



PTIC 05 December 2024

Video: https://youtu.be/MvDJUobz_ul

Video timings for the start of each agenda item are provided below.

Actions in red text

Opportunities to engage/test/feedback in green text

Contents

PTIC 05 December 2024.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
1.1. Apologies.....	2
2. Notes of last meeting 26 September 2024.....	2
3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (3:22 - 38:05).....	3
Procurement.....	3
BODS development.....	3
Upcoming features.....	4
3.3.PTI-TXC Profile Application Notes (Dead Runs & Day Shift) (38.05 - 42:35).....	7
3.4.Fares Profile Update (42:35 - 46:08).....	7
4. NaPTAN (46:08 - 1:14:07).....	8
5. Traveline Update (1:14:07 - 1:26:07).....	10
6. Christmas Data (1:26:07 - 1:30:05).....	12
7. Accessible Information Regulations (1:30:05 - 1:50:39).....	13
8. Content Management to Display Interface (RTIG T047) (1:50:39 - 1:52:28).....	16
9. EU Standards Development (1:52:28 - 1:59:15).....	16
10. Bus Centre of Excellence (1:59:15 - 1:59:23).....	17
11. Issue Log (1:59:23 - 2:00:15).....	17
12. Next Meeting (2:00:15 - 2:01:15).....	17
AOB (2:01:15 - end).....	18



1. Introduction

- Ian Barrett, Lancashire County Council
- Mike Baxter, Leicester City Council
- Justin Bloom, Vix
- Nic Cary, DEFT153
- Bethany Fallon, Podaris
- Ewa Glowacka, KMPG
- Josh Goodwin, bustimes
- Dr. J Harrison, DfT
- Teresa Jolley, DEFT153
- Mike Nolan, Traveline
- Triumph Okojie, DfT
- Steven Penn, KPMG
- Dan Saunders, Basemap
- Jonathan Raper, Transport API
- Tim Rivett, RTIG
- Chris Sherry, Passenger
- Nick Truscott, Cornwall Council
- Keith Willis, React Accessibility
- Tricia Wright, Nottinghamshire Council

1.1. Apologies

- Peter Stoner, Ito World
- Keith Sabin, Shropshire Council
- John Austin, South End
- Rob West, Elydium

2. Notes of last meeting 26 September 2024

1 action - done

Opportunities to engage for:

- PlusBus
- Christmas data
- Bus Centre of Excellence



3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (3:22 - 38:05)

update from Triumph

Programme updates, and procurement and ambitions

Procurement

- RQI in March, supplier day
- SQ in July with intention for ITT soon after, but has been delayed a bit to ensure assurance and robustness
- Republished Selection Questionnaire again in October for submission deadline in November. Increased number of responses, taking some time to review
- Current plan is governance, evaluation, moderation and selection of suppliers in December. Governance might take a bit longer into early Jan.
- Intend to release ITT in January 2025. Might be a bit delayed.

BODS development

updates since last time ...

- developed internal warehouse to store data from beginning of BODS. Currently data held in manner that supports the programme and products like ABODS as well as development requirements.
- consideration for making the historical dataset available for public consumption, but concerns about volume and cost of processing, plus concerns about need for that public availability translating into sustained usage.
- going through gov/assurance/evaluation of this, to help us decide whether and how to commit to that if we decide to do it.

Released data quality and centralised / integrated AVL services at end of August

- to replace 3rd party solutions that underpinned BODS.
- Now have open source open code DfT source. Continued iterating improvements on these services, including AVL to develop subscription API capabilities for AVL service.

NCSD Coach service dataset

Transitioning away from the incumbent process for providing this.

Since August, when we released the service, we have taken on board feedback from industry on scope, validity of data etc, and have been working with industry on how we provide this dataset. Will be provided through in BODS and in near future, hope it becomes single source of truth, from DfT perspective of coach service dataset.



Upcoming features

New ABODS - we have rebuilt the service allowing us to extricate ourselves from suboptimal arrangements with 3rd party suppliers providing parts of the service on proprietary software-as-a-service basis.

We wanted to bring in-house for DfT ownership and control, and increase openness and transparency, and engage the industry in building and the articulation of the logics algorithms around analysis etc.

Engaged with industry for user research to understand pain points, and involved industry on logic for algorithms for defining analysis and reporting

User acceptance testing completed - good feedback, for what bus operators and Local Authorities understand to be needed on the ground

Bit more work to do - retrospective application of new algorithms to historical dataset, and a few other things

Aim to launch this service in Q1 next year.

Then, may want to add details of detailed compliance metrics etc. to give as complete-a picture they can get about status of data on BODS

Cancellations service on BODS:

ambitions on aggregated Real-Time cancellations data from big 5 operators. Voluntary participation, if this continues, aim to launch this Q1/Q2 next year.

Hopefully in addition RTI RT schedule and AVL data, can provide some cancellations data as well.

Continued improvement on devolved registrations portal, to improve accuracy and completeness, along with improving interactions with various stages of registrations data.

Big things we hear from industry in development of TXC tool - not operating optimally. Past 12-18 months, committed to providing an alternative tool through Powys County Council but due to procurement technicalities in DfT, this will no longer be available to us.

So need to review options available to us. Industry research, governance and assurance on TransxChange tools, on where we are. Evaluating various options for providing TransxChange tool for industry to supply TransxChange to BODS.



Want to make sure we making optimal decision on how we provide a new improved TransxChange tool that meets user need effectively, and meets ambitions of BODS and DfT.

Discussion / Q+A

Nic: continue to be blown away by amount of work being undertaken. On TransxChange tool - I know it wasn't easy for some operators to use - has the Department considered opportunity to tender a service provided by a 3rd party, where they provide a simple interface under license which smaller operators etc could use

Triumph: yep that is an option. Part of valuation of how that fits into the current backlog and workload, size of the team etc. If we would run a procurement like this, might be after BODS and ABODS. We don't have a position on it yet, but it is an option.

Dan Saunders: ABODS redevelopment and data warehouse. Interest to get access to historical data, expensive. Can ABODS be opened up to non private sector? DfT ABODS providing historical AVL data, but maybe might not happen?

Triumph:

data warehouse - not ruling out publicly available data for the warehouse. But we are saying there are implications to providing this, and assess these against cost and other departmental objectives and perspectives in DfT, and decide if and how we do make it available.

We understand the value of historic data, innovation and research, but need to make sure we make the most robust decision around how.

2nd bit - ABODS. Opening up externally, there is an appetite for it. However, there are considerations - we are thinking of, but something we are evaluating. Other stakeholders who have a vested interest in ABODS being publicly available.

Dan: AVL data - do we want to start investing development resource to do this ourselves, or will this be done by DfT. State of limbo - hard to make commercial decision. Knowing would be better.

Tim: if others would have a business case for accessing ABODS - share with Triumph for use cases for accessing it. Some sort of commercial arrangement to cover costs of data transfer etc. **Share your cases / ideas with Triumph.**

Chris Sherry: prioritisation question. Why deciding to focus on tools about analysing the data in BODS vs tools to help get more accurate data into BODS to analyse that. Quality and Quantity of data in vs data out?

Triumph: Not so much about prioritising one over the other. Ambitions to provide service that provides reporting and analysis that adds value and is of benefit to bus operators and local



authorities. Also understand that quality of tools for publishing to BODS influences what's in it. Have provided a Create Fares data service. Can't go into that market, given interaction with ticketing systems etc. However, provided funding to provide CapEx to bus operators to procure the tools and services required to provide AVL services to BODS.

Also TXC tool. Assumption we made - didn't quite add up, in terms how we provided a more robust tool. Make plans and assumptions, and things don't go to plan. Thought we had a good plan, and life has blown that plan up! So we have to reassess our options to resolve that.

Chris: I struggle with a bit - putting data into BODS is a legal requirement, and getting it out is not.

Triumph: ABODS allows them to export data and demonstrate punctuality data. We are equally as committed on both sides, and want to provide robust services.

Dan Saunders: TransxChange tool. Was there also a NeTEx fare tool? Also not great feedback on?

Triumph: there is a Create Fares tool, that support NeTEx tool. Unlike you, not aware of negative feedback - please share if you have it?!

Dan: feedback was on providing both tools as a pair.

Triumph: providing a tool that does both is not discounted, but there's a lot of harmonisation of standards for that. Part of the evolution and monitoring process.

Someone might be considering adopting that Fares tool. Need to sort out the TransxChange bit. If we can help do both at the same time, then it might be one option.

Ewa G, KMPG: Create Fares tool live in 2020 - iteratively developed following feedback from operators, include some large operators including First. It will be further developed as per request from operators. First tool we know produced for fares. Used this to guide development of mobile apps. Other smaller digital services use the open source code to develop their businesses and products. Also have seen other bigger players who are providing fares submission to BODS - using open code to develop their understanding.

Don't know where the confusion is coming from. Combination of fares and TransxChange - an option and makes sense logically. But we are looking at it.

Data quality: a lot of tools on BODS for operators and local authorities to review data quality - pushing and encouraging people to use it and improve data quality.

Analysing vs data quality: a lot of data and analysis highlights data quality issues. Would love to highlight to operators and consumers.



3.3.PTI-TXC Profile Application Notes (Dead Runs & Day Shift) (38.05 - 42:35)

Tim: challenges, errors and inconsistencies found - shared update through PTIC before sharing with DfT.

Application notes on:

Dead runs - to position a vehicle to the start of its first running service, or between routes if not ending/starting at the same stop. Useful for RTI as it allows for predictions to be generated before journeys start. There are different interpretations for how deadrun start times should be interpreted/coded, so the note has been added to help clarify and resolve this

Day shifts: so far - feedback on this has been slightly more controversial. Where you might have a journey in early hours of Sunday morning, but from a passenger information perspective, might want to show it on the day before's timetable. Error in profile documentation where if submitted it in accordance with that, it would have failed schema validation. Feedback so far - supposedly not a problem. But, people think we are stopping the use of day shifts. All we are saying is please use it in line with schema - integer. Use 1 not +1, (first is an integer, latter is a text field).

Q+A / Discussion

Nic: could software suppliers provide tooltip or synchronised response, so that unless integer entered, it won't work?

Tim: Most tools only allow you to put in an integer, but just one particular authority expected supplier follow letter of law, but most suppliers do follow this as you suggest.

3.4.Fares Profile Update (42:35 - 46:08)

Update from Steven Penn

Updated version of NetEx profile for BODS, related to removing requirements for stops and fare stages. More relevant - emails from official BODS communication channel stating that complex fares is being pushed back, and put deadline for provision of complex fares of 31 March 2025.

Profile already had sections in it relating to complex fares. Most of the information required in complex fares is already published in simple fares.

New stuff - prices calculated and money taken after the journey. Either tap at end of the day, or daily/weekly cap.

We will start working with major operators and suppliers in the new year to push this forward. Won't mean much to most smaller operators, - as not supplying tap in tap out or sophisticated capping platform.

Notes and Actions from the 05 December 2024 meeting

[Next meeting 06 March 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Extend fares validator to include complex fares rules. Once deadline passed, look at hard block for all noncompliant fares data. Curtains down for consistent fares data.

Tim: copy of updated profile document is on PTIC website.

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/files/BODS_NeTEx_Fares_profile_v1_1.pdf

CFDS tools as ability to create complex fares and caps.

No Q+A or discussion

4. NaPTAN (46:08 - 1:14:07)

Update from Dr J

Link to Mural:

<https://app.mural.co/t/digitalservice3659/m/digitalservice3659/1733407397416/1be127f9334065096d2920f8814144789b3a3cc3?sender=u719acef472ba7c4d42f34745>

Run through new stuff and new bit of what's going on

New stuff:

Rail - Rail Replacement (RR) buses. We need to get data together to enable PSV AIR on RR buses. Sounds simple!! **Currently getting a canonical list of rail stations - more challenging than you might imagine. Please offer your help with a good contacts / lists if you have them!!**

Currently only 3 rail platforms in NaPTAN!! Need many more to enable us to do this.

Some railway stations use local bus stops - nothing that needs to change except name that is given on the AVL messaging - often these stops are not named for the rail station. Might be duplication needed. Not duplicate bus stops, but some other sort of clever stuff, and will be called RRB. If you need to create a RRB stop in the middle of a carpark, and they enter the car park, operators don't think they are can start to use this in regular bus use.

We'll be starting work on this in Jan 2025

Rail Station Entrances are currently managed by Local Authorities. Wide variety of these, and how well the data information is managed. Even on good stations, several entrances that are missed - side entrances etc. So need to do pathways and accessibility etc. Going to take these into the central part and there will be some migration happening.

Why were Local Authorities managing the rail station names? Long history there!



We are going to look for right feed for rail station information from Network Rail, Rail Delivery Group, Darwin etc then build information needed, and have a human review for check and review.

Non-Passenger stops

Asked for from coaches and depots. We've figured out how we're going to do it, and there will be communications on this in Jan 2025. ATCO code 999 reserved for this. Stop on the M6 for a break. Stop needed for schedules to work, but not for passengers to get on and off.

Journey Planners will need to know about this and not publish these. Might also help with Deadruns as Tim mentioned earlier. Can be managed in BODS.

NaPTAN data quality issues

Work on active and inactive status, and modification date, creation date and revision number. Combination of things should give good metadata. Utopia not possible! Will publish our wish fields: Status field: good. Modification date - do not touch it!! Software glitches - different Local Authorities had problems with data issues. 3 fields - don't use because they are overwritten / not written consistency, and depends on software version and other bits and tweak, and which software version you've come from.

Bus operator trying to talk to Local Authority and talking to the right person in there.

FixMyStreet provides the right kind of form that we need. We are exploring with them how we can use that. We'll run a pilot with Local Authorities to test and see if it works. If this doesn't work, will explore a different solution. Allows Bus operators to report a bus stop to relevant Local Authority. Form = easier.

Accessible NaPTAN: Brenda to have the same experience as others.

Currently adding in visual cane users: wheelchairs and this. World-beating. Others might try wheelchairs in a locality, but not across 3 countries.

How?

- assess street furniture (with human or AI eyeballs)
- infer accessibility from street furniture

On target.

Showing outputs from first run of AI eyeballs. Machine Learning (ML) looking at image review. Minimal training at finding bus shelters - front or back to street. Some doorways in stops - not as accessible for wheelchairs, as little room to manoeuvre in and out off. Parish bus stops - built in style of parish - stone etc. Hedgehog tunnels...?!

Notes and Actions from the 05 December 2024 meeting

[Next meeting 06 March 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Currently tuning up the ML learning to see things better and properly. No hallucinations / lying about what it sees!!!

Should have 5-7 Local Authorities mapped out with AI eyeballs and available in the API for testing by end Jan 2025. Improving workflows and pipelines ready for next steps.

Discussion / Q+A

Keith Willis: AI - good with floating bus stops?

Dr J: no as these are not accessible. So need to screen these out. Cannot guarantee accessibility of piece of street. Cuts number of bus stops from 400,000 down to 350,000.

Only looking at active marked bus stops.

Keith: DfT BODS - how best to do TransXChange and NeTEx tool - have you reconsidered from lessons learnt - can it be done from NaPTAN - consistency of data going into it?

Dr.J: No, because there are multiple commercial suppliers of these tools - me disrupting that is not allowed. Am looking at creation of simplified tool for updating metro stations. I can devolve to Local Authorities the maintenance of their own metro station information. NPTG nightmare - all had access to edit it, but not all followed same rules. Means there are some wild variations in it - lack of consistency. Possible return of a tool like that.

Did consider what you are suggesting early on, but recognised we are not allowed to disrupt a commercial industry. My job is to take in the data people can give me. Given that NaPTAN hasn't changed from early 2000's, when I started in 2020, there was less than 15% of people on NaPTAN 2.4. Now 47% to 2.4. Push people to change when that adoption goes higher than 50%. Being mindful of impact of earlier versions still being in use.

Dan: who / how to be in private beta for A-NaPTAN?

Dr J: anyone who's providing a travel or journey planning role. Every journey planner we can find. Traveline, Citymapper, TfL go. Google. trying to negotiate with Moovit and Apple. Make sure what we are giving them can be displayed to passengers. Need this focussed feedback from tester users via the Journey Planning community. Keep limited to this until we go to public beta.

5. Traveline Update (1:14:07 - 1:26:07)

Update from Mike Nolan

last 6 months - web service procurement (x4 sites)

Notes and Actions from the 05 December 2024 meeting

[Next meeting 06 March 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

In very final stages now in agreeing contract with preferred supplier. Announcing in next couple of weeks. Excited for significant improvements in the Journey Planning experience, bringing in fares data, disruptions from BODS and vehicle tracking, as customers have asked for

Announcement in next few weeks. Supply a number of bus operators currently. Accomplished supplier

Plusbus: e-ticket trial in WYCA, Cambridge and Weston-super-Mare. No issues reported for purchasing and using tickets as a flashpass. Also, new User Acceptance Testing in Oxford - GoAhead and Ticketer to validate and scan tickets.

Plan to run this out next to Ticketer users in Q1-Q2 next year

Also working with TransMach, another ETM provider, working on testing the validation rules with them, too.

With Ticketer and TransMach, we are covering the majority of bus operators. More ETM suppliers to work with in the new year

Number of retailers selling tickets - TOCs in etickets. New retailer to come to market in new year. Significant step forward.

Q+A / Discussion:

Dr.J: very aware there are now 2 plusbus datasets - one in NaPTAN and the one Mike is creating. A plan once agreed so that we shall make 1 from 2. How we implement and make it work. We'll work it out later in 2025. Do not use version in NaPTAN!! Use Mike's version only

Jonathan Raper:

Nextbus - proxy to Local Authority systems for RTI. There are a number of places that have dropped off Nextbus recently: Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Bath, Bracknell Forest, Warrington, - big list!!

Clearly a lot of Local Authorities are no longer integrating with Nextbuses - lost a lot of coverage. Not in hands of Traveline - but the question is about what the future holds for that kind of proxying into Local Authority systems? Is it anticipated that some other national service is to be constructed?

Mike: Nextbuses - historic system. Feeds drop in and out. Tasked team to look at where coverage is and where missing. A lot of the time its a Local Authority changing their own systems and the previous setup exporting to NextBus is lost. There's a task on us to remind Local Authorities on the need to feed this. e.g. TfW - Welsh-wide feed. Should be something that's there. **People using**



it – so it’s on us to find gaps and try and fill them. Plan to continue existing contract for a few years. Please do let us know if you’d like us to follow up.

Jonathan Raper: more power to your elbow for getting this done / feeds restored

Mike: future - it’s also unclear if this is something BODS might cover. Talk of BODS providing some sort of national prediction service. We’re keeping NextBus for at least for next few years.

Jonathan Raper: should BODs enter market where no market failure?

Ian Barratt: Lancashire don’t have RTI any more. Some operators do, and feed it in.

Traveline data - sources becoming a quiz currently. Complaint that service not showing , but they were using BODS data rather than static data provided by Local Authority. **How do you work out who is providing the data live in Traveline?**

Mike: currently we only use data source from the regions. We are not using BODS in any of our output and occasionally operators.

Mike and Ian to follow-up separately, and check in with Ito and Google as well to confirm.

Nic: wrestling with this - Hertfordshire. Can share what we have found out with you.

Mike Baxter: Traveline data. In Leicestershire CC - they provide data to Traveline, but they tend to work behind times - sometimes it will be a bit out of date. If Local Authority is a bit late, then gaps? Leicestershire type it all in rather than drawing in TransXChange files from operators, and why it takes so long.

Mike: do take from First and Stagecoach directly, and rest is Local Authority.

6. Christmas Data (1:26:07 - 1:30:05)

Update from Tim

If trying to make data available for Traveline with lookahead for people to plan ahead Christmas journey - time has already passed!

Advice published in September on how to present this years data - what days were what in TxC.

Any problems or feedback on this that need to be aware of, so we can learn for next year?



Discussion: Nick Truscott: bespoke rather than coding for early runoff. Still no consistent way of production at operator level.

Tim: early runoff problem. Peter Stoner would say we need to do something about early runoffs as per PRI profile. I'm all ears for this for operators who have to do things differently each year

Nick T: operators - I ended up manually adding early runoff designation to those trips and it all works fine in Real Time system. Sometimes the finer parts of managing the data is not passed down to those creating the data.

Ian B: Lancashire - created dataset to do it. Several hundred files.

Chris Sherry: 2026 is the next time it gets very challenging - Christmas and Christmas Holidays come into play due to where they fall in relation to weekends.

Tim: Share learning to help us bed things in

7. Accessible Information Regulations (1:30:05 - 1:50:39)

Update from Tim

Airing from Dr J who is doing sterling work on Rail Replacement, which is one of the toughest challenge of Accessible Information Regulations. This is where bus operators need to have Audio Visual and hearing loop fitted to vehicles running local bus services. RR services is captured as any vehicle running less than 15 miles between pickup and drop off of passengers is classed a a local bus service.

Exemptions were put in place for fitting of equipment - expire in 2026. So there is a push on to sort our Rail Replacement between now and then.

Several parts to this:

- getting data sorted out - first part - Dr J working on. Where do Rail Replacement Buses stop? (Jonathan Raper has had much experience on this years ago)
- route that they are taking - not always known in advance
- AV equipment needs to know the route the vehicle is taking, name of stops and how to pronounce them properly. Currently route and recording of audio needs to be done significantly in advance. If you have kit from supplier A in one vehicle and supplier B on another - that means you have to do it twice!
- How do we get to point where if you built route in Supplier A back office, how do you get it in to supplier B back office?
- RTIG leading work in Jan 2025 to produce an interchange format that will enable route data and pronouncements to be shared between systems and make things happen more



easily. Not just problem for RR, it's a challenge for some small bus service operators, so a couple of sponsors from major conurbations who are also interested in this, where they might be providing bureau service to operators

Ian Barratt: inclination to update NaPTAN database isn't often a priority. So how does it go on when stop names change? A dynamic link? Can't get anything from our operators on what they do.

Tim: AV systems either do text-to-speech on the fly, or pre-recorded. If change a stop name - update datasets, it should be reflected. Pre-recorded stop names is more tricky. Text-to-speech useful for this reason.

Nick Truscott: experience in stop naming updates in NaPTAN - stop locations. Reluctance from operators to apply it in their systems. One system breaks all their mapping if you change NaPTAN. Then have to remap the entire service, which is added workload. No capacity to do this. Feel that some of the software needs to be more flexible. Moving a NaPTAN stops slightly shouldn't break the entire service. Software should be able to update in backend. Battling against some behind software.

School bus - large operator - not tracking start and end of journey. RT system was importing the operators version of stop location and overwriting the NaPTAN version. Question in my head - of the 5,500 stops in Cornwall, how many do bus operators have slightly differently in their systems? This should not be the case in this day and age of data APIs.

Tim: Yep. This should be improved in time. Checks in BODS potentially, that compare to NaPTAN.

Nick Truscott: Checks and balances around stop location. If lat/long / E/N 20m out from NaPTAN - should flag an alert?

Tim: Don't need to have the location in the TxC file. Operators should just provide the stop code. Don't unfortunately catch that. Something to think about

Keith: on-bus audio - transferring files between different operators. this would be useful for on-street displays too.

Tim: Yep. useful set of things it will pick up.

Dr J: One of last NaPTAN meetings (YouTube videos) was around stop naming, indicators, summary = not got a good way of naming stops. Varies wildly across the country. There is a character limit in NaPTAN, but only place it is strongly enforced is in the CSV files. **Want to change how people get to the data in CSV file. Look at increasing the name length. Future thing to think about. What is a reasonable length? What do you think? Currently 48 characters. Common name and short common name currently have the same length restrictions, based on the systems you are using.**



Differences in Common names coming from TxC and NaPTAN and building a report to share with Local Authorities to let them know where bus operators are renaming them. This is driving many people nuts! People are trying to do the right naming and build good naming conventions, then it is being overwritten. This affects what is shown on RTI screens and name on bus stops, and names on buses don't match.

e.g. Local Old Kent Road Tesco's, London. Want to get ahold of it and show how crazy it

TJ: sounds like a useful tool. There are some reasons why NaPTAN fields are not used by bus operators. Building their own tools, using their versions of the stop name.

Dr. J: getting a handle on it, and how what is done locally as well as making it in NaPTAN. Focus should be on use for passengers.

Tim: sometimes we lose sight of what is useful for the passenger.

Nick T: stop naming - operators have their preferred names in the scheduling systems. Publicity production - if a stop is locally known as something that is what the NaPTAN name should be called. Fortunate that our two main operators are on board with it,

Nic C: endorse this view. NaPTAN can support quite a lot. Should not disregard the fact that bus drivers understand passengers - colloquial stuff is very useful and shouldn't discount it. Trouble though - we look at problem of changing NaPTAN - hard work for Local Authorities to change it,. Can't improve something unless give people chance to improve it.

Nick T: Our approach is our door always open.

Mike B: Stop Names was one of Roger Slevin's key things? Names associated with side-roads etc. Sticking religiously to gospel rule doesn't always work.

Jonathan Raper: some stop names have been redacted because they don't meet equality legislation.

Dr. J: know of one, on the run between M1 and M25, one of the stops is of the local pub - relatively offensive. Can we rename the pub and the stop..?!



8. Content Management to Display Interface (RTIG T047) (1:50:39 - 1:52:28)

Update from Tim

Interface standard that allows you to plug one system into another suppliers system. Using stop name and timetable information.

Last 18 months, initial implementations carried out and has flagged up challenges. Working Group working through what needs to happen to make the standard work in real life. Likely to be a new version out in the next few weeks - Christmas / New Year.

Can also be used for accessible displays on bus. Considered across other countries too. We're paving the way here in the UK.

9. EU Standards Development (1:52:28 - 1:59:15)

Update from Tim

Lots going on with standard of historical data and format of that. Progressing well. Mid-2025 plan for first outputs available.

Work to link to historical data - produce a common glossary of terms used EU legislation across PT data standards - to improve some understanding and commonality of that. Work of love by a few people. Interesting how EU legislation is inconsistent in use of terminology. Useful bit of work when done.

Work due to start on vehicle data. At the moment, not a model for vehicle data: speed, acceleration/deceleration, how much charge is left in battery / cell of battery. Work starts on this in Jan to develop a data model.

SIRI work is starting to prepare for latest update to SIRI. Documents from last update have only just been formally agreed by CEN. Technical work done a few years ago. Control actions that affect cancellation and driver changes. Operational stuff not passenger information-related.

EU profile for Real Time data - requirement for MMTIS systems - EU Directive. Just going through approvals process. Suppliers doing work to implement this over next few months

Notes and Actions from the 05 December 2024 meeting

[Next meeting 06 March 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

NeTEx will be a bit more stable now in next few years.

Transmodel - with exception of vehicle data stuff, lots of work done to update general model, and not much movement currently. Lady overseeing that from France is retiring, it will take a few years for someone else to take up that role and understand what has been done since she has been in charge over last 20 years.

Q+A/Discussion

Dr J: if we can get into conversation with the accessibility ones - even if only so we can present what we are doing with A+ NaPTAN, this would be interesting / challenging / mind blowing.

Tim: meeting recently with people responsible for MMTIS and Napcore X (NaPTAN for Europe). Project X is the one to progress that in 2025. She was extremely interested in how we are proposing to use AI.

Dr J: aware of challenge of planning a bus journey across a boundary in Germany, let alone countries.

Tim: no national dataset.

Dr.J: Deutsche Bahn rail work - they are amazed at what we can do

Action for Tim to do intros of Dr J and team's work to EU teams with interest in learning from us

10. Bus Centre of Excellence (1:59:15 - 1:59:23)

Update from Tim

Not a lot of change

11. Issue Log (1:59:23 - 2:00:15)

Please raise an issue!! No formal issues raised for resolution.

12. Next Meeting (2:00:15 - 2:01:15)

Proposed times, checked against industry events etc

- Thursday 6 March 2025 14:00
- Thursday 5 June 2025 14:00
- Thursday 18 September 2025 14:00
- Thursday 4 December 2025 14:00



AOB (2:01:15 - end)

Nic: applies to those working for Local Authorities on RTI - stems from work done for Hertfordshire. Graphing from data on BODS.

For RTI providers, ideally want to central place for timetables, rather than running boards from every single operator. BODS is obvious central place. But currently, where Ticketer supplies the timetable data on behalf of operators to BODS, they are stripping out Block Number.

Helpful chat with BODS team, and aware of this issue. But how do we resolve this? We're on the scent. Had helpful correspondence with Omnibus and BODS team.

Cunning plan in BODS to patch the data. Hope if we can succeed, as it could be a solution adopted nationally.

Nick T: slight variation on that theme - we have an operator who uploads data to BODS every week to account for changes to scheduling. Quite excessive. Should only be uploading anything that's changed

We picked it up through the BODS compliance report - dropping off 42-day compliance because they had hard end dates for when the file expired, and that this was not a far-enough (42-day +) lookahead.

Uploading database on operating period - due to end within 42 days - coming up as not correctly loaded in scope date.

Doing weekly updates to keep block number to date. Not an ideal situation for sure.

Teresa: the bigger challenge is keeping the block number up to date to make a match with AVL. Ticketer offer service to upload timetable but stripping block number out.

David: we don't load block to BODS because it's not mandatory, so we've not done it.

Triumph: in spirit of all trying to achieve, for matching data, as an industry we should be collaborating enough to provide data in datasets that are beyond mandatory.

Nic: completely endorse that view.

Not mandatory, but if Ticketer did include block number, in 20%-40% of cases it would be wrong in many cases. Legitimate to strip it out at the moment.

Notes and Actions from the 05 December 2024 meeting

[Next meeting 06 March 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

BODS solution - take a ticket machine file - have a way of patching that into the Ticketer-provided files. Update zip-files with an updated ticket machine file.

Triumph: a conversation to reach out with you for Nic

Jonathan: Block number is not the only way. Fuzzy matching is a way to do it.

Nic: Indeed, but with cross-journey matching, it's browned out.

Mike B: surprised that block numbers changed on a weekly basis. Usually, a smallish operator in Leicestershire, tends to change it when goes from term- to holiday- time.

Nic: Yep absolutely right, but for the larger operators - it's a more volatile dataset

Nick T: road works are a big part of this. Have disruptions in BODS system. Many of these are big enough to involve scheduled change.

Action for Nic C and Triumph to chat.