

UDG Specifications and Standards Group Notes of a Meeting

Meeting particulars

Meeting held: 15:00 on 25 January 2008 at TfL offices, 25 Ecclestone Place, London

The following were present:

- Derek Renaud, TfL *Chair*
- Mark Cartwright, Centaur Consulting *Secretary*
- Brent Collier, Sheffield CC
- Andrew Hancock, Stoke-on-Trent CC
- Ian Skeoch, Peek Traffic
- Ivan Wells, Highways Agency

The following tendered their apologies:

- Laurie Egan, Norfolk CC
- Martin Porter, Lancashire CC
- Hamilton Purdie, Glasgow CC
- Gary Umpleby, Mott Macdonald (on behalf of USF)

1 Welcome and introductions

Action

- 1.1 DR welcomed everyone, especially AH for whom this was the first in-person S&SG meeting.

2 Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

- 2.1 The minutes of the last meeting (13 November 2007) were accepted as an accurate record.
- 2.2 There were no matters arising which were not covered elsewhere in the agenda.

3 Technical Secretary's report

- 3.1 The report was reviewed and discussed in detail.
- 3.2 Journey time: it was felt that no immediate action was required here, as this seems to be under control within the ANPR (Halcrow) and object review (Siemens) activities.

- 3.3 Unique identifiers: ideally this would be captured in a (meta-)data Object. However moving this into implementation might be tricky. **IS** noted that WMids currently have a major ITT out which involved the interworking of a number of different highways authorities, and a question to them of how they intend to handle this issue would be timely. It was confirmed that S&SG would be happy to be cited in this.
- 3.4 Ramp metering: this was acknowledged as an area of interest, though not one of high priority. Logically there should be little new, relative to the information available through other signal contexts, other than perhaps an message to indicate to the Centre what strategy an autonomous local controller was currently adopting (and why). WMids will possibly be interested in this too as part of their current tender: **IS** to ask.
- 3.5 Incident management: the note on "good practice" having been welcomed by both the UDG MG and the National Traffic Managers Forum, S&SG was cheered but unsure as to how to progress: this is as much a mater of process as of technical specification. It was concluded that we need a clear steer of the requirements of incident managers, so as to help us consider whether and how the existing data objects might need extending to handle incident management. **IW** will ask the question of relevant HA staff, and **DR** will do the same in TfL.
- 3.6 Location referencing: the INSPIRE-facing strategic work being done within DfT is not of immediate concern, though we should continue to track this activity (eg alongside the National ITS Framework being developed by Louise Barnett). Of much more direct relevance is the real world implementation of OS' ITN products, and their shortcomings, and the standardisation available through TPEG-loc etc. **IW** reported that HA is currently consolidating its activities in an Enhanced Network Modelling (ENM) project.
- 3.7 Academic workshop (July 2008): the UDG's plan for this was noted. It was agreed that this was not at odds with the more specific but longer-term view being collated by InnovITS (regarding grid computing as a tool for transport modellers).
- 3.8 NTCIP: it was acknowledged that UTMC's detailed understanding of the NTCIP programme is out of date. It would be good to update on this but this was not high priority. Ideally this would be done through local reviews by major implementers (including, potentially, HA and TfL).
- 3.9 Road pricing: it was agreed that the bulk of the road pricing framework was still too fluid to be incorporated into the UTMC specification. The possible exception of the air interface (embodied in EN15509) was noted. **MC** to obtain and review.
- 3.10 DATEX: the DATEXII-based specification of NTCC information publication was examined, in its CASE environment. It was agreed that, while it was more specific – and, as a real implementation, more useful – than the full DATEXII model, it was still not appropriate for an LA audience. What is less clear is how much of this, if any, should be adopted as a mandatory specification for use by UTMC suppliers. **MC** will produce a short "green paper" for consultation among suppliers (including via Joint Technical Group) to help inform S&SG's view on how this might be used.

3.11 NB the CASE tool used is Enterprise Architect, for which a freeware viewer is available at <http://www.sparxsystems.com.au/products/ea.html> (scroll down and click on the link "EALite", which will download the program EALite.exe).

3.12 It was agreed that some of this could usefully be taken forward by means of a general technical workshop, say around April. MC to draft an agenda for consideration at the next S&SG meeting, focussing on incident management, unique IDs and network description/location referencing.

MC

4 Compliance

4.1 There had been no submissions for compliant products during the period.

5 Product catalogue

5.1 S&SG considered the views of some suppliers that the web-based product catalogue might no longer be required. After discussion it was agreed that, while support might not be universal, it was still a valuable and worthwhile project and should be continued as planned.

6 Technical Specification update

6.1 The draft update for the Technical Specification was reviewed and was felt to be in a fit state to circulate for informal consultation. The fact that there were some "withdrawals" (telnet, FTAM) was noted, but it was felt unlikely that these had been used in practice and this would not, therefore, break with the philosophy of "backwards compatibility" in practice. However this should be validated during consultation.

6.2 MC is continuing to track and chase a number of development tasks in the marketplace, on ANPR, traffic counters and rising bollards. There is no secure projection on when these will be ready for consideration by S&SG.

MC

6.3 IS reported that discussions on the unified UTC MIB had progressed well, and the last few issues seemed close to resolution. It was currently expected that the companies will be in a position to submit an agreed joint proposal shortly after a final meeting on 12 Feb 08. This includes a chunk of "common" data which might usefully be separated out as a separate Object. Also, some aspects – LRT and greenwave in particular – had been "parked" and would need to be picked up later: the proposal will allow for these to be done via special-function bits.

IS

6.4 S&SG members will continue to have the opportunity to review this over the next few weeks, in parallel with UTMC suppliers and, via the Joint Technical Group, other technical stakeholders. Comments were requested by end-Feb, to allow for a final revision by the next S&SG meeting in March; the intention was then to agree an update for submission to MG and DfT.

All

6.5 More major changes would follow for the following iteration, from the other work items which should come underway shortly – notably the UML work, which is dependent on finalising the support contract with DfT. MC to ensure that both S&SG and industry stakeholders are kept informed. **MC**

7 Technical work for 2007-09 – discussion

7.1 MC reported that the support proposal for UDG was submitted by UTMC Ltd during the middle of January and was now in DfT evaluation. Once (hopefully) approved, this will unlock not only the UML project but also the remainder of the web-based product catalogue work, the security guidelines, the technical framework contract and any *ad hoc* tasks.

7.2 Following from previous discussions, it was agreed that a list should be maintained of issues and potential tasks for S&SG, highlighting both urgency and deliverability. This would become a key part of the S&SG management process, and would also allow engagement with LA “customers” for UDG work. DR/MC to draft. **MC/DR**

7.3 The tasks arising from Joint Technical Group would come into this.

8 AOB

8.1 DR noted that he had chaired S&SG since its inception in 2003, and felt that it was a realistic time to ask whether anyone else was minded to take the role. He would be willing to continue if noone else was able to but would prefer to hand over the reins. Members of S&SG were asked to consider this and let their position be known over the coming weeks. **All**

8.2 IS noted that he had not yet seen all of the input papers for the meeting. MC will send. **MC**

9 Next meetings

9.1 The next meeting will be at 14:00 on 19 March 2008, and will be held by teleconference.