

UDG Specifications & Standards Sub-Group (S&SSG)
Minutes of a meeting held on
11 June 2004 Ecclestone Place, SW1

Present	Mark Cartwright Laurie Egan Larry Pope G Umplby R Gibson Derek Renaud Brendan Sleight	Centaur Consulting Norfolk County Council Lancashire County Council USF USF TfL Tf L
---------	---	--

Apologies	H Purdie	Glasgow County Council
-----------	----------	------------------------

1	Welcome	Action
2	Specifications	
	<p>TS001 and TS002 are now out of date (1997). It was felt the specifications were not detailed enough and open to interpretation. These shortcomings could lead to delay and confusion.</p> <p>It was agreed, subject to UDG approval, that an updated DOR (V2.0) would be produced. TS003 (which is an update of TS001 and TS002) is an updated UTM framework document. A draft is currently with the DfT for comment.</p> <p>DR to press UDG for a date when TS003 will be issued for consultation.</p> <p>TS004 would subsequently form the new DOR, when agreed.</p>	DR
3	Data Objects Registry (DOR)	
3.1	<p>Current position – Some fundamental differences in supplier interpretation, particularly ‘link’ object definition. The proposal is to bring present interpretation and implementation to a common level. USF now on meeting No 8 and are working towards this.</p> <p>The indications are that the suppliers are co-operating well on DO’s.</p> <p>It was agreed, subject to UDG approval, that an updated DOR (V 2.0) would be produced, following USF meeting No. 8 (set for July) a V.2.0 draft would be produced – expected September.</p>	USF

3.2	Actions Proposed	
	UDG needs to underwrite S&SG recommendations, which are as follows for the DOR: DR to raise at next UDG meeting.	DR
	a We move to a V2 version of DOR	
	b V2 will not be backward compatible with V1. Additions to V2 (V2.1, V2.2 etc) will be backward compatible to V2.0.	
	c Any future problems in backward compatibility will form a V3 which will probably not be V2 compatible.	
	d At present S&SG would hope that a V3 will not be necessary.	
	e V1, local authorities should note that this will probably leave them with important decisions and possible costs on how to update. Local authorities will have to take the update issue up with individual suppliers.	
3.3	Future Plans	
	Local authorities need to consider their position. Do they take latest supplier products (which may exceed current UTMC specifications) but are not compliant, or follow a compliant route (perhaps with a less functional product). It is unlikely that specifications can keep pace with multiple supplier developments. Guidance to be requested at UDG. Problems re local authority specials already exist. A table to be prepared and circulated to members. Members to then respond to programme office.	DR USF Then LA Members
	One method to limit these effects was for suppliers (heavily prompted by local authorities as appropriate) make earlier and greater use of 'notification' of objects. Some suppliers may not support such an approach which publicly notifies new developments/ideas. These issues to be raised at UDG for discussion.	DR
	The need for lower level than that 'notified' to be considered and raised at UDG.	DR
3.4	Update of MIBs	
	A proposal was put that a USF working group is set up to deal with MIBs in the same way that data objects are developed.	
	The feeling from USF is that they want the funding issue resolved. Ongoing funding issue to be referred to UDG (and its relevance to work controls).	DR

3.4.1	Significant MIB issues	
a.	VMS current MIB is supported by 3 manufacturers. But a new one is in use. Of the main 3 VMS suppliers – one wants to change.	
b.	Alvin Kiplin – VMS Ltd needs to get its MIB into DOR in due course. We will not press as unhelpful at present.	
c.	I out (UCO 16). Peek have offered a new MIB.	
d.	For Data objects the commitment already offered will be supported. Particularly system to system data objects.	
e.	MIB's needing attention are: 'I out', 'VMS', 'Car Park' and '141 controller'	
f.	USF want a resolution of funding before they work on these MIBs. (see earlier)	
g.	'I out' purchasers need to give clear signals that they will only buy 1 standard. Those involved will need to press UDG and Local Authorities.	
h.	It was suggested that greater use be made of the 'notify' and 'submit' options within the DOR to alleviate issues.	
i.	UTMC has lost its visibility. Management Group and Companies to explain position. The DOR should be brought up to date and ensure used MIB's are 'notified', 'submitted', etc.	MC
j.	Ease and Use of the Website - Publicity to Review. <i>(Post Meeting Note: Even experienced UTMC'ers have difficulty with Website navigation).</i> DR to raise at UDG.	DR
k.	Car Park 1 MIB (IDT) in DOR but with changes proposed – (Siemens). We propose leaving 1 MIB for now.	
l.	Controller (141) - MIB is an issue beyond V2.0 – but a major feature for interoperability.	

4	Product Catalogue (PC)	
	RG has suggested changes to layout of catalogue. Programme Office to implement changes and post update on website.	MC
	Proposal that PC is re-issued when V2 DOR is issued and after work on DOR and specifications is complete. UDG to agree.	DR
4.1	Compliance	
	It was suggested that we develop a compliance statement stating compliance levels, how they are defined and how certified. Mark Cartwright to draft up a compliance statement proposal.	MC
5	Website	
	Some recent updates have been applied with navigation improvements. (See earlier point re navigation).	UDG/ Publicity
6	UDG interfaces	
6.1	Publicity – There is a perceived lack of awareness of UTMC. A publicity update is necessary. To be raised at UDG.	DR
	The Chairs of RTIG, TIH and UDG have met. Concerns were expressed that local authorities are having to join multiple organizations. This point has to be taken up by Chairs of these organizations with DfT.	UDG to note
	DR to invite RTIG to August meeting.	DR
6.2	TIH Registry	
	Concerns at the wide ranging issues in ITS approaching us in the next 5 years. Should the RTIG, TIH, UDG be asked to produce a 'vision' document. Raise at UDG.	DR
6.3	UTMC logo	
	Discussions took place concerning UTMC logo use and permissions for use. MC agreed to produce a paper based on the discussions.	MC
7	Any Other Business	
7.1	UDG to clarify the position of UTMC position in Europe. To be raised with UDG.	DR

7.2	USF wants its spreadsheet of supplier/products discussed for wide distribution. Refer to UDG.	DR
7.3	During the meeting a flow diagram was produced outlining how the document (spec., DOR, PC etc.) development might take place with outline responsibilities. This will be drawn up as a basis for future discussion.	BS
8	<p>Future Arrangements and Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>12th August 2004 - Room G1, 10.30am - 3pm Eccleston Place. 14th October 2004 - Room 2.2, 10.30am - 3pm Eccleston Place. 14th December 2004 - Room 2.2, 10.30am - 3pm Eccleston Place. 10th February 2005 - Room 2.2, 10.30am - 3pm Eccleston Place.</p>	
	Distribution:	
	Those Present UDG Chair	