ITS CABINET WORKING GROUP TELECONFERENCE
MONDAY, 02/09/09

ATTENDEES (* indicates voting member)
- Ralph Boaz, Pillar Consulting *
- Tim Fiebrich, Siemens *
- Dave Miller, Siemens
- Jim Rose, Econolite *
- Kenneth Lee Montgomery, GADOT *
- Reza Roozitalab, McCain *
- Peter Ragsdale *
- Sean Coughlin, Caltrans District 4
- Steve Alonge, Noblis
- Siva Narla, ITE
- Guillermo Ramos, NYSDOT
- Scott Evans, EDI *
- Peter Skweres, Mn/DOT
- James Kinnard, Adaptive Solutions
- Bob Rausch, TransCore *
- Bruce Eisenhart, ConSysTec
- Brent Kataustas, Siemens
- Leah Fuss, Econolite

MISSING VOTING MEMBERS
- Ron Johnson, Harris County, TX *
- David J. Wells, Caltrans *
- Raul De Anda, LADOT *
- Clyde Neele, Naztec *
- Craig Gardner, Intelight ITS *
- Robert Welborn, City of Houston*
- Chuck Morrison, City of Seattle*
- Mohamed Talas, NYCDOT*
- Dave Holstein, Ohio DOT *
- Jim Waggoneer, SFMTA *

[Action items are assigned using capitalized last names in brackets.]

GENERAL
- Discussed distribution of documents.
  - Currently sending documents as well as post them on the website. Generally, documents sent via email are 2 MB or less.
  - Going forward, documents to be distributed via the ITS Cabinet Website (http://www.ite.org/standards/ITScabinet/v2.0.asp) with a link to the location sent out via an email announcement.
  - It was discussed that there be two weeks (if possible) on any requested feedback from the WG that requires review of a document. Note: This does not apply to special task groups that may be set up to address an urgent need.
- Discussed ITS Cabinet ConOps v.03
Generally, what was circulated was not a completed ConOps document but a summary of the user needs expressed in the presentations from the ITS Cabinet Workshop in Austin, TX in November 2008.

There was a lot of discussion about what was missing from the document but most of the concerns expressed were about requirements and design details, not needs. There was some misunderstanding about the Systems Engineering Process and how it works. James Kinnard asks that input be specific and instructive.

There was some disagreement about where the lines should be drawn in regards to needs and technology. This discussion ended due to time constraints. Ralph will give some assistance with this. [BOAZ]

It was discussed that there were not a complete enough set of needs in the document to serve as a basis of for developing requirements for the new standard.

It was stated by Ralph Boaz and Robert Rausch and confirmed by Noblis that the ITS Cabinet Standard V2 effort includes (but is not limited to) reverse engineering of ITS Cabinet Standard V1 standard.

Ralph Boaz reviewed a document circulated for the meeting showing a method to identify the user needs in the V1 standard. A small team is to be formed with Harris County, Caltrans and one or more of the consulting team. [BOAZ]

It was stated that on this type of project we should not be focused on a standalone ConOps document (although the work order is stated this way) but rather ConOps-type content for the actual standard. [KINNARD]

It was decided that those expressing user needs from the workshop should provide a rationale so that the user need can be understood and assessed by others. A form is to be distributed to solicit this input. [BOAZ]

- Discussed attributes document distributed by Ralph Boaz. A version of this will be distributed as widely as possible. [BOAZ]

NEXT TELECONFERENCES/MEETINGS

- To be determined after discussions with the consultant team and the WG leadership. [BOAZ]