

Minutes of Meeting

Page 1 of 6



Project: UTMC DEVELOPMENT GROUP (UDG) **Ref** UDG Secretariat
Subject: UDG Management Group Meeting 24
Location: Waterloo Room, 123 Buckingham Palace Road, HA, London
Date of Meeting: 14 January 2009
Date of Issue: 23 January 2009
Copies to: Attendees + Apologies + Brian Maxwell, Rana Ilgaz, Derek Renaud, Steve Harray

Name of Attendees:	Representing:	Ref:
Simon Beasley (Chair)	Reading BC	SB
Mark Cartwright	UDG Secretariat/Centaur Consulting	MC
Jeremy Coggan	Nottingham CC	JC
Adrian Gray	Hampshire CC/CSS	AG
Spencer Palmer	DfT	SP
Mark Percival	Tenet Technology	MP
Jennie Martin	ITS UK	JM
Glynn Hutton	VMS Ltd	GH
John Redmond	Warrington BC	JR
Elaine Rodgers	Mott MacDonald	ER
Andrew Wilson	Highways Agency	AW
Ben Thancanamootoo (Notes)	UDG Secretariat/EJG Consulting	BT

Apologies: Roger Hough, Hamilton Purdie, Robert Stewart, Sunil Budhdeo

Comments: Andrew Wilson attended in place of Robert Stewart; Jeremy Coggan attended in place of Sunil Budhdeo; Elaine Rodgers co-opted for Gary Umpleby

	Item	Action
1.0	WELCOME	
1.1	Elaine Rodgers(ER), Jeremy Coggan (JC), Spencer Palmer (SP) and Andrew Wilson (AW) were welcome to the meeting	
2.0	MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING	
2.1	The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting.	
2.2	Item 2.3 – TSG's stage 2 survey of a sample of authorities, which will include a few questions from the UDG (eg on identifying UTMC adapters and interfaces), is expected to be undertaken by Richard Berry. SP had contacted Peter Bull to confirm this was going ahead, but timing was still unclear.	
2.3	Item 2.4 – SB has made contact with both Plymouth and Nottingham and needs to make arrangements for visits to capture their UTMC implementation experience and feed the information into UTMC good practice guide.	SB

- 2.4 Item 2.6 - The preparation of short Good Practice Guides (GPGs) was suggested for:
- ANPR **JR**
 - Count Sites **JR**
 - VMS **RH**
- JR and RH will produce a short outline of the GPGs which will need to be developed further, although there is currently no resource available for the production of GPGs.
- Warrington BC may be able to make some funds available to UTMC Ltd for this work. **JR**
- 2.5 Item 2.6 – TRAFFEX – DfT, HA and ITS(UK) will have separate stands.
- SP confirmed that there is space on DfT’s stand for UTMC and that the UDG need to provide the DfT with a proposal. It was agreed that BT will co-ordinate a group consisting of ER, MP, JM and AW to plan UTMC input. DfT’s contact will be Ashraf Keeka. **BT**
- As a do-minimum, a leaflet and a rolling powerpoint presentation would be required. **BT**
- BT suggested that Kent’s CORDON project would be a good demonstration to showcase of urban-interurban integration using UTMC. **BT/AW/MP**
- ER pointed out that TRAFFEX has a wider audience and the messages need to reflect that fact and agreed to develop a first draft of a flyer taking that into account. **ER**
- 2.6 Item 2.7 – JCG: It was agreed that it was beneficial to maintain a local Events Calendar in a way that is accessible to both LA departments and external organisations. **SB/MC**
- 2.7 Item 3.1 – The XML WG is meeting next week. A request may be made to project FREEFLOW to do some XML UTMC work. **MC**
- The revised Technical Specifications have been posted on the website. An enquiry, soon after, about UTMC compliance was received from a Spanish ANPR manufacturer Quercus Technologies.
- 2.8 Item 3.2 – Tech Specs and EU Directive: It was established that if the Tech Specs are approved by a Peer Review process, then the EU Directive on formal consultation with European Standards Bodies did not apply. This was duly completed. The revised Tech Spec launched at Conference on 3 December and is now available on the website.
- The issue of continuing Crown Copyright will be reviewed in the future. **SP**
- 2.9 Item 3.3 – The web-based Products Register is now live. There are some teething problems which are being ironed out. **MC**

- 2.10 Item 3.4 – The S&SG does not have the resources to take up an active and more formal compliance policing role.

The issues of compliance arise mainly when systems need to be linked through the use of adapters – are they compliant?, who owns them for the purpose of maintenance?

MP suggested that suppliers should sort out these kinds of issues and there is a precedent in the case of common databases where Tenet/Motts/Siemens/Cloud Amber are currently engaged in seeking common understanding. The outcome may be useful input into Tech Guidance or Best Practice. **MP**

MP felt that suppliers would prefer a “good practice guide” approach rather than a tightly prescriptive tech specs which stifle innovation.

- 2.11 Item 4.2 – National Traffic Managers Forum: SB has been invited to speak about UTMC and streetworks at a NTMF event. **SB**

- 2.12 Item 8.2 – UTMC portfolio at DfT: This is still outstanding, but in the meantime SP will be the DfT representative.

3.0 UDG BUSINESS PLAN PROGRESS

- 3.1 MC presented a summary of progress, namely:

- The XML WG is active and new WG being planned with HA
- Small task let to Motts to consider XML alignment with DATEX II
- Work on ANPR MIB integration with CBD is active and ongoing
- HA’s Integrated Network Management (INM) initiative is being followed closely

MC confirmed that payment will be made for Secretariat work not funded under the DfT contract from the surplus generated from the 2008 conference. For technical support, the UDG is fulfilling its obligations to the DfT, and starts 2009 on a sound financial footing.

4.0 UDG MEMBERSHIP

- 4.1 SB opened discussions with feedback received from conference following the invitation to subscribe, and stressed that it was important to explore how the UDG gains its funding to deliver its business objectives. The importance to have a secure and sustainable source(s) of funding is greater because the needs of LAs are greater and because of HA’s plan for convergence and Integrated Network Management between urban and interurban.

- 4.2 MC reiterated that with current obligations and funding from DfT (£70K) and surplus from the conference (~£15K), the UDG is able to sustain current operations minus outreach and good practice guides etc. The key issue is what happens after February 2010 if current funding arrangements with DfT end.

There are implications for the upkeep and maintenance of the Technical Specifications, the investments made by LAs in UTMC compliant systems and all organisational links between the UDG, the UTMC community and other ITS bodies.

- 4.3 SP acknowledged that UTMC is a successful concept which has been supported by DfT, but that it needed to be self-sustaining and that it was important to look at other industries to see how things are done. The DfT looks to the HA for technical leadership.

- 4.4 ER noted that all HA standards are maintained by the HA, and wondered if the UTMC Tech Spec could be supported in a similar way.

AW acknowledged this but could not make any commitment at this stage. The HA is minded that UTMC needs to be maintained and its Convergence Programme and INM initiative are closely linked to UTMC.

- 4.5 MP suggested that if subscription was not taken up in sufficient numbers, there may be a need to look at other revenue models such as putting a levy at procurement stage or as part of a maintenance contract.

JM suggested that instead of seeking members, is there merit in recruiting sponsors?

GH wanted to know what sponsors will receive in return compared to competitors who are not sponsors.

MP said it is easier for his company to provide assistance in kind than funds in cash.

Both SB and JR felt that LAs benefit significantly from UTMC and that support should come in large part from that community. The UDG may need to spell out more clearly how LAs can benefit from UTMC.

ER asked whether the UDG can charge for use of the Technical Specifications – the answer to which was no, at least at present, as they are crown copyright with free access.

- 4.6 In reply to AG question about subscription take-up, MC noted that numbers will need to be close to 30 to make a real difference. Operations will be financially sustainable at much lower membership levels than this, but it becomes difficult to hold workshops etc. Also of relevance is the need to have enough members to facilitate the election of a MG.

SB stressed the need to explain to LAs the benefits of membership and for UDG to work with other organisations including ITS (UK) and its JCG partners, RTIG and TIH.

- 4.7 DfT would like to see closer working/integration of ITS organisations, and it would be willing to consider supporting an independent review/study on the future of UDG/UTMC long term viability, when advised. **SB/SP**

5.0 JOINT CHAIRS GROUP UPDATE

- 5.1 The main items of relevance from the Joint Chairs Group meeting of 16 December to UTMC are:

- Developments in the thinking around the National Technical Framework for ITS, and the possible status/responsibility of UTMC within this.
- The emerging cooperation with HA on INM (raised at Conference) and the alignment, via project FREEFLOW, with RTIG with respect to XML framework.
- The statement by ITS(UK) that it “would be keen to assist with all UTMC activities if that were desirable, including technical activities as well as events etc.”
- The engagement of JCG with the DfT’s Chief Scientist at its next meeting (4 February).

5.2 JM clarified that ITS(UK) was not “keen to take over” all UTMC activities as reported in MC’s JCG notes, but “assist with” all UTMC activities. She noted that she would be suggesting changes to the draft JCG notes to MC. **JM**

6.0 FEEDBACK FROM UTMC CONFERENCE 2008

6.1 BT summarised the positive aspects and aspects which could have worked better. In summary:

- The venue, Royal Armouries, provided excellent facilities with its dedicated conference suite
- The “call for presentations” provided the organising committee with wider choice of selection and is seen as a good model for future conferences
- Attendance of just under 160 delegates was similar to previous conferences
- The conference made a surplus in the region of £15K
- The on-line registration proved confusing for attendees who qualified for free places
- Last minute changes to exhibitor stand plan, on the advice of the RA, caused some upset to a few exhibitors
- The exhibition plan should have more details including location of sockets, columns and effective height of ceiling

ER suggested that exhibition planning should allow for more space between stands and each unit space should be marked. **BT**

7.0 AOB

7.1 *UTMC Conference 2009*

Discussions on possible hosts for this year’s conference led to the choice of Bristol and Warrington.

Bristol John Laite will be contacted in the first instance. [\[Post Meeting Note: Bristol has accepted UDG’s invitation to host with the HA as co-host\]](#) **BT**

A conference 2009 flyer was suggested for distribution during TRAFFEX in April. **BT**

7.2 **UDG Elections 2009**

MC recapped on procedures and informed the Group that recent past elections have been conducted electronically (by email). This year, of course, the eligible organisations were limited to those who had subscribed to the UDG.

A quick “show of hands” indicated that none of those present were thinking of leaving the Management Group. (It was noted that several members present had yet to complete their subscription forms.)

SB asked whether the 7 LA and 3 supplier representatives respectively was still the right split and reflected current developments. There was no strong feeling to change this.

It is understood Transport Scotland may nominate its own staff. Currently Hamilton Purdie represents TS and Glasgow CC interests.

SB felt that the work of the UDG needs to be more transparent with up to date meeting notes and forthcoming meeting agenda posted on the UTMC website.

BT

7.3 JR wanted to know whether Warrington BC can have UTMC as a link on its website and vice-versa. This was agreed.

BT/JR

8.0 **DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

8.1 The next UDG MG meeting is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 15 April 2009, HA offices, 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London at 11:00.