

[redacted]
From:
Sent:
To:

[redacted]
Tuesday, November 17, 2009 4:51 PM

Subject:

Re: Pushing Guardian Status Down to eGuardian

Let's talk about this before we move forward. This is interesting, but would also expose the field to external scrutiny regarding the time spent to cover an incident. Let's talk.

b6
b7C

[redacted]
From:
To:

Sent: Tue Nov 17 16:24:31 2009

Subject: Pushing Guardian Status Down to eGuardian

eG'ers

One of the new features that will be implemented in eGuardian is "*Pushing Guardian Status Down to eGuardian*". We are actually already doing this to some extent--when Guardian incidents are closed a "message" is sent down to eGuardian with the final disposition, and that information is available visually as one of the "messages" in the incident.

This new feature would simply integrate that information more tightly with eGuardian. After an eGuardian incident is referred to Guardian, as the Guardian incident goes through its workflow, the status of the corresponding eGuardian incident would be updated accordingly. So an eGuardian incident's status would go from **Draft**, to **Referred**, to **Open** (reflecting what is, at that point, in Guardian) and finally to **Closed**. The final disposition (no/yes/unknown nexus to terrorism) would be made more apparent in eGuardian.

The incident workflow history in the eGuardian incident would reflect these status changes--the user might be a generic "Guardian User", or it could possibly show the Field Office that the action occurred in.

Does this make sense? See any problems with it?

b6
b7C

[redacted]
(office)
(cell)

EGuardian-616