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SECTION 1 – SCOPE MANAGEMENT PLAN

1.1 Introduction
The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) is a Standards Development Organization (SDO) developing an Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) family of standards since 1996, with support from the U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT) under a cooperative agreement DTFH61-X-96-00014 with AASHTO and NEMA as its partners. ITE takes the lead in executing tasks and appointing sub consultants for ATC family of standards. AASHTO and NEMA, meanwhile, follow the SDO procedures of getting the standard approved under the terms of the MOU for ATC between the three SDO’s, and governed by their individual association rules. Once approved, all three SDO’s own every ATC standards equally and cooperatively. AASHTO, ITE, and NEMA also ensure effective and equal participation from their memberships for ATC standards development and updates.

1.2 Objective
The objective of this task order is to develop cooperatively with AASHTO and NEMA the ATC ITS Cabinet version 2 standard and to distribute the resulting standard at no-cost via the web.

1.3 Task Order Scope
This effort to upgrade and enhance current published ITS Cabinet Standard v1.0 to a new ITS Cabinet standard v2.0 consists of developing new standards for several new subassemblies including the High Density Switch Pack (HDSP) and a new flasher, and to re-use the existing V1 Serial Interface Unit (SIU and to consider providing either or both low power and low voltage (48 VDC) operation. The prototype cabinets use the Cabinet Monitoring Unit (CMU) that was originally developed for the V1 cabinet – but it integrated the monitoring circuitry of the monitoring system into the HDSP so that it can provide current and voltage monitoring. The need is to complete the specifications (Standard) for the plug-in assemblies noted above, to explore an alternative CMU design, and to develop one or more overall cabinet designs that provide low voltage and low power operation.

The V2 cabinet design effort shall investigate supporting additional security elements to help ensure the mechanical integrity of the cabinet and create appropriate alarms in conjunction with such actions as door open. This could also include improved cabinet monitoring for such additional situations as temperature and fan operation. The re-engineering of the V2 cabinet could also promote greater use of Printed Circuit backplanes which would further reduce cost and improve reliability.

The overall goal of the V2 program is to complete the design of the standardized subassemblies and establish a low voltage and low power cabinet and subassembly design that could reduce the cost of operation and the capital cost for installation and provide more reliable operation and superior cabinet monitoring – for a safer operation. At the same time, such a project could result in an option that would be more compact design for the urban environment and would establish a platform to support the next generation of lower power devices and other connected vehicle attachments.
This particular effort intends to leverage the prototype developments already underway by several vendors, and the support from New York City for the development and deployment of prototypes for demonstration of the power savings.

ITE will provide the personnel, equipment, supplies, facilities, tools, materials, supervision, and other items and non-personal services necessary to perform tasks described below. In order to accomplish the objectives of this task order ITE will complete the following tasks:

- Task 1: Cross Cutting Activities
- Task 2: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Committee Draft Standard – Design Content
- Task 3: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 User Comment Draft Standard
- Task 4: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard
- Task 5: Develop Publish Ready ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard
- Task 6: No Cost Distribution

The tasks in this Statement of Work (SOW) define the steps necessary to support the development of the ITS Cabinet Standard Version 2.0. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) is the lead standards development organization (SDO) for the development and maintenance of the Advance Transportation Controller (ATC) Standards. The Institute of Transportation Engineers will interface with USDOT in seeking approval of the work plans for the development and publishing of ITS Cabinet Standard Version 2.0, as well as work cooperatively as driven by its Memorandum of Understanding with AASHTO and NEMA.

Under a memorandum of understanding with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA), they will update the ITS Cabinet standard. The ITS Cabinet v01.02.15 standard was published in May 2003. In 2006 the working group updated the standard, but it was not published. Since 2006 the SDOs have collected requirements for changes to the ITS Cabinet standard; this Performance Work Statement (PWS) will socialize those requirements with the working group, update the necessary portions of the standards, and ballot and publish the revised standard. The project was suspended due to funding at Step 50 in the Project Management Plan. This project picks up at Step 50 and completes the remaining steps in the Project Management plan, plus the manufacture of production units and field test by Early Adopters.

Task 1. Cross Cutting Activities

Objectives:

2. To comply with Section 508, Accessibility Requirements under Task 1, Program Management.
3. To develop subcontractor management plans
4. To perform all contracting requirements based on Governmental requirements
5. To develop monthly financial, narrative reports
6. To provide editing services to the overall Task Order
Approach
The ITE project team will participate in a “kick-off” meeting with the USDOT and its representatives to ensure that all parties have a clear understanding of the requirements of this SOW and what the USDOT’s expectations are. The kick-off meeting shall take place within 45 working days of the Task Order Award Date.

ITE will develop an Implementation Plan which contains a Project Management Plan (PMP) and a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) that integrates the three development areas of the project.

Task 1.1 Project Management Plan

The PMP describes the overall approach to managing the efforts described in this SOW, and coordinating the work performed by any and all subcontractors. The PMP will contain the following:

- Team Organization. ITE will describe the overall structure of their team, explain the roles and responsibilities of all key individuals, and describe the reporting relationships among the team.

- Human Resource Management Plan. The PMP will contain a Human Resources Management Plan that includes team resumes (reflecting revisions or substitutions since contract signature), representing domain experts and a qualified technical editor.

- The Team Management Plan, including team members, is subject to USDOT approval as part of the overall approval of the PMP.

- Quality Management. ITE will describe its Quality Management, how it will ensure that the documents submitted as deliverables herein, will:
  - contain suitable material for the target audience
  - be organized in presentation
  - contain proper word use and English diction
  - contain detailed illustrations
  - be comprehensive, complete and correct
  - be edited for grammatical and editorial errors

The Quality Management items listed above are subject to USDOT approval as part of the overall approval of the PMP.

- Communications Management Plan. ITE will describe how they will coordinate their efforts with the USDOT, particularly the Contracting Officer’s Task Manager (COTM) and the Contracting Officer (CO).

- Detailed Project Schedule. ITE will prepare a detailed project schedule, in Microsoft Project 2010 format, that lists all of the planned tasks and milestones for the project. The Project
Schedule will address all project management and systems engineering management activities. The detailed project schedule will reflect a work breakdown structure (WBS) comprised of at least three levels. ITE will provide an updated Project Schedule, reflecting actual work performed, with every Monthly Progress Report that it submits. The monthly updated Project Schedule will reflect both the baseline task start and end dates and the actual start and end dates for each task in the Project Schedule. The project schedule will be provided in both Microsoft Project 2010 and Adobe Acrobat format backwards compatible to Adobe Acrobat version 6.0.

ITE will develop the PMP based on a PMP template attached as Appendix 1. If a variation of the PMP structure is used, this alternate structure will be subject to USDOT approval.

Task 1.2 Systems Engineering Management Plan

ITE will develop a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP). INCOSE Systems Engineering Handbook v3.1, or later, is the document that will be used for guidance in this area, and IEEE Standard 1220-2005 may be used for additional guidance. The SEMP will include the following sections:

- Configuration Management Plan
- Verification and Validation Plan and a
- Risk Management Plan.

The Risk Management Plan will document risks that might affect the project and the characteristics of the risk. Types of risks that must be considered include risks potentially impacting: technical, project schedule, scope, and costs. A Risk Management Log will be maintained on an on-going basis during the entire period of performance to track risks, mitigation plans, and status. Each risk will have a unique number, probability of occurrence and impact of occurrence rating. An example Risk Log is provided in Appendix 2.

ITE may revise the approved version of the PMP, SEMP, and schedule only with pre-approval from the COR and COTM and will deliver, to the COR and COTM, any modified version within 20 working days after receiving COR and COTM approval.

Once the draft PMP, SEMP, and schedule are ready for review, ITE will schedule a kick-off meeting with the USDOT and its representatives to review each document and ensure that all parties are in agreement on the overall approach to project execution.

ITE will place the revised version of each contract deliverable (including the detailed project schedule) under document configuration control, with version numbers assigned to each document. All documents submitted to, and approved by, USDOT will be assigned a unique version number.

Authorization to proceed to the remaining tasks is pursuant to COR’s written approval of the revised PMP, SEMP, and schedule.
Deliverable(s):

1.1: Draft Project Plan (consists of PMP, SEMP, MS Project Schedule)
   Deliverable Schedule: 10 working days before Kick-off meeting

1.2: Final Project Plan (consists of PMP, SEMP, MS Project Schedule)
   Deliverable Schedule: 2 weeks after kick-off meeting

1.3: Subcontract Management Plans
   David Miller and Tori Golden from Siemens Industries, Inc. will serve as the primary
   consultants on this project. See Resumes Attachment 4

1.4: Monthly Invoices and Progress and Financial Reports

NOTE: Authorization to begin work on Task 2 will be provided by JPO, pursuant to ITE
completing Task 1 in a satisfactory manner.

Task 2. Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Committee Draft Standard – Design Content

ITE will work with the ITS Cabinet working group and its oversight body, the ATC Joint
Committee in developing a draft ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard following steps outlined in Task2.1
to Tasks 2.5 as shown below.

   Task 2.1 Develop Draft Design Content including traceability to requirements.

ITE will develop Draft Design Content of the ITS Cabinet including traceability to requirements
for review and comments by the ITS Cabinet WG members and AASHTO, NEMA
representatives.

Deliverable(s): Draft Design Content

   Task 2.2 Participate in Technical Walkthrough of Draft Design Content

ITE will conduct a technical Walkthrough webinar for the working group members, and
AASHTO and NEMA representatives

Deliverable(s): Draft 2 Design Content

   Task 2.3 Deliver Second Draft Design Content

ITE will develop Draft 2 of the Design Content for review and comments by the ATC JC
members.

Deliverable(s): Draft 2 Design Content

1 Will be made 508-Compliant, PDF format.
Task 2.4 Participate in ATC JC Walkthrough of Second Draft Design Content

ITE will conduct a technical walkthrough of Draft 2 Design Content among the ATC JC members.

Deliverable(s): Revised Design Content

Task 2.5 Deliver Updates to Design Content

Update the design content to meet ATC JC Walkthrough feedback. If necessary, as part of this Task, update the Concept of Operations and Standards Requirements sections as identified in the ATC JC Walkthrough.

Deliverable(s): A revised draft of Concept of Operations and Standards Requirements

Task 3. Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 User Comment Draft Standard

This phase of the project is to provide an opportunity for public comment on the user comment draft, to handle the comments received, and to achieve final acceptance of the ATC committee to bring the standard forward for SDO ballot.

Task 3.1 Develop User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard

ITE will develop User Comment Draft for review and comments by the ITS Cabinet WG members and AASHTO, NEMA representatives.

Deliverable(s): User comment draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0

Task 3.2 Circulate User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard

ITE will distribute the User Comment Draft through ITE ATC Community, ITE All Member Forum, ITS Cabinet Working Group, ATC Controller Working Group, ITE Web pages for ITS Cabinet, ITE Connect newsletter in order to collect comments for the Draft.

Deliverable(s): None

Task 3.3 Address Comments on User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard

ITE hold a WG teleconference to address the comments and will revise the User Comment Draft in accordance with the comments.

Deliverable(s): Revised User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 and disposition report
Task 3.4 Participate in ATC JC Technical Walkthrough of Comments Addressed on User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard

ITE will conduct a technical walkthrough session to present the User Comments Draft revision of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard to the ATC JC.

*Deliverable(s):* ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard.

**Task 4. Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard**

This phase of the project is for the formal SDO ballot process and will deal with appeals to the ITE Notice of intent to adopt, or comments received with the AASHTO and NEMA ballots.

Task 4.1 Develop Draft ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard

Task 4.2 Circulate Draft ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard

SDO’s (ITE, NEMA and AASHTO) issue a notice of intent to adopt per their guidelines.

ITE will distribute a Notice of Intent to Adopt ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard allowing 30 days for appeal and comments per SDO guidelines.

*Deliverable(s):* Circulation Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard

Task 4.3 Address Comments on Draft ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard from Notice Of Intent period

If an appeal is received by ITE, ITE Headquarters will work with the ITS Cabinet Working Group and ATC Joint Committee to develop a response. Within 30 days after receipt of the appeal, ITE Headquarters shall respond in writing to the appellant, specifically addressing each allegation of fact in the appeal to the extent possible.

If an appeal is not able to be resolved informally in a manner consistent with the ITE procedures, ITE Headquarters shall initiate the process for the appointment of an Appeals Panel and will schedule a hearing.

*Deliverable(s):* Comments and Disposition Report on Comments of Draft Recommended Standard

Task 4.4 Participate in ATC JC Technical Walkthrough of Comments Addressed on Draft ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard

Task 4.5 Ballot ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard

ITE will distribute the ballots, ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard, the Standard Development Report and all other supporting documentation pertaining to the development of the ITS Cabinet v2.0 standard among the member of the ITE Board of Direction.

*Deliverable(s):* Ballot version of ITS Cabinet v2.0
**Task 5: Develop Publish Ready ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard**

Based on comments from the ballot period, ITE shall finalize the standard document and deliver the publish-ready version of the standard.

**Deliverable(s):** Publish Ready ITS Cabinet Standard v2.0

ITE shall make the published version of the standard available for no-cost download on the ITE website. Based on comments from the ballot period, ITE will finalize the standard document. ITE shall deliver the publish-ready version of the standard.

**Deliverable(s):** URL for hosting of ITS Cabinet Standard v2.0

**1.4 Scope Management**

At the present time, there are no anticipated scope changes. If scope changes become evident during the course of the task, the ITE Project Manager will provide a written justification to the FHWA Project Manager and to the FHWA Contracting Officer if the scope change is deemed “substantively significant” in content in accordance with the baseline scope.

Both the FHWA and ITE Project Managers will become very aware of the existing scope. If stakeholders request additional scope items (scope creep), both project managers will communicate to others that the items requested are outside of the existing scope-of-work and cannot be accommodated unless FHWA desires to add the specific activity (activities) to the existing work plan. ITE Project Managers shall bring any scope items to FHWA manager’s attention by emails as well at the monthly coordination meetings for this task.

**1.5 Approval Authorities**

Between ITE and FHWA

- For FHWA, Steve Sill (GTM) has the Final Technical Approval for all technical products of this contract.

- ITE will submit Interim and Final Deliverables concurrently to the COR, the COTM (if applicable) and to ITSProjects@dot.gov once these deliverables have been accepted by the Government. ITE shall include the contract number (and task order number if appropriate) in the email for each deliverable. The Government may request ITE to include specified keywords in the subject line of emails containing deliverables. Additionally, the Government may request ITE to submit Deliverables to an electronic repository as specified by the COR.

- ITE agrees to follow the ITS JPO publication guidelines, which are listed on the ITS-JPO website: [http://www.its.dot.gov/pubsguidance.htm](http://www.its.dot.gov/pubsguidance.htm)

- ITE also agrees to submit all reports intended for public distribution in one of the approved ITS JPO report templates, also found on the ITS-JPO website: [http://www.its.dot.gov/pubsguidance.htm](http://www.its.dot.gov/pubsguidance.htm)

- ITE agrees that all documents submitted for publication on any USDOT website will be compliant with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended. Information about section 508 can be found on The Access Board website at [http://www.access-](http://www.access-).
ITE will contact ITS-JPO POC, Steve Sill (202-366-1603) to identify the ITS-JPO Section 508 compliance specialist assigned to this task order.

- ITE agrees to contact their Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) to request any changes to the ITS JPO template or if there are any questions about the publications process.
- ITE understands that any deviations from the standard report template must be approved by the COR prior to submission.
- Only staff of the U.S. Department of Transportation can make official comments to the media about this project. ITE agrees not speak to the media as an official representative of the U.S. Department of Transportation absent prior approval from the COR.

SDO ITS Standards Development and Approval Process

Figure 3 shows the process that shall be followed by ITE to approve the ATC ITS Cabinet Standard. ITE has the responsibility to seek input from its membership and give them a fair and adequate representation while following sound systems engineering practices, ANSI based standards development process, and building a consensus among the representatives from its sister organizations such as AASHTO and NEMA.

Figure 3: SDO ITS Standards Development and Approval Process
1. Published Standard

   Comments Received by SDO

2. Standard Maintenance

   a. COTR Approval
   b. Work Complete
   c. Trip Report

3. SDO collects comments for 3-6 months

4. WG receives comments

5. WG reviews comments and assigns to the consultant

6. Consultant presents initial response to comments to WG

7. WG discusses the consultant’s response

8. WG proposes to joint Committee for approval

9. JC reviews the disposition

10. SDO Published with minor revisions to community

11. No-cost disposition

12. Outreach material

   a. Accepts each change with a vote
   b. Rejects disposition
   c. Modifies disposition
   d. Puts off for future review and input from other panel members
   e. Puts off due to lack of quorum
   f. Puts off for future major revisions
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SECTION 2 – SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT PLAN

2.1 Introduction

ITE Team anticipates that the total period-of-performance will require 18 months to complete. The actual performance of the work if no contingencies are required and without close out activities would require 16 months as shown Table 1 Schedule of Deliverables. The schedule is reflective of a number of complex interactions between ITE and its subcontractors, and within the USDOT and their representatives. The Microsoft Project attachment shows an NTP of September 21, 2015. Please note that durations in the attachment are business days and include two week US DOT review period for draft deliverables.

The schedule will be managed as follows:

- Bi-monthly status meetings (quick 15-minute telephone conferences and follow-up bullet action items) to identify where the deliverables are relative to the schedule prior to launch of the site and monthly thereafter. Included will be the discussion of any red flags associated with the schedule such as: technical, resource allocation, or reviewer issues.
- Implementation of contingency plans and fallback plans if schedule slippage is apparent such as the conduct of parallel work activities and intensive work sessions to iron out technical issues with subject matter experts

2.2 Schedule of Deliverables

Table 1: Schedule of Deliverables shows the timing of different work products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Milestone Date (from NTP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Draft Project Management Plan [TOPR Deliverable]</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Deliver Final Project Management Plan [TOPR Deliverable]</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Configuration Management Plan [TOPR Deliverable]</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Verification and Validation Plan [TORP Deliverable]</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan [TOPR Deliverable]</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Deliver Final Systems Engineering Management Plan [TOPR Deliverable]</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Identify Technical Editor / Consultant Team, Deliver Resumes</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Deliver Draft Design Content to WG</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Deliver Second Draft Design Content</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Deliver Design Content</td>
<td>15 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Deliver UCD of ITS Cabinet V2 Standard to WG</td>
<td>20 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.8</td>
<td>Deliver User Comments and Disposition Report on User Comments of User Comment Draft of ITS Cabinet v2.0</td>
<td>32 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Deliver Ballot version of ITS Cabinet v2.0</td>
<td>60 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>URL where ITS Cabinet v2.0 can be downloaded</td>
<td>72 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Assumptions
Since this is a Firm Fixed Price Contract and the contract stipulates that fee reductions and considerations will be imposed upon ITE should the schedule be delayed, the following stipulations must be noted:

1. It is assumed that the Section 508 requirements for this task will require the use of HTML and therefore the requisite editing/time necessary for conversion to address this requirement.

2. A number of deliverables will come due over the summer months between June and September 2016. This is typically vacation time for both DOT, ITE staff and the subcontractors. ITE has built contingency time (Task 7) into the overall period of performance to allow for deviations that may occur during these months.

3. ITE cannot be responsible for external events that will delay the project such as weather (city shut downs for days or weeks at a time or week), hurricanes, floods, tornados, protests, and/or other acts of God, natural disasters and national emergencies. If such events occurs, ITE will notify the COR/CO and renegotiate an adequate change date for the period-of-performance without penalty.

4. ITE assumes that the Government will adhere to the 2 week review schedule acknowledged in the statement of work. If the Government would like to see an alternative review schedule for deliverables, ITE is amenable to making such modifications. Upon finalization of Government deliverable review schedule, the Government will agree to adhere to that review schedule. In addition, the Government agrees to consolidate all comments from all governmental agencies and representative organizations and provide one package of comments to the ITE project team for consideration and inclusion in the final deliverables.
SECTION 3 – RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 Overview of Team Structure

ITE’s Task management plan is better defined using the ITE Management Organization Chart, Standards Committee structure charts for ITS Cabinet version 2 standards, the Program Management Plan (PMP), and the Standards Maintenance Process. Each of the aforementioned items will be explained in greater detail below. ITE intends to use sound engineering practices to ensure that the SDO process, as well its products, are traceable to each other as well as published for open access on its web page.

The Task Organization and Management Chart is shown in Figure 1 of this Technical Proposal provides the Staffing Proposal and Subcontractor Management plan. Task will be managed by ITE Project Manager, Mr. Siva Narla. Mr. Narla will direct all technical aspects of the task. Douglas Noble, Deputy Project Manager, will assist Mr. Narla in all management aspects of the task including budget and schedule maintenance, subcontractor processes and federal acquisition requirements, and the development and maintenance of the project management plan as required under Task 4 of the RFP. Ms. Tatiana Richey will function as the contract administrator. She will assist in the development of Master Services Agreements, Task Order Approval Forms, travel and per diem requests, and expense reimbursement requirements for subcontractors. Ms. Richey will also assist in processing contract paperwork for new/additional subcontractors to the maintenance task, throughout the period of performance that may not have already been approved by the Government. She will work with Douglas Noble to complete a cost and price analysis and reasonableness check to ensure that proposed rates are fair and consistent with other professionals of similar professional credentials. Deborah Rouse will function as an editorial assistant and will provide editorial services and review of documents throughout the duration of this project and will serve as a 508 Compliance contact. Zachary Pleasant will provide support with posting the documents on the appropriate pages on ITE web site. Courtney Day will provide administrative support with teleconferences, outreach and other miscellaneous needs required by the project.

The ITE Management Organization chart also shows that ITE will have approved subcontractors to work with us to complete the necessary standards development tasks under this assignment with direction and advice from the ATC Joint Committee and technical working group that is working distinctly under their direction. Each ITS Standard has a working group that is responsible for it, in this case, the ITS Cabinet Working Group. The working group will be managed by two co-chairpersons—one from public and one from private sectors. The working group will report directly to the Joint Committee for technical and approval matters, and to the ITE Project Manager, Mr. Siva Narla, for programmatic, contractual, and consultant aspects. The Working Groups will hold teleconferences and meet periodically. All working group meetings will be documented through meeting minutes. All minutes will be dated appropriately and will be placed on the ITE Standards development web site under the ITS Cabinet v2 Standard page. Working group chairs and the ITE Project Manager will approve all final meeting minutes prior to finalization and uploading to the ITE web site. ITE, as the lead SDO, manages sub consultants, meetings (conference calls and face-to-face), deliverables, and is responsible for publishing the updated documents on its website for ATC ITS Cabinet Version 2 standard.
Figure 1: ITE Management Organization Chart

3.2 ATC Standards Committee

Figure 2 shows the ATC Standards Committee structure and the relationships between them. ATC Joint Committee is the primary volunteer body that is responsible for identifying, assessing, monitoring, and implementing Standards related to the ATC family. Working groups work under the direction and focus on specific subsets of ATC Standards such as the controller, cabinet, and Application Programming Interface (API) software. ITE works with AASHTO and NEMA to ensure a fair and balanced representation from each entity on the ATC JC, as well as the execution of the work plan for ATC family of standards. ITE also ensures that the working groups are well represented from public and private sectors and are executing to the direction of the JC. ITE is responsible for technical editing of the ATC standards prior to publication on the web. ITE works on periodically publishing articles as well as outreach both, during and after the standards are republished on ITE web site and distributed through ITE Community, ITE Connect newsletter, and also through AASHTO and NEMA contacts.
Figure 2: Standards Committee structure for ATC family of Standards

ATC JOINT COMMITTEE

a. Chair (rotation)
b. ITE (6 reps)
c. AASHTO (6 reps)
d. NEMA (6 reps)

ATC Controller WG

6 to 10 members
½ - Public Sector
½ - Private Sector

ITS Cabinet V2 WG

6 to 10 members
½ - Public Sector
½ Private Sector

ATC API WG

6 to 10 members
½ - Public Sector
½ Private Sector
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SECTION 4 – RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

4.1 General Approach

Risk Management includes the following steps:

1. Risk identification
2. Risk analysis and prioritization
3. Risk Mitigation
4. Risk Monitoring
4.2 Risk Management

For the purposes of this proposal we will include the identification of the risks in an initial Risk Management log for the task order. Seven risks have been identified at this time and initial risk responses are also included in the log below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Task Order</th>
<th>Project Work Stream</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Risk Response Plan</th>
<th>Date Assessed</th>
<th>P*I</th>
<th>Related Issue #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>C, S</td>
<td>Obstruction by one stakeholder</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Enforce Rules of Order, recognize 3 other stakeholders between repeats</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>End Users dominated by Non-Users</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Chair will proactively seek advice from End Users as to fulfilling Needs</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Design deviates from Requirements</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Enforce Requirements Specification and prior WG votes</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>New features not traceable to Needs</td>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Creeping Features will be collected and tabled for next 5 year review</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>Task Order</td>
<td>Project Work Stream</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Risk Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Risk Response Plan</td>
<td>Date Assessed</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>C, S, Q</td>
<td>Competing designs that meet needs</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Select design that best conforms to Non-Functional Requirements</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Deviation from SEP, jumping ahead</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Cut off discussion unrelated to the current SEP step</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Competing SDO Standards work</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>NEMA 3TS Technical Chair will identify and reconcile gaps</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>C, S, R and Q</td>
<td>Personnel (consultants) turn over or become unavailable to perform tasks assigned</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>SRKN</td>
<td>Work with Siemens to have a resource pool of consultants to draw replacements from.</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>C, S, R and Q</td>
<td>ITE staff turnover or become unavailable to perform tasks assigned</td>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>SRKN</td>
<td>Build a resource pool of alternate staff to draw replacements from.</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
- ID # - unique identifier for each identified risk item
- Contract No. or Task Order No. – specific activity to which the risk item applies Project Work
- Stream – specific contract/task order activity and/or deliverable to which the risk item applies
- Status – current status of the risk item (Identified/In Progress/Resolved)
- Risk Category – category the risk item falls into (Cost, Schedule, Political, Regulatory and Quality.)
- Description – concise description of the risk item
- Impacts – impacts on the task or program if the identified risk occurs
- Owner – individual or entity with authority to resolve risk
- Risk Response Plan – description of the planned response should an identified risk occur. Column can be a reference to a specific plan document.
- Date Assessed – most recent date the risk and/or risk response plan was updated
- (P) – Probability of Risk, see 4.4 below
- (I) – Impact of Risk, see 4.3 below
- P*I – risk probability (P) multiplied by impact of risk (I)
- Related Issue # - identifier of the issue # associated with the identified risk (if applicable)

4.3 Risk Impact (Magnitude)
The magnitude (impact) of a risk can be characterized as:

1) Large: Has the following characteristics (3):
   a) Technical. Risks affecting the completeness or correctness of the project
   b) Schedule: Risks that cause a schedule slippage.
   c) Cost. Risks that cause cost to exceed the budget.

2) Medium: Has the following characteristics (2):
   a) Technical. Results in errors that require additional work to resolve
   b) Schedule: Risks that cause a schedule slippage of 1-2 months.
   c) Cost. Risks that cause cost to exceed the budget of less than five percent.

3) Small: Has the following characteristics (1):
   a) Technical. Results in minor errors that can be corrected through quick and normal review processes without much additional work.
   b) Schedule: Risks that cause a schedule slippage of 1-3 weeks.
   c) Cost. Risks that cause cost expenditures that may not match budget plan, but do not exceed overall budget.

4.4 Probability
The probability of a risk can be characterized as:
1) High: greater than 30%. (3)
2) Medium: (less than 11-29%) (2)
3) Low (less than 10%) (1)
SECTION 5 – COMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

5.1 Introduction
The ITE Team will maintain regular communications with the GTM and ATC Standards Committee, including scheduling periodic conference calls to discuss project status as noted previously. During these calls, the GTM and ITE Team will discuss project progress, findings, monthly and cumulative costs to date, issues, concerns, and recommended actions. Additional communications strategies that may be employed by the ITE to facilitate the completion of the project might include the use of a document sharing site to create a collaborative environment along with web conferencing technologies to facilitate working meetings for the sharing of information. These tools will enhance the collaboration across all project team members who are located in various locations across the country.

5.2 Methods

Communications between ITE and the Project Management Team
Telephone project briefings between the ITE Project Manager and the FHWA Project Manager will occur at least bi-monthly for a quick duration (e.g., 15 minutes or shorter) and more frequently at the outset of the project. The purpose will be to advise each other on the status of action items and the schedule of deliverables. A bullet email list of actions will follow each telephone call. Regular daily email will be conducted as necessary.

Communications between ITE, Technical Advisory Committee and the Project Management Team
All substantive technical emails will include copies to PMT members.
Periodic Web Meetings will take place between the ITE and the subcontractors based on time (e.g., every four to six weeks) or major deliverable completion. Progress will be summarized in a scorecard that indicates deviation from planned milestones and cost, plus a forecast to completion.

Communications between ITE and the Stakeholders (ITS Cabinet WG and ATC Joint Committee)
ITE shall attend periodic conference calls with ITS Cabinet Working Group and ATC Joint Committee along with the subcontractors (Siemens) based on time (e.g., every four to six weeks) or major deliverable completion. Progress will be summarized in a scorecard that indicates deviation from planned milestones and cost, plus a forecast to completion.
5.3 Contact Information

Key stakeholder contacts for this task order are included in Table 2. The table includes the stakeholder roles and responsibilities including stakeholder expectations from ITE (to be updated as needed).

**Table 2: Contact Information for Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Functional Role on Project</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Sill</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Program Manager; ITS Architecture and Standards</td>
<td>COR/GTM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.sill@dot.gov">steve.sill@dot.gov</a></td>
<td>(202) 366-1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Khan</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Contracting Officer</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarah.khan@dot.gov">sarah.khan@dot.gov</a></td>
<td>(202) 366-5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siva Narla</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Transportation Technology Senior Director</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snarla@ite.org">snarla@ite.org</a></td>
<td>(202) 785-0085, x119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Noble</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Senior Director, Management and Operations</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dnoble@ite.org">dnoble@ite.org</a></td>
<td>(202) 785-0085, x148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Richey</td>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Technical Programs Associate</td>
<td>Contracts and Invoicing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trichey@ite.org">trichey@ite.org</a></td>
<td>(202) 785-0085, x604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>Principal Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miller.dave@siemens.com">miller.dave@siemens.com</a></td>
<td>(512) 837-8407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6 – CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

6.1 Introduction

Configuration management is defined as: “A management process for establishing and maintaining consistency of a product’s performance, functional, and physical attributes with its requirements, design and operational information throughout its life” (ANSI/EIA 649-1998). This plan for configuration management of the technical memoranda (when exercised) and technical reports, identifies an initial set of filing conventions and comment response conventions that will be used throughout the project duration.

6.2 Project Management Plan

ITE will prepare the Project Management Plan and as necessary ITE will update the PMP during the life of the project when substantive issues dictate (either internal or external) and/or requested to do so by the US DOT. Modifications to programmatic items and schedules will always be maintained as part of the PMP. The PMP will be a living document and is expected to be updated if and when significant changes are made within the period of performance of the project. In addition, ITE will make progress notes within PMP regarding the status of deliverables so that stakeholders can have a complete understanding of what has been accomplished at any point in time.

ITE will submit monthly progress reports no later than 15 days after the end of the month being reported on in the format specified by the COR. The progress report will describe work completed during the period, anticipated work, problems encountered and anticipated. Since this is a Firm Fixed Price task order by task except for travel and Section 508 compliance, financial status will be provided based on deliverables completed and other costs.

6.3 Project Operating Guidelines:

A team decision-making process will be used for this project were:

- All team members support final team decision (Steve Sill and Siva Narla are the final decision-makers)
- Voice and respect each other’s opinions
- Resolve conflicts
- Meet internal team deadlines (internal deadlines are earlier than what is shown in published schedule)
- Bring up issues in a timely manner
  - Team meetings (structure, frequency, etc.) and Communication (methods, uses, frequency, protocols, etc.)
  - Full team meetings for progress reporting every two-to-four weeks (Siva Narla to prepare agenda with input from Steve Sill)
• Timely reporting of progress and issues
  o Face to face meetings as determined by ITE/FHWA
  o All e-mails should go to Steve Sill, copy the rest of project team, as required. Steve Sill is the single point of contact for FHWA.
  o E-mails should be responded to in a timely manner

6.4 Documentation and Filing Conventions
All of the documentation created on the project will employ a document numbering scheme that contains Task ID, document name, version (if applicable), and date of document creation.
• Example: T1 ITS Cabinet Standard v2.0 Project Mgmt Plan v1, 9-24-15

6.5 Comment Tracking
The ITE Team use Microsoft Word track changes to consolidate comments from multiple sources for what we will call many of the minutiae comments. Together, the project manager and project coordinator along with the FHWA COTM will review the smaller comments and dispose of those comments very quickly.

For significant technical and policy comments, the ITE Team will use develop a comment table with the following fields:
  a) Comment number
  b) Date Received.
  c) Commenter. Name of the person providing comment.
  d) Organization. Organization the Commenter represents.
  e) Document. Document to which the comment applies.
  g) Keyword. A list of keywords describing the topic of the comment.
  h) Page. Page number of the document to which the comment applies to.
  i) Paragraph. Paragraph number or section number of the document to which the comment applies to.
  j) Status. Indicates if the comment status is Open or Closed.
  k) Comment. The comment.
  l) Date Responded. The date the comment was discussed and closed by ITE and the PMT/PMT Representative.
  m) Response. A description of the response from the ITE Team and the PMT Representative(s).
  n) Action Taken. Description of the action taken with the comment. Options include Accepted, Rejected, No Longer Applicable, and None Required.

The comments database will be updated and made available after each technical review.
SECTION 7 – SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT

7.1 Introduction
The following section provides a summary of subcontracting arrangements engaged by ITE with subcontractors.

7.2 Siemens
Task order subcontract agreement issued to Siemens on September 21, 2015 for a period of performance from September 21, 2015 through March 21, 2016 for work assignments as stated in the scope of work including:

- Task 1: Cross Cutting Activities
- Task 2: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Committee Draft Standard – Design Content
- Task 3: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 User Comment Draft Standard
- Task 4: Develop ITS Cabinet v2.0 Recommended Standard
- Task 5: Develop Publish Ready ITS Cabinet v2.0 Standard
APPENDIX A

ATC Standards Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Functional Role</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Miller</td>
<td>Siemens Industry Inc.</td>
<td>Principal Systems Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miller.dave@siemens.com">miller.dave@siemens.com</a></td>
<td>(512) 837-8407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Seymour</td>
<td>TTI</td>
<td>Associate Agency Director</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eseymour@tamu.edu">eseymour@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>(972) 994-0433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rausch</td>
<td>Transcore</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.rausch@transcore.com">robert.rausch@transcore.com</a></td>
<td>(770) 447-6831, ext-6206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Talas</td>
<td>NYCDOT</td>
<td>Traffic Management Center Manager</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtalas@dot.nyc.gov">mtalas@dot.nyc.gov</a></td>
<td>718) 433-3390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thai</td>
<td>City of Anaheim Public Works-Engineering Department</td>
<td>Principal Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jthai@anaheim.net">jthai@anaheim.net</a></td>
<td>(714) 765-5202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Mao</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Director, Transportation Planning</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.mao@txdot.gov">andrew.mao@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>(713) 802-5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Duncan</td>
<td>Econolite</td>
<td>Chief Technology Officer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gduncan@econolite.com">gduncan@econolite.com</a></td>
<td>(714) 575-5710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Ramos</td>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Section</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gramos@dot.state.ny.us">gramos@dot.state.ny.us</a></td>
<td>(518) 457-1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cheeks, Jr.</td>
<td>DCDOT</td>
<td>Chief Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:James.Cheeks@dc.gov">James.Cheeks@dc.gov</a></td>
<td>(202) 671-1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wickes</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Signal and Radio Operations Branch Manager Traffic Operations Division</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Henry.Wicks@txdot.gov">Henry.Wicks@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>(512) 506-5125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark C. Wilson</td>
<td>Florida DOT</td>
<td>State Traffic Operations Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.wilson@dot.state.fl.us">Mark.wilson@dot.state.fl.us</a></td>
<td>(850) 410-5419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei Wang</td>
<td>Louisiana DOT</td>
<td>State Traffic Signal Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lei.wang@la.gov">Lei.wang@la.gov</a></td>
<td>(850) 410-5419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Wyatt</td>
<td>DelCan Technologies</td>
<td>Senior Design Engineer</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.wyatt@delcan.com">j.wyatt@delcan.com</a></td>
<td>(770) 831-3370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Evans</td>
<td>Eberle Design Inc.</td>
<td>Vice President, Engineering</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sevans@EDIttraffic.com">Sevans@EDIttraffic.com</a></td>
<td>(480) 968-6407, ext-218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Deer</td>
<td>Peek Traffic</td>
<td>Vice President of Engineering</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ray.deer@peektraffic.com">Ray.deer@peektraffic.com</a></td>
<td>(941) 845-1342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>