

New York City Sub-Regional ITS Architecture Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes – February 28, 2007

Last Updated: April 19, 2007

A meeting of the Sub-Regional Architecture Advisory Committee was held at 10:00 AM on February 28, 2007. The meeting was held at NYSDOT Region 11's offices at 47-40 21st Street, Long Island City. A copy of the agenda and the attendance sheet are attached at the end of these minutes. Presentations are available on the architecture web site. The following link is to an online guidance document about regional ITS architecture use and maintenance: <http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/regitsarchguide/index.htm>.

Welcome

Mr. Lai welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Introductions and Announcements

Went around the room so everyone can introduce themselves.

Fred Lai is interested in how stakeholders have used the regional ITS architecture.

Consultant Presentation – Manny Insignares, ConSysTec (charts hardcopy were handed out)

- Q: Will V6 of the ITS Architecture be upwards compatible with older versions?
 - A: Yes. Updating will be for the most part automated by the new version of TurboArchitecture later this year.
 - B. Ernie Athanailos/Ira Huttner & others: Some discussion on the definition of what a 'Terminator' is, in addition to a clarification about the function of the new market package for passenger counting.
 - Rob Jaffe: Even though there was passenger counting in previous versions of the national architecture, it was mixed in with other transit functions on the same diagram. This version puts all the relevant pieces in one place.
- Federal Perspective Discussion – Art O'Connor
 - 2-years since development of the NYC Sub Regional Architecture. At this point, the major focus is clearly on the demonstrated 'use' of the Sub Regional Architecture. Art needs a better understanding of how the architecture is being used & implemented within each of the agencies. That is, the documented project-specific Systems Engineering reports & corresponding updates or (project) sequencing of each agency's deployed

ITS program to date (since mid-2005). In that way, other agency use of the Architecture can proceed accordingly & consistent w/ Rule 940, and more importantly, as was agreed among each of the agencies several years ago. It was stated that any enhancement to subsequent versions of the architecture (up to versions 6.0) is foolish if the architecture isn't being used by all.

- No maintenance or update since development of the NYC Sub Regional Architecture despite consensus to do so in the executed Sub Regional Architecture (5/2005).
- Comments:
 - Ira Huttner: We (PANYNJ) are not using the Sub Regional Architecture. The Architecture is about identifying relationships and how we communicate w/NYS and NYC, and this is being followed (e.g. communicating through Transcom). We helped develop those institutional arrangements and are following it. So, we are using the arrangements and protocols that have been institutionalized. Encourage other agencies to communicate with our agency by Transcom. Architecture is a consensus of agreements about how we conduct business and communicate with each other.
 - Art O'Connor: Refer to it as you wish. These remarks reflect the undocumented practice well before the execution of the NYC Sub Regional Architecture. It is unnecessary to repeat this train-of-thought once again, or to resurrect the TRANSCOM direct communication issue; it's been discussed at great length & resolved a number of years ago. The NYC Sub Regional Architecture is being used providing the appropriate illustration is made consistent with the requirements of Rule 940 – as signed in mid-2005 by all member agencies.
 - Ira Huttner: There may be a few changes here and there we need to change to be consistent with the architecture.
 - Art O'Connor: Fine. Please show us how Table 3.3 in the NYC Sub Regional Architecture (PANYNJ recommendations for consistency with the NYMTC Region & NYC Sub Regional Architecture) reflects these changes.
 - Ira Huttner: PA is not affected by Rule 940. We are effected by security, and going forward with Federal grants.
 - Art O'Connor: we are well beyond this issue & how the PA is funded. The PA is certainly affected by Rule 940 as one of the key transportation agencies in this region irrespective of funding. It was clearly agreed among all that Rule 940 would be strictly followed regardless of whether highway trust or non-highway trust funds were used. This

includes DHS funds. It would benefit all of us if the PA could illustrate compliance with Rule 940 in these cases. The fact that Federal DHS funds have no requirements with compliance with Rule 940 is irrelevant.

- Tom Batz: Regional ITS Architecture impacts when you invest in ITS, the data is shared with everyone else that may be effected. Whether you use it or not, is in the wording. Everyone around the table is trying to follow it.
- Art O'Connor: Tom's comments are on-target. But we need to document and share it.
- Tom Batz: Identify projects that are done, and where they are tied in.
- Abiyu Berlie: Both Art & Ira are correct. The Architecture represents what systems are doing now (and are planned to be doing) with regard to connections and the information being shared.
- Ernie Athanailos: NYCDOT is using the architecture. We need to update links with other agencies.
- Ira Huttner: We don't want a big 2-3 year process.
- Art O'Connor: We were told 5 minutes ago that the PA is not using the NYC Sub Regional Architecture.
- Mohammad Talas: We want to understand ahead of time what the environment is, and what data will be shared, and what's happening in the "neighborhood". As an engineer, we can't guess what the other agencies are doing. So, if we want to follow the SEP, we need to know what's going on. We need to know what other agencies are doing.
- Tom Batz: E.g., Transmit sites are being deployed by three agencies. We shouldn't be deploying one on top of another.
- Jon Roper: Need to touch base with all the stakeholders. Contact the stakeholders, review the market packages, new and old. Architecture is still valid. The way we conduct business is still the same as it was before. An update at this time doesn't seem to create value. Regarding capital planning, if someone wants to know what the MTA is doing, the 5 year program is on the website. This is a basis for what is submitted to the TIP. We are using regional architecture as a basis for the project architectures required by the FTA (who the stakeholders are and what you're doing in common with them, follows through the SEP). The Market Package priorities have not changed.

- Art O'Connor: So we can get a look at some of your Systems Engineering reports or confirm with the FTA on the compliance with Rule 940/FTA Policy during their Triennial Reviews?
- Fred Lai: Web security document. We had reasons in the past for not making our regional ITS architecture public (still user id/password protected).
 - Shelley Prettyman: MTA doesn't want to make it public until all agencies have reviewed and made sure that their info is not a security risk. Drafted a "Security Sensitive Information Policy". Process for how and what is made public. Same document provided by Paul Vollaro at the last meeting.
 - Ira Huttner: Using a password for access is not enough. If it's retrievable from a website, we don't know who has it, unless we can track who has it. Especially if we add more security services.
 - Fred Lai: Can portions be made available and others not distributed. Security sensitive information should not be on a website. What's on the website now: are we all comfortable what's in the architecture today? Harder question: what do we do from this point forward? How do we share among each other, and what goes on a website and when?
 - Abiyu Berlie: What is the value of the architecture to the public? If it's not a requirement, why are we bothering?
 - Shelley Prettyman: Is there a requirement to release the architecture to the public? (RSJ: Not that I know of.)
 - Art O'Connor/Tom Batz - Question to ConSysTec: Any similar experience with other architectures on security issues developed by ConSysTec?
 - ConSysTec (Rob): No.
 - Shelley Prettyman: If a wider audience needs to document, e.g. consultants doing Project SE analyses, then there's a benefit to making it available. In either case, it's the same security issue.
 - Fred Lai: We need to consider the role of NYMTC. Wide audience. They need to blend in the architecture with the TIP process. Can we pick out pieces that can be open and parts that stay secure.
 - Jon Roper: We still need everyone to specifically identify parts of the current architecture that need to be restricted from public view. Market packages have little or no technology that could bring risk. Security guys need to be engaged to give a reasonable judgement. Second: how will we conduct business outside the architecture, we are exchanging technical information, and we need to keep that exchanged technical information in a secure way.

- Ira Huttner: Distribute the security document electronically, and Fred should identify the questions that each agency should consider. Next question: if we upgrade to V5/6, what are we going to document and share w/others. A few months to respond.
- Jon Roper: As long as we keep the ITS architecture high level, we can participate to an agreed level, without technical information.
- Shelley Prettyman and Fred Lai will formulate the questions and poll the participants about security policy questions.
- Architecture Maintenance Activities
 - Fred Lai: How we make modifications. ConSysTec defined a process. Do a review with stakeholders.
 - Fred Lai: Are there any final comments on the Maintenance Plan? Then we can close out that activity.
 - Manny Insignares: All comments were incorporated and Maintenance Plan is up to date.
 - Ira Huttner: Send us the Maintenance Plan.
 - Art O'Connor: Did we have closure on the Use Plan?
 - Manny Insignares: No comments received. Document is focused more on “planning” (e.g. getting projects into the TIP). Can ask NYMTC how the architectures have been used in this regard. Another aspect is using the architecture in the Long Range Plan, but also using it in projects. There is a linkage between the architecture and projects, e.g. in developing a Concept Of Operations.
 - Art O'Connor: Has anyone used the “change request form”?
 - Shelley Prettyman: Who can submit a change request?
 - A: Anyone, but it has to be sponsored by one of the four partner agencies.
 - Shelley Prettyman: When do the agencies deal with changes?
 - Art O'Connor: Sit down at least once a year, but also could be driven by a change request.
 - Fred Lai: We need to consider, can we sign off on what we have today?
 - Shelley Prettyman: Want active approval of changes, not just “if nobody objects”.
- Fred Lai: Two years has passed since sending the architecture to FHWA. Want to share experiences. What changes should be considered? Some new things coming up.

- Raj Amin and Fred Lai: Same ATMS program.
 - New pilot program for travel time using Transmit (on Staten Island and the Whitestone Bridge to JFK).
Question: Does this change the architecture? Also looking at a corridor approach to traffic management in a few places – is this a use of existing architecture?
 - Ira Huttner: Doesn't necessarily change anything. Field devices connected to Transcom and to your Center.
 - Tom Batz: New to use travel times on VMS.
 - VII will require some new connections and stakeholders
- Abiyu Berlie: We should get together once a year or so each of us can talk about integration projects that used or might use the architecture.
- Ira Huttner: The PA has nothing to add to any changes/updates to the NYC Sub Regional Architecture.
- Art O'Connor: You're serious?...Nothing to add over these last several years including the few changes noted earlier along with whatever deployments that were made using DHS funds?
- Ira Huttner: No comment.
- Art O'Connor: May 23-24, FHWA will have a Use and Maintenance Workshop for NYC at NYMTC and strongly encouraged participation by all agencies given this general discussion & challenges on the documented 'use' and 'maintenance' of the NYC Sub Regional Architecture.
- Art O'Connor:
 - March 13 Webinar to go through the System Engineering Handbook.
 - Handed out CDROMS of recently released System Engineering For ITS guidance doc (January 2007).
- Update on NYSDOT Guidance Document – Manny Insignares
 - Discussed use of regional ITS architecture in Long Range Planning, Budgeting/Programming and Implementation.
 - ConSysTec will keep the NYC Sub Regional Architecture on their website for the foreseeable future.

Closing Remarks

The group agreed to meet again in early June, 2007 (maybe during the week of June 11). Follow up on security issue and architecture use examples.

The meeting adjourned at (exactly) 12:30 PM.

Action Items:

- Agency experiences on a project specific level that illustrates the use & need to update the NYC Sub Regional Architecture as agreed among all agencies in the Architecture compliance submission to FHWA/FTA (5/25/05).

We believe that these minutes are an accurate depiction of the discussions and agreements at the meeting. If there are any additional comments, additions or clarifications needed, please contact or e-mail to Manny Insignares (212-687-7911, manny.insignares@consystec.com).

Meeting Participants

Name	Affiliation	Phone
Fred Lai	NYS DOT R.11	718-482-4745
Arthur O'Connor	USDOT/FHWA	212-668-2206
Mohammad Talas	NYCDOT	718-433-3390
Bruce Prussack	LIRR	718-558-8173
Ernest Athanailos	NYCDOT	718-786-8853
Shelley Prettyman	MTA-HQ	212-878-0236
Sofia Kim	MTA-HQ	212-878-1285
Jon Roper	MTA-HQ	212-878-7007
Thusitha Chantra	NYMTC	212-383-7233
Abiyu Berlie	MTA B&T	646-252-7102
Ira Huttner	PANYNJ	212-435-3121
Tom Batz	TRANSCOM	201-963-4033
Raj Amin	NYS DOT R.11	718-482-4734
Karen Johnson	NYCDCP	212-442-4717
Robert S. Jaffe	ConSysTec	914-248-8466
Manny Insignares	ConSysTec	212-687-7911

INTERAGENCY ITS SUB-REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE

Date: February 28, 2007 **Time:** 10:00 AM to 12:30 PM

Location: NYSDOT - REGION 11

47-40 21st Street, LIC, N.Y. 7th Fl. Conf. Room

AGENDA

1. Introductions and Announcements (5 min.)
2. National Architecture Update (30 min.)
 - * Version 6.0
 - * Federal Perspective
3. Uncompleted Issues (30 min.)
 - * Web Security of Document
 - * Architecture Maintenance Activities
4. NYC Sub-regional Architecture (60 min.)
 - * Agency Experiences
 - * Changes to Architecture Elements
 - * Project System Engineering Analysis
 - * Project Sequencing
5. Training Opportunities (10 min.)
6. Next Architecture Steps for Consideration (15 min.)