CHARM – Kick-off Market Consultation
29 March 2012; Amsterdam RAI
http://www.rijkswaterstaat.nl/CHARM
pincharmindustryday@highways.gsi.gov.uk

Session 1 (10:30 – 11:15)

Ton Coertjens, liaising officer at Rijkswaterstaat, opens the first session at 10:30 and welcomes the audience to the session. The reason for the market consultation is that the CHARM programme needs the feedback from industry to implement the best ideas and solutions. Before the session really starts Ton emphasises the fact that all questions asked and answers given during the session will be published online. He gives the panel the opportunity to introduce themselves:

- Karin Visser, National Traffic Manager of RWS
- James Lowth, Head of Control Rooms, represents the internal users of TMCs.
- Bob Castleman, Divisional director of Traffic Technology Division at the Highways Agency.
- Johann Visser, Programme manager at Rijkswaterstaat.
- Ian Chalmers, Programme manager at the Highways Agency.

Ton starts session 1 with asking several questions about the CHARM programme to the panel.

1. *Why do HA and RWS undertake the CHARM programme?*
   Bob Castleman: The Highways Agency (HA) and Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) respectively, are responsible for the operation and maintenance of the English and Netherlands motorway and trunk road networks. Road traffic is monitored and communicated to using roadside technology that is governed by control rooms in traffic management centres. Both organisations have the requirement to update/refresh the control room technology. They have joined up in order to develop a requirement for a new generation of traffic management (centre) systems that may be jointly procured. This work is being completed under the CHARM programme and will be completed by the end of December 2012. The CHARM programme has identified that 90% of the functionality of HA and RWS control rooms are the same. They have therefore agreed for the CHARM programme to explore the joint procurement of a replacement for their existing control room systems

2. *What are the main challenges for traffic management operations?*
   James Lowth: Much of the work in the TMC (Traffic Management Centre) can be very reactive, for example handling incidents. Some work can be proactive, e.g. if operators can predict a problem on the network, measures can be delivered to alleviate prospective situations.

   The TMC Operator role is to support the road operators' objectives of improving journey reliability and reduction of incident related congestion, and monitor the operation of the network by analysing information from various sources such as traffic management systems, police, CCTV, historic and predicted traffic patterns.

   TMC operators use this information to set roadside signals/signs, deploy roadside resources such as Traffic Officers and Incident Support Units as well as liaising with Police, request the attendance of other emergency services, and provide information to road users and others (like other road / traffic management operators). A limited number of these tasks are safety critical (e.g. tidal flow)

3. *Which problems do HA and RWS face regarding their current traffic management systems?*
   Johann Visser: Currently all TMCs are custom-built. The evolutionary development of TMCs has led to a collection of hardly integrated, partly legacy systems. The technology in these centres remains highly fragmented and prone to vendor lock-in and the cost of ownership is high. There is no overall ICT architecture available that is open, modular and adaptable to future development.

4. *How do HA and RWS envision a new generation of traffic management systems to be significantly different from the current set of systems?*
   Bob Castleman: The CHARM programme will deliver a strategy for procuring a joint solution that will meet the following requirements:

   •Flexible
   •Scalable
   •Cost Effective
   •Continuity of service
   •Easily configured
   •Easy to do business with
   •Adaptable
   •No technology or vendor lock in
   •Ergonomic Design

5. *Why are HA and RWS in this together?*
   Johann Visser: HA and RWS are similar organisations with similar challenges and a long-standing relationship. We manage the traffic in some of the busiest areas in the world using a similar approach.

   By doing this together we hope to create an incentive to industry. We hope the prospect of 9 new TMCs in the next decade will entice industry to offer us solutions that better meet our requirements.

   Karen Visser: The CEO's of the Highways Agency Graham Dalton and Rijkswaterstaat Jan Hendrik Dronkers, have a strong commitment to collaborate in this programme. Two weeks ago, they have confirmed this commitment when they met in Brussels and were informed about the progress of CHARM by Johann Visser.

   Being the chair of the Governance Board of CHARM, I have been monitoring the progress of the programme in detail. And I have discovered that our organisations are not only performing the same processes for about 90% at this moment, additionally we share a vision how we would like to operate Traffic Management in the near future. This means that we are even more aligning our businesses in a way that enables to define and procure common functionality. This enables our organisations to make a strong statement to the marketplace.

   Another aspect that I would like to emphasis is the effective cooperation that has been achieved in the past year working together as ONE team. Several working groups are in place consisting of both English and Dutch participants, with regular meetings and effective exchange of

information. This has lead to timely delivery of the process comparison, the PCP challenge about you will hear more in the second session and in the preparation of this Industry Event.

6. *Are HA and RWS traffic management operations sufficiently similar to be supported by shared information systems?*
   James Lowth: Yes, the analysis of HA and RWS processes has shown that the processes are similar for over 90%. We have analysed these processes in detail, since this is the basis for further collaboration. HA and RWS are currently drawing up common business requirements, user needs, and functions based in large part on this comparison.

7. *Are other road operators / traffic management authorities involved?*
   Ian Chalmers: The CHARM programme is governed by a Governance Board with representatives of HA and RWS at board level. In addition, a "Sounding Board" is composed of representatives of European road authorities / governments and (inter-) national ITS organizations. Currently its membership covers the UK, Ireland, Sweden, Germany, Austria, France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

8. *What would HA and RWS like to get out of this market consultation process?*
   Bob Castleman: The objective of the market consultation is to enable the market place to show how the future strategy and objectives of HA & RWS can be realised from a wide range of leading suppliers.

   Round 1 has the objective to enable the market place to provide RWS and HA with an insight in the capability of wide range of leading suppliers in meeting the requirement.

   Round 2 has the objective to obtain a clearer and more detailed insight in the potential solutions that industry can offer that meet the ambitions of HA and RWS.

9. *What's in it for the industry?*
   Johann Visser: By providing input to the market consultation Industry can help shape procurement strategy for TMCs in the Netherlands and England. With CHARM we hope to give the opportunity to deliver (parts) of TMCs to the best available suppliers.

Ton continues to the next item of this session and invites the audience to ask any further questions to the panel:

Question 1 *What role would (innovation??) play when you look forward?*

Bob Castleman: One of the aims of the CHARM programme is to use existing technology in stead of bespoke technology. Both organisations have experience with programmes focused on bespoke technology and unfortunately those programmes failed.

Question 2 *Could you please elaborate more on the scope of CHARM? Will CHARM also encompass the integration with regional networks?*

Bob Castleman: We envisage that the future systems have an open character and that it will be flexible and scalable. These features will make it possible to treat (all) English roads as one network. The same goes for the Dutch road network.

Johann Visser: Rijkswaterstaat is collaborating much more with regional road operators compared with five years ago. This collaboration will continue in the future and thus RWS will take this trend into account during the CHARM programme.

Question 3 *Are there any plans about the first procurement of the new generation of TMCs?*

Johann Visser: The first TMC that will be renewed in the future is an RWS TMC. This TMC in the south of the Netherlands will have to be renewed in 2014. This short timescale gives the CHARM programme an incentive to steer towards existing or proven technology as much as possible to reduce implementation risks.

Question 4 *Will the CHARM programme use the COTS (Commercial Of The Shelf) or the PCP (Pre Commercial Procurement) approach to realize the programme aims?*

Bob Castleman: The CHARM programme will use both approaches for different aspects within the programme. For the majority of the specifications, the COTS approach can be used to procure existing technology. For some areas further research will be needed and the PCP approach is a procedure that can be used to procure the required knowledge. I would like to ask for any suggestions regarding this matter as nothing is cast in stone.

Johann Visser: CHARM has identified several areas where PCP can/will be used for further development. One of the requirements for these areas is that it must be compatible with the basic system(s) that will be the COTS products. The areas of PCP will be discussed further in Session 2 of this event.

Question 5 *Could you please elaborate more on the scope of CHARM? Will the programme also deal with roadside technology?*

Ian Chalmers: The current scope is limited to the Traffic Management Centre only. Due to the vastness of the roadside technology, this needs a long time to change.

Question 6 *When will the requirements for the TMCs presented that we as the industry need to meet?*

Ian Chalmers: We will go into further detail about the requirements in Session 2.

Question 7 When has the the first TMC to be in place by you CHARM programme?

Johann Visser: Geldrop is the first TMC that has to be rebuild and renovated in the Netherlands. The current planning leads towards delivery at the second quarter of 2014. However we understand that this will be very hard for the Industry to realise the new generation TMC functionality on this short term, however we thrive to get as little delay as possible.

Question 8 *Will the outcome of CHARM be publicly funded or will private funds play a role?*

Bob Castleman: This is one of the aspects that are not clear in the current phase of the programme. It could be that private finance will be used.

Question 9 *Could you please give an indication of the potential contract value?*

Bob Castleman: It is not yet clear what the costs of new TMC technology is.

Question 10 What are the next steps (both short and long term) for CHARM?

Johann Visser: This is too early to communicate yet. At the moment we are analysing all options and risks. One of the short term aims is to inventory the existing technology to see what could be used for CHARM.

Bob Castleman: We can already mention that the Highways Agency has 7 TMCs that need to be renewed in the next decade. We would like to implement a new solution as soon as possible to reap the benefits as soon as possible. We will act as fast as finance and industry allow.

Ton Coertjens thanks everybody for their questions and invites the participants of Session 2 to go to the next event room.

Session 2 (11:30 – 12:30)

Ton Coertjens, liaising officer at Rijkswaterstaat, opens the second session at 11:30 and welcomes the audience to the session. He gives the panel the opportunity to introduce themselves:

- Kees van der Kaa, CIO (Chief Information Officer of RWS)
- Bob Castleman, Divisional director of Traffic Technology Division at the Highways Agency.
- Johann Visser, Programme manager at Rijkswaterstaat.
- Ian Chalmers, Programme manager at the Highways Agency.

In this session Ian Chalmers has explained the business challenges of Traffic Management and gives a brief introduction what lead HA and RWS to perform this programme together. He indicates the 90% proven similarity between the business processes within both organisations which enables them to together perform this dialogue with the market together. And he challenges the market to share their vision with the CHARM programme in order to enable Highways Agency and Rijkswaterstaat to procure a next generation of functionality which can be provided by the Industry.

Johann Visser explains the process of the market consultation. Most of the information is also listed in the market consultation document.

Johann Visser explains the audience that the next generation functionality should be bases on proven technology. Additionally HA and RWS have defined three areas where they would develop innovations. These areas are briefly described as: (1) better real time predictions of the traffic situation, for instance 1 hour ahead and 4 hours ahead; (2) improved support for (generation of) traffic management scenario's (scenario's are ways to coordinated influence the traffic) and (3) how do we need to adjust our functionality in order to be prepared for cooperative-ITS. HA and RWS have submitted a grant for Pre Commercial Procurement at the European Commission. With this grant our organisations will try to co-finance the research and development of innovative functionality as mentioned above. The innovative modules will have to fit / be integrated in the architecture of CHARM which means that we try to avoid the generation of new "stove-pipe" applications. It will take about 3 years to explore the opportunities to realise these innovations which means that they do not belong to the initial scope of the first TMC in Geldrop.

After the presentations, the next questions have been posed;

Question 1:
There's a rumour that Flemish traffic management are taking part in the CHARM project and that rumour seems to be confirmed by the Flemish logo in the presentation.

Answer 1:
Flemish traffic management takes part in the international sounding board of the CHARM project. The chairman of the sounding board is Flemish. The Flemish are not committed to TMC replacements but are very keen on CHARM development. They may have investment plans in the future.

Question 2: Is there a possibility of shared data centres on traffic management between the two countries (England and the Netherlands) ?

Answer 2: Nothing is out of scope but we don't want scope creep. After reaching the initial goals, all is possible including this one.

Question 3: Is the presentation available?

Answer 3: The presentation will be published on the CHARM web site at www.rws.nl/CHARM

Kees van der Kaa thanks the 120 attendees in the meeting for their attendance and invites them to fill in the questionnaire and bringing their ideas to the CHARM programme. He emphasises that we need the support and input of the market place to make CHARM to a success. And he is looking forward towards a constructive cooperation.