_Line_Start_Position**: int
- **Start_Date**: datetime
- **End_Date**: datetime
- **Event_Description**: varchar(250)
- **Duration**: int
- **Red_Blue**: varchar(250)

### Format

- **Id**: int
- **Scenario_Title**: varchar(250)
- **General_Outline**: varchar(MAX)
- **[Created By]**: varchar(250)
- **Created**: datetime
- **Modified**: datetime
- **[Modified By]**: varchar(250)

- **Id**: int
- **FSS_ID**: int
- **[Event Group]**: int
- **Time_Line_Start_Position**: int
- **Start_Date**: datetime
- **End_Date**: datetime
- **Event_Description**: varchar(250)
- **Duration**: int
- **Red_Blue**: varchar(250)
7.1.1.2 Application Development Tools

The application development tools are:

- Visual Studio 2012
- Ajax Tool Kit
- SharePoint Client Object Model 2013

7.1.1.3 Application Interface Design

The application interface design was developed with purpose of minimizing communications with remote servers for data. For any selected scenario all related data gets pre-loaded to all form or grid views to give the user the fastest possible response time when working with a scenario.

The interface incorporates standard navigation buttons as well as standard insert, update, delete, select and cancel hyperlinks in the form and grid views used.

The CAMS application is inserted into a SharePoint Page on the AHRA site to allow for common look and feel as well as co-location with AHRA.
7.1.1.4 User Access Controls

User access permissions are inherited from the AHRA SharePoint user group. A user may create and edit their own scenarios and may view other scenarios. The Scenario owner is the Scenario Facilitator.

Rating Users may create ratings for a scenario for which they have been given privilege to do so by the Scenario Owner.
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