

Minutes of Meeting (Draft)

Page 1 of 7



Project: USF MANAGEMENT GROUP MEETING **Ref:**
Subject: USFMG Minutes
Location: Transport for London, Eccleston Place, London
Date & Time of Meeting: 29th June 2005 at 10.30am
Date of Issue: 30th June 2005
Copies to: Attendees
Apologies: Mandi Patel, Francis Groark, John Massey, Pete Hutchinson

Name of Attendees:	Representing:	Ref:
Richard Gibson	IDT (Chair)	RG
Mark Bodger	Siemens	MB
Will Sharp	Babtie	WS
Gary Umpleby	Mott Macdonald	GU
Derek O'Garr	Golden River	DO
Mark Pleydell	TSEU (Secretary)	MEP
Paul Welsh	Owen Williams	PW
Robin Hewitt	Halcrow	RH
Jeremy Cowling	Peek	JC
John Raffle	VMS Ltd	JR
Rob Taylor	Tyco	RT
Mark Percival	TENET	MP
Julie Hurley	York CC	JH

Item	
1	Apologies: were received from the above members. RG thanked TfL for providing the venue and facilities.
2	Secretary Mark Pleydell was appointed Secretary for the meeting.
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting Minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.
4	UDG Meeting 28th June 05 RG summarised the discussions within 28 th June UDG but the specific areas are covered below.
5	Traffex 2005 While USF recognised the UTMC representation on the DfT stand it was felt to have been lost in the wider DfT message. This may be due to division of DfT interests in the wider field of ITS. USF members were grateful to UDG members for their support. There was discussion over commitment of DfT to the adoption and uptake of UTMC. UDG, TIH, RTIG currently have quarterly meetings with Cathy Jenkins DfT. The problem may be one of demonstrating the benefit of UTMC to DfT.
6	UTMC Conference 2005 UTMC Conference 2005 is in Glasgow Mon/Tue 5 th 6 th Dec (dates to be confirmed)



	<p>LAs maybe do not have a full appreciation of UTMC.</p> <p>Consolidation of UDG, TIH, RTIG should reduce the dilution of interest. Talk ITS strategy LTP2 then show how UTMC can deliver the result. Need to keep UDG working with DfT as DfT will not work directly with USF. Must align our interests with Dft</p> <p>As a widening of any themes identified by the UDG, the UDG are encouraging papers from suppliers to show benefits of UTMC at next UTMC conference. This was generally felt to be preferable to more papers presented by the UTMC Demonstrator sites.</p> <p>USF are keen to explore this opportunity further and members to offer suggestions for papers direct to Julie Hurley (UDG) by 15 July 2005. Possible topics discussed included :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the process of development of purchaser requirements ii) The significance of the Traffic Management Act and the requirement for (and responsibilities of) Traffic Officers <p>Papers from users on UTMC benefits are appearing on the website.</p> <p>LA LPT2 plans, draft July 05, comment January06, resubmit March06. Awareness of TMA is low, very few LAs have full time TMO.</p> <p>The general opinion was that there is a very low awareness of need for Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and means of gathering data for KPIs amongst LAs.</p> <p>Note: ITS(UK) proposing seminar/conference targeting Traffic Officers in Nov 05.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Update on MIB workshops</p> <p>MB provided an update. Process went well, starting from a focused starting point. Putting two MIBs per day made good use of available funds. Work completed under budget.</p> <p>Payment of invoices was late – next time the payment process should be tightened, however, the precedent of funding specification development was very reassuring.</p> <p>There were no serious contentions during the specification process. Consensus on MIBs and objects inside MIBs. Lessons had been learnt from the Data Object Technical Working Groups. Future enhancements will be easier as we reduce the number of uncertainties in the specifications.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Compliance With Specifications</p> <p>Based on the email from Mark Cartwright (Centaur) suggesting prescriptive testing v. pair-wise demonstration of interoperability.</p> <p>The following points were raised:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescriptive testing is expensive, general USF response was in favour of compliance through paired interoperability.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over entry level for new players – risk of closed shop – conservative customer base may not take the risk • Requirement for multiple quotes will put pressure on users to give new players access to the market. • There was also a suggestion that implementing the network interface is not an overly large problem. • There is no requirement for a pairing to get on the register. • GU suggests that the specs may still not be sufficient detailed to guarantee compliance however the optimisation to achieve compliance is very quick. • Customer comfort will always tend to suppliers with previous experience. <p>GU gave a review of how conflicts of interpretation or implementation could be resolved where both parties made statements of compliance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resolve amicably between conflicting parties who then offer the solution to UDG, S&SG and USF Technical Working Group. <p>Where this is not possible then:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. take the problem to UDG S&SG and USF Technical Working Group for resolution. <p>If resolution can not be reached then:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. UDG bring in an independent consultant to determine preferred resolution. <p>USF members noted the risk that where suppliers assert compliance, purchasers often have an expectation that this means plug-and-play with no configuration, installation and commissioning cost/time/effort to accommodate the small discrepancies between differing suppliers. Specifying UTMC does not remove the need for someone to take responsibility for system integration.</p> <p>Not all systems will be the same – to allow innovation the specs cannot specify every last detail. Compliance is the ability to demonstrate previous interoperability.</p> <p>RG: USF to ask for SSG meeting with USF attendance.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Feedback From The UDG (Julie Hurley)</p> <p>Julie Hurley joined the meeting at 11:25</p> <p>RG welcomed JH who had kindly agreed to give USFMG an update on the work and direction of UDG.</p> <p><u>Formalisation Of UDG</u></p> <p>JH advised that the formalisation of UDG into a separate entity would proceed during the next few months. Formalisation would allow UDG direct visibility of budget for work without the intervention of Mouchel or Centaur as currently occurred.</p> <p><u>DfT Funding</u></p> <p>UDG have DfT funding for this and next year at undisclosed levels.</p> <p><u>UDG Work Plan</u></p> <p>UDG has submitted a work programme to DfT based on the funding.</p> <p>UDG is pushing for an S&SG meeting as these have been quiet so have not generated direction for technical issues for next year. (The UG405 controller MIB is relevant but</p>



separate).

Communications Strategy

A draft has been put in place by UDG. Priority is for UDG to get a web site that is clearly a separate entity from DfT site. This supports the UDG becoming a separate entity. The web site does not perhaps fully represent the demonstrators. The strategy also addresses promotion of methods for specifying and adopting UTMC compliant systems.

GU asked "Is USF part of formalised UDG?" JH - No but USF will continue to attend UDG meetings and contribute to UDG business. The core membership is representation from Reading, Hampshire, City of York and TfL.

General view from the LA's is that they do not want to subscribe to another group. This supports UDG investigations of overlap with TIH, TIG, et al. relates to other groups. But have to be in a position to work as a separate entity. Give freedom to bid funds for UTMC work.

JH Advised that the registry remains with DfT for the short term but UDG would like to take it on.

RG asked if there was scope in UDG to contract-out the development and implementation of the marketing communications strategy to encourage more proactive canvassing of potential LS users of UTMC. JH observed that UDG is currently strongly reliant on being approached by adopters but with current structure of UDG no-one has sufficient resource to do active promotion.

Liaison With Dft/RTIG/TIH/HA/ITS(UK)

JH reported that liaison to identify commonalities and routes for consolidation across ITS-related initiatives were progressing. Difficulties arise due to DfT responsibilities for these separate areas residing in different areas of DfT so consolidation of the different groups requires corresponding DfT consolidation.

USF agreed that consolidation was desirable and that USF members should encourage consolidation at any reasonable opportunity.

There are a number of areas of overlap between the organisations, e.g. both TIH and UDG maintain specifications and standards. Alignment with TSG is currently seen as a less promising route as UDG is closer to ITS.

UTMC Compliance Testing (MIBs and Data Objects)

This subject was discussed extensively, key points are noted below.

The text of Mark Cartwright's note on compliance testing was circulated. The idea of system compliance was removed by UDG allowing the focus to be on component and product compliance.

JH reported that while UDG were satisfied with the pairwise testing route. USF suggested that there is no need for a compliant system provided the products used are compliant and are in the registry with the version number for all to see.

Suppliers of compliant products or components would still submit these via S&SG against specific TS004 requirements and would note known deviations or ambiguities against specifications.

USF existing equipment suppliers have compliance at V1.8.



There is possibly a conflicting message between impression of plug and play v. actuality of high level of convergence in real systems and the need for configuration.

JH new purchasers encouraged to request V2 compliance to ensure rolling progress in systems.

GU asked how anyone demonstrates non-compliance in the spec uncertainties. Claim compliance at any level.

How have UDG purchasers dealt with consequences of non-compliance.

GU repeated the USF discussion of D Renaud model for resolving pairwise non-compliance above.

JH – UDG purchasers group have discussed the conflict – JH is comfortable with the resolution mechanism described as it addresses both UDG and USF interests and keeps overall convergence on specs. USF to forward back to S&SG and copy to JH for circulation to all UDG to get the overview.

There followed a wide ranging discussion of the perceptions v. the actuality of procuring and implementing a UTMC compliant facility

USF are concerned over timeliness to avoid the limbo between agreed standard/solution and its availability. There has to be a mechanism for fast communication of solution and comment agreement is required e.g. email but does not allow arbitration. But does expose the issue widely.

JH outlined a longer term position that as UTMC is more widely deployed and upgrades have occurred to V1.8 systems then UDG may want to tighten up process to be V2 and only V2. There was a suggestion from USF that V2 will then be out of date. However as USF members do more projects and work with more partners then the situation relating to interoperability will automatically improve, which in turn will make the role of UDG/USF in conflict resolution more administrative and less technical.

USF were concerned that limitations on use of the logo appear to have returned even though this was agreed at earlier S&SSG meetings. There is a large investment in V1.8 systems and these have to be recognised; hence the previous agreement to allow use of the UTMC logo on V1.8 products.

USF request that compliance and marking decisions be held until USF have fully commented.

UTMC Conf 2005

Tentatively Mon 5th & Tue 6th Dec. It was pointed out to JH that this would mean significant work on the previous Sunday (to set up) which would also involve travelling long distances. JH was asked to consider moving dates. If the conference dates can be changed then USF preferred dates/times are Tu/We and a week earlier both are preferred.

Three venues in Glasgow

UDG would like a USF member to attend a meeting to assist in final venue selection. GU offered to see if a Motts rep can attend on behalf of USF.



UDG co-ordinator is Ben Thancanamootoo (UDG secretariat) so USF input to him.

Individual stand space likely to be arranged through ITS(UK) directly after an overall requirement is agreed with UDG

Papers for conf. JH requests ideas for papers and workshops and listed those that the UDG had identified as possible (below).

Workshops (target attendees)

How to specify UTMC projects (Consultants & LAs)

User information exchange (LADEx has disbanded) so this may provide a forum (LAs)

How to FAT and SAT UTMC (LAs /Consultants)

The conference session headings are not yet defined

RG asked about the need for papers from the USF point of view. JH welcome papers possible paper from pairs of suppliers demonstrating interoperability or suppliers talking about multiple pairwise operation of facilities but not isolated product promotion presentations.

USF members to offer suggestions for themes or ideas directly to JH by 15th July

RIF

DfT has identified traffic hot spots in England and the RIF is to address these through data exchange between HA and LAs . It is mainly concerned with getting good quality data to travellers across the HA/LA boundary.

USF asked how this differs from TIH and TCCs?

Cathy Jenkins DfT has circulated an internal policy document for comment. This should ultimately yield work packages. Content is currently unclear.

RIF work has been undertaken in a very short timescale – has had significant public investment. It is expected to be piloted in the West Mids. Steve George, in a TIH capacity, is pushing for UTMC adoption as this is a big contribution to information movement.

It was unclear who the RIF suppliers would be. Given that they were likely to be from amongst USF membership, members were curious as to why so little was known about RIF.

PW outlined the West Mids architecture as Matisse based. Each LA has UTC with overall control centre collocated with HA system.

PW to talk to Steve George to find out who is involved to approach to promote UTMC.

Action PW

ITS World Congress 2006

There may be problems with the organisation of the congress. If this continues then UDG will put forward UTMC input of whatever types - site visits, papers, demos unilaterally.

USF will support Steve George and PW in getting direction and input to the congress.

Minutes of Meeting (Draft)

Page 7 of 7



	<p>UTMC village idea was raised at UDG meeting – this unlikely to be part of ITS(UK) as they are hosting. JH to talk to DTI representative about UK focus for exhibiting UTMC. LAs want to show how coordinated and well UK local government is using and advancing ITS.</p> <p>PW – should a/the theme be “delivery of joined up systems”?</p> <p>JH to investigate whether there is a UK budget for representation so that we can prepare a submission against the budget. Use that source to book floor space then sub divide that within the community.</p> <p>M Percival to talk to Alan Carter on behalf of USF</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action MP</p> <p><u>Controller MIB</u></p> <p>This was discussed at UDG. LAs would like this. What is USF view?</p> <p>MB, Siemens & JC, Peek are unclear about the availability of future funding.</p> <p>(DfT are not giving any funding, despite removal of trials from phase 1 which could be expected to free funds for later trials.)</p> <p>External funding will break the deadlock and allow trials to proceed – and there is a precedent for such funding from early UTMC trials.</p> <p>JH to talk to Adrian Gray (Hants CC - project manager) to try to clarify the situation around funds.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the controller MIB could be either exactly that or a UTC link into the controller, either option being transparent to the in-station.</p> <p>RG Suggested that this may yield a paper for the UTMC conference.</p>
10	AOB: none
11	Date of Next Meeting USF 11:00 Thursday 13 th Oct (At Ecclestone Place, subject to confirmation)