PTIC – Minutes 24 May 2016

Attendance

Chas Allen (Stagecoach), Luke Baker (EPM), Ian Barratt, Graham Browne (WYCA), John Carr (Independent - Chair), Simon Court, Sarah Disborough (SilverRail), Russell Gard, Lisa Geraldie, John Gill, James Hall, Miles Jackson (DfT), Mark Jones (EPM), Nick Knowles (Independent), Steven Penn (Traveline), Stuart Reynolds (Independent - Co-secretary), Jonathan Shewell-Cooper (ATOS), Andrew Steele, Peter Stoner (ITO World - Co-secretary), Mark Taylor (Staffordshire CC), Rob West

Apologies for Absence

Peter Cranny (Transport for Ireland), Roger Slevin (Independent), Mark Cartwright (Centaur)

Introduction

JC welcomed all to meeting. Introductions around the table.

Apologies Roger Slevin. Peter Cranny. Mark Cartwright.

Minutes of meeting 16 Feb.

Matters Arising –PTIC Issue 95 has been passed back as a comment to Keith Sabin.

No other matters arising

DfT update (MJ)

The Buses Bill is quite simple, but the secondary legislation is where the interesting detail will lie. For example, it is unlikely that the registration process will require fare information, although it is specified elsewhere in the Bill. There will be a workshop in June to which PTIC are invited, although invitations have not yet been sent out, with a view to having a scoping document before the House of Lords.

The Government wants Royal Assent for the Buses Bill in spring 2017. The meeting expressed concern that a scoping document for a decent specification that supports the aspirations by the end of June is very rapid. JC to take action to call Stephen Fiddler and discuss.

ACTION JC

It was reported that, for secondary legislation, something detailed would need to be in place by the time that assent is received, and that some aspects of it would want to be brought forward quite quickly (such as franchising powers, for example).

The meeting expressed further concern that, where standards-based electronic information may be required, that would be a large hurdle to overcome in

potentially short timescales especially for smaller operators.

The meeting heard that it wouldn't be a case of resurrecting FareXChange, as much of the work to determine fare data structures has already been done in NeTEx; the UK would "just" have to define its own profile. Several suppliers already have fares modules that do some of this that could be used as building blocks. It was noted, though, that fares associated with journey planning and fares simply as a piece of data are not quite the same thing, and even fares associated with journey planning differ between "what is the fare for this journey" and "what is the cheapest way of making this journey". Could you ever do the second without knowing the full set of fares for all services from all operators? It was agreed, though, that just because it was hard didn't mean that it shouldn't be done.

It was suggested that PTIC should produce a paper of "what is possible" that can inform the discussion? Especially around data, smart ticketing, etc. What is done now, what could be done shortly, or is planned, and what is "hard". There was a concern that there is a gap in appreciation between ticketing medium and the fares structures that you are trying to impose upon the medium. The meeting asked JC to request a paper from MC.

ACTION JC/MC

There was a discussion about what "fare data" entailed. Rather than going into a large data standard to hold fares, might an easier "first bite" might be to have a common API that could request the fare from the back-end system, particularly in light of operators possible concerns about confidentiality of fare changes. While this offered an easier step, need to keep in mind the aspirations of the Bill, The group was asked to consider looking at this from a point of view of Tim Berners-Lee's "levels of openness", so that a fare table on an operator's website is a quick win, but would score lower on an openness score (because it isn't "data") than a set of data.

TXC publisher

An update to TXC publisher to make it compatible with TXC v2.5 is in the pipeline once the NaPTAN data management software system has been completed. However, it is still under review because registration process is under review.

The meeting considered that lack of Publisher support for 2.5 is holding up EBSR using v2.5. Publisher is an integral part of the EBSR process because DVSA uses it to create the registration document. Would be a powerful argument for adoption if it was the agreed position of an operator / supplier / authority body (PTIC). It doesn't have to be a DfT designed tool, as there are suppliers who specialise in developing this type of tool and who are well used to reading and writing TXC data.

It was agreed that it is essential that the underpinning data (NPTG, NaPTAN) needs to continue to be maintained to a high standard, across the UK (including Scotland, Wales, and London)

NaPTAN management

It was reported that new system would go live the following day.. Landmark system is already locked for upload, and download will be turned off when the new system goes live. Members were advised that the new system validated the file against a schema whereas the old one didn't, but that so far this was only an issue where the header record (declaring the NaPTAN schema) was missing.

Heritage Rail Stops

South Tynedale Railway exercise (9100 records for Heritage Railways) was a success. Created new ones for Ravenglass & Eskdale as well, but this is now on hold until Cumbria systems move was completed.

Multi-modal travel information (DG Move)

MJ is waiting to see the final draft of the proposed regulation, and will circulate when it is received. EC wants a vote by December 2016. This needs to feed into the PTIC paper under item [3] as well.

ACTION MJ

Traveline

Changes to regional structure

IOW has moved from SE to SW. Cumbria hasn't yet moved, but will do. NW data (for TNDS) will shortly move from Trapeze to TIL systems. When it does so, Cumbria will move to NW. Should have happened already, but will happen now hopefully in the next 4 weeks.

Updates on European Standards

CEN machine readable files – nothing further yet

Siri Part 5 proposals have been published but are just consequential changes because of changes elsewhere.

Updating of Transmodel (paper from Roger Slevin presented by SR). Parts 1-3 now approved, and progressing with part 4. Funding from EU to complete remainder of Pt4, parts 5-8 and update technical report but details not clear. SR was requested to circulate Roger's notes with the minutes.

ACTION SR

Distributed Journey Planning (see RS paper). Agreeing common terminology but steady progress is being made.

NeTEx (NK) Everything has been voted through and finished white papers. Numbers of questions coming in that show that people in Europe are trying to build applications that use it. Expect to see tools emerging over the next 18 months, and customers moving to use it thereafter. For UK the position is the same as it has ever been – at some point there should be a formal UK profile with NeTEx incorporating NaPTAN and TXC. Could be a business case to have fares in there too. Even if UK

leave EU, it is probably better (cheaper) to adopt the EU standard than to create a bespoke one.

Data Exchange for historical performance data. No UK support, but other countries wanted it. No support from PTIC (circulated by email) so BSI was advised to abstain. Outcome of vote due soon. It was noted that the Buses Bill requires this data. The view of the meeting was that if DfT wants it then it should be up to the DfT to take the lead on promoting this.

Urban ITS – SR read out Mark C note (see email)

PTIC issue register

No new requests since the last meeting

AOB

JC wanted to reiterate that there is great value in PTIC being a group representing a cross section of operators / authorities / suppliers putting forward a common view that can influence the secondary legislation. Correlation between what can be delivered and the timescales in which it can be delivered. Urge members of group to consider ways in which they might engage.

Consider having a hackathon or reach out to app developers (e.g. through TNDS list) as to what data they want for development.

Next meeting

Tue 4th October, PM.

POST MEETING NOTE: This has now been changed to be 13th October at Stagecoach offices in Stockport from 1pm to 4pm.