Border Information Flow Architecture Working Group
Summary of Apr 29, 2004 Meeting

Subject: Border Information Flow Architecture Working Group (BIFAWG)
Meeting in Conjunction with Transportation Border Working Group w/ Teleconference
Participants on April 29, 2004

Purpose/Desired Outcomes:

The third meeting of the BIFAWG was held in conjunction with the Transportation Border
Working Group (TBWG) on 29 April 04 in Washington, DC. Several members unable to attend
the TBWG participated in the meeting via teleconference. The desired accomplishments of the
meeting were to discuss Steering Committee Make-up, review steering committee nominations
and make selections, and to conduct a roundtable discussion on project. The roundtable
discussion topics included project scope, needs and benefits, and short term objectives.

Opening:
Mike Onder, FHWA and Madeleine Betts, Transport Canada opened the meeting with a recap of
the project and a brief discussion of accomplishments to date and introductions of the
participants.

Attendees:
See Attached Attendee List

Key Discussion

Mr. Jonathan Sabean led a discussion on the Steering Committee procedures and nomination and
selection of members. The group discussed the make-up of the steering committee. At the March
24, 2004 BIFAWG meeting, it was decided that the Steering Committee will be made up of 10
representatives, one representative only from each side of the border from the following groups:
1. The co-chairs;
2. states/provinces;
3. Customs;
4. a regional planning organization; and
5. Homeland Security, which could also represent First Responders

There was at least one representative nominated in each of the categories above with the
exception of #5. It was decided that we would continue to seek representation and participation
"5" above, however, not having a steering committee name is not imperative and the group could
precede with an 8-member steering committee. The following is a summary of nominations and
selections.

Name	Organization	Nominated By	Group Represented	Status
Susan Spencer/ Madeleine Betts	Transport Canada		Co-Chair	Selection Confirmed
Mike Onder	FHWA		Co-Chair	Selection Confirmed
Hugh Conroy	Whatcom Council of Governments	Mimi Sukhdeo,	Regional Planning Organization	Selection Confirmed

Gordon Peters	NY State DOT	Gerard Cioffi	State DOT	Selection Confirmed
* Mimi Sukhdeo	Transport Canada	Gordon Rogers	Other	Pending
* Luc Lefebvre	MTQ	Karen Songhurst	Province	Pending
* Stephen Erwin	Ministry of Transportation Ontario	Self	Province	Pending
* Keith Fortowsky	Province of Sesqui	Self	Province	Pending
Wayne Sauer	Canada CBSA	Self	Canadian Customs	Selection Confirmed
	US Customs (CBP)	TBD	TBD	TBD

*Keith Fortowsky agreed to host a meeting with the Canadian provincial nominees to determine how best to have the group represented on the Steering Committee.

FHWA took an action to continue outreach to US CBP to solicit participation for the group. Transport Canada will work to find a representative for the Canadian regional planning organization.

Jonathan reiterated that the steering committee is responsible for directing the activities of the BIFAWG and coordinating/preparing the majority of the deliverables. The group will meet at least monthly by teleconference. The large body Working Group will be composed of 15-30 representatives from agencies involved in processes at or on the approach to the border. Members will be expected to contribute material and information, and play a feedback and advisory role. The larger body of the BIFAWG will meet bi-monthly by teleconference and report back to the TBWG on a semi-annual basis.

In addition to the steering committee and large body of the working group, the participants at the meeting agreed with concept of maintaining a contact list of Stakeholders who need to be consulted and other groups/organizations that should be kept informed of the BIFAWG activities.

Ms. Crystal Jones led a roundtable discussion. The discussion provided an opportunity for participants to speak about
- the need for border information flow architecture and agency expectations of the project
- why a border architecture is relevant to your region and your work.
- how the region for the architecture should be defined
- agency's current activities in regional architecture development, bi-national information sharing initiatives etc.
  - the benefits you feel your region has for the development of a border architecture
  - What disconnects were identified during the implementation of the initiative
  - What further gaps were subsequently identified which have not been addressed
- discuss the qualitative benefits of a border information flow architecture
- preliminary level of (non-financial) support on both sides of the border.

Some key areas of discussion included:
- Use of a tool like Turbo Architecture to support the initiative

- Identifying needs that the architecture will address
- Conduct of a facilitated workshop to move the architecture development forward
- Analysis of current initiatives to identify shortcomings that need to addressed
- How the groups work fits into the National ITS architectures of the US and Canada

Other Business:
The group committed to provide a bi-monthly report to the TBWG on the status of the initiative.

Proposed Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

Steering Committee
Jun 2, 2004, 2:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Entire BIFAWG
Jun 30, 2004, 2:00 – 3:00pm

Proposed Agenda Items
2 June Steering Committee Meeting
- Review and discuss detailed task and who group should organize itself to complete work
- Discuss stakeholders and their role in the project
- A Facilitated Workshop on development of the architecture

Proposed Agenda Items
TBD by Steering Committee.

Meeting Summary Prepared by: Mr. Jonathan Sabean
                                 Ms. Crystal Jones

Approved by: Mr. Michael Onder
                                 Ms. Madeleine Betts