

## **Public Transport Information Coordination (PTIC) group**

**Notes of a meeting held on 10 October 2012 from 1430 to 1600 at the Kia Oval.**

### **Attendance :**

Mark Cartwright (RTIG, chairman), Roger Slevin (traveline SEA, secretary), Chris Gibbard (Transport Direct), Jonathan Shewell-Cooper (Atos), Ian Barratt (ATCO), Mark Fell (TTR), Peter Miller (Ito), Peter Stoner (traveline), John Prince (SYPTTE), David Batchelor (independent), David Houston (First), Chas Allen (Stagecoach), Rob West (Omnibus), Peter Ratcliff (WYPTE)

**Apologies :** Keith Sabin (traveline WM), Hans Mentz (mdv), Nick Knowles (independent), Mike Ness (independent)

### ***1. Minutes of previous meeting***

Agreed without amendment.

Matters arising :

OSM use case list has been distributed – will discuss under Basemap item

Under previous AOBs CG had mentioned GB standards hosting role was at risk – but this has not come about as yet, and we are able to leave arrangements unchanged. RTIG offer to help with this remains open if required.

### ***2. Olympic legacy***

CG handed out a short paper which is also available to download. Paper covered a discussion on the things which might have a legacy from the Games – and the one with the most energy behind it is “accessible transport”. This is thought to have the potential for greatest impact in the future. Travel Demand Management may also be useful but there are only discrete situations in which it would be relevant. Venue modelling is a useful concept for elsewhere – it used NeTEx (IFOPT). Olympic Route Network was a novel approach to focus on key road routes, and penalise other routes – TD road journey planner managed to reflect ORN features. Real Time News in journeys through a Transport Coordination Centre. Novel ticket product – the Games travelcard – was linked to Journey planning. Data in advance of it being certain that it was correct. CG advised that TD is trying to achieve the legacy for accessible transport – and wants to find parties who will help with this and possibly with other legacies. PM asked what is happening about data collection on accessibility of stations – appears to be no resource from TD to produce advice or guidance at present. JourneyWeb 2.4 was necessary to make the journey planner work with these features. MC asked for comments back to RS

([solutions@slevin.plus.com](mailto:solutions@slevin.plus.com)) on the paper from CG for consideration at next meeting – particularly thoughts on priorities of the various items. JSC reminded us that Glasgow 2014 is next major event in GB.

### **3. *TNDS report***

PS reported that this is being produced on a weekly routine, and the database now has complete coverage – but not yet moving towards daily processes. London data is from London Data Store – which is the permanent base timetable data, without short term plan variations. RS advised this may also be the case to a more limited extent from other data created within mdv's DIVA database. TfL has agreed that the data they provide to SE region each week could be used for TNDS – SE is looking at how this could be delivered. Coach data is still a gap – a trial NCSD Export in TXC is available for testing. TD are seeking consent to publish. Rail data is also “open”. Over 100 subscribers to TNDS data so far (though some may just be curious rather than serious regular users of it). PS has looked at a week of logs and hopes to be able to get a longer period of logs to get a better understanding of take up. Looking now at accuracy of the data and becoming aware of deficiencies. Work to use National Operator Codes (NOC) is ongoing in several regions – but not yet complete on this. Key steps are to improve base data quality. There is a lot more work required to deal with holidays. No work done yet on interchanges.

OSM and mapping data use cases : if crowd sourcing is to be used then guidance would be essential and some leadership. Funding for this however does not exist. CG is keen to make use of data collated by the ODA – this at present is not open data, but TD will be asking the suppliers of that data if it can be made open. Discussion about the relevance of NaPTAN v3 or some other method to handle the accessible interchange info.

### **4. *Review of DRT API***

Nick Knowles was not at meeting – but had said he did not know about it. Geoff Duffel appears not to have made the model available for Nick to review. PS to follow up with Geoff to progress it

### **5. *Track data***

There have been calls from some members of the open data community to make tracking data available, where it is available. Could and should it be made available? Noted that the data is extremely verbose and repeated many many times even though it is predominantly static. Discussion over this suggested there is no business case for traveline regions to make it available in TNDS – traveline should focus on the things that are necessary to make information systems work. Others can process the data if they want



it – some traveline regions could make such data available (but several others do not hold it themselves as they work with on-the-fly routing using a routing engine to join the dots). RS commented that joining the dots is used extensively in SE, EA and EM regions – and has proved to be very accurate if the stop locations are correct and the road network turn restrictions are correct for buses.

## ***6. Persistence in timetable data***

There is no common position of what persistence means. Issues such as de-duplication are relevant to this question. However there is no business case for the travel information community to get involved in this – it is something that others need to embrace if it is to happen.

## ***7. Real time requirements for data in TXC***

No one indicated an interest in the question

## ***8. Correct use of PTP and TIP***

RS advised that a PTP is a stop which is included in the Registered particulars of a service – whilst TIP is an important stop that an operator wants to declare to the public but which is not a PTP (and therefore not a registered element of the timetable). Principal Point (PPT) is no longer relevant and probably could and should be deprecated in a future version of NaPTAN (it has already been removed from TXC Schema).

## ***9. Ireland***

Some testing is to be done in context of Northern Ireland whilst Eire already has its system working

## ***10. European Standards***

In NK's absence RS gave an update on the key work items.

SIRI v2 has now gone through the comments stage and final edits are expected to be completed by November, ready for final vote. It includes options for JSON or Google

Buffers which enable SIRI to be used for “direct to end user” communications. Bindings have been improved to make integration easier. A range of other minor edits and updates, along with a clean up of documentation, is also in this version – which will be a full CEN EN standard rather than a Technical Specification. A schema exists and is in use already. Approval expected by mid-2013.

NeTEx parts 1 (Network) and 2 (timetables) now have a stable schema. Documentation will be ready to go out for comment in November, with final approval expected before the end of 2013. Two significant existence proofs have been completed – one using VDV data in Switzerland, and the other using EDIFACT data from Romania. There are a large number of nations supporting the work.

NeTEx part 3 (fares) has taken FareXChange as a UK input – and work is proceeding steadily. UK risk arises from lack of funding support which may lead to non-participation. Work to date has been promising and a lot of examples have been tested. The “daily price cap” that is a product that was not feasible at the time of FareXChange, but is now part of the London Oyster arrangements, is something which UK alone is wanting to add.

Next NeTEx meeting will be in December.

Chris Queree is leading other work related to ticketing – with particular interest to the rail industry. A pricing API is seen to be a necessity – the parameters for this are now being defined and this is expected to lead to a candidate API in due course.

RS advised that there were significant problems with work within the ISO group – and as he no longer received support for participation in ISO, he had decided to withdraw from attending the meetings. The one in Moscow in October would have very few participants – even the chairman and secretary of the group were not going to be there.

RS also noted that the EU had sought bids for a project related to Europe wide journey planning, fares and bookings – something in which the UK experience and interests would need to be protected and taken into account.

## ***11. PTIC issues catalogue***

No discussion at this meeting

## ***12. AOB***

Inspire – CG circulated a document (also available for download) which sets out the current situation with implementation of Inspire in GB.

### ***13. Next meeting***

Avoid end Feb /early March – perhaps mid Feb or mid March. Is anyone able to offer to host the meeting – please contact Peter Stoner or Roger Slevin if so?