Notes of PTIC meeting 6th Feb

Apologies
Tim Rivett

1. Notes of last meeting - OK
2. Matters arising
    a. SR will circulate paper on fares after the meeting. It is now finished.

3. Bus Services Act / Deloitte
    a. SD – background to project.
    b. Presentation from Deloitte.
        i. So far have carried out desk research & interviews. Presenting first findings today. These will be validated with stakeholders and then passed back to DfT for formal consultation beginning in May this year
        ii. Only focussing on findings today; haven't yet made recommendations.
        iii. (See presentation for detail)
        iv. Peter Warman suggested that closing Transport Direct in 2012, which had acted as a central coordinating body, and leaving the industry to deliver coordination, has caused 6 years of "drift" where none of these things were being sorted out properly or with any degree of oversight. Agreement from the room. The coordination & roles that we all have, as well as the standards, were derived through guidance & push from DfT initially.
        v. Richard Warwick mentioned Competition & Markets Authority / Competition Act – operators can't cooperate because seen as colluding & is seen as anti-competitive. This is where DfT need to step in and say "this is OK, this is what is needed".
        vi. Question is also not just around end-users. There are lots of apps. The question is around who is seen as authoritative, the "correct" solution.
        vii. SR re: nextbuses (which was flagged as a "positive" development fom the industry) – data is missing, data is not connected because it has to be paid to connect. Free data is not connected because TIL can't afford to connect (e.g. TfL). So RTI is OK but sweeps a lot of issues under the carpet. MC noted difference between "open" and "quality".
        viii. PW – are there going to be requirements on accuracy so that the consumer is given some sort of quality mark. SD – yes, this will be part of the legislation. JR asked "what is the truth"? Different answers from bus stop information, operator websites, registrations, TNDS … etc. SR noted differences in responsibility, and if wanted to apply a "sanction" (PS) then need to start from scratch – which isn't the problem that we are trying to solve.

ix. "Standards are not sufficiently established" is more to do with best practice guidance for how to code e.g. TXC or NaPTAN.

x. Discussion about incentives – incentives relate to e.g. cost of EBSR vs paper, but at end of the day this is about getting users onto buses so there are passenger benefits.

xi. Operations/Compliance misalignment. Mentioned school holidays & EBSR being "set and forget". School operation is often (CA/RW) down to individual depot operations managers deciding what to run on the day.

xii. Not focussing on end-user delivery. "Market is good at delivering to the public" so wanting to focus on providing good quality open information and then letting the market do what it needs to do with it. But many people don't actually want to have apps on phone, or whatever, they want to see e.g. bus stop information. Or requirements for infrequent journey next week or month are different compared to regular user with a pass, or have a disability, or…

xiii. Needs to be significant consultation with industry around NeTEx to ensure that we have a UK profile that does what we want, but where we ensure that data is structured in a coherent way and doesn't vary from supplier to supplier.

xiv. Next steps – findings to project board in mid Feb and DfT will decide on next step and communicate their approach to the market around March time. Formal process of consultation will begin thereafter. Will be presenting a set of possible solutions, but not recommending a specific one. It will perhaps include a set of things around the outside, such as incentives, in order to make things work better.

xv. JR suggests that PTIC should have more outreach. Need a website, etc., and wider promotion within the industry.

xvi. AS asked why we are doing fares? Not allowed to sell tickets. Need to be clear about what we are trying to achieve, rather than just ticking a legislative box. Operators (CA) are concerned about justification for producing fares if no tickets are sold, but are also very concerned about fares being misrepresented, and them being blamed for it.

4. TIL (SP)
    a. Fares data being created for north of England. GTFS. Delivery date for first part of fare data is end of March. Will be made available for open data use once data is in TIL planner.

5. TfN activities (RM)
    a. Fares is phased delivery. Single & return to begin with. Don't want to give operators too much work
    b. Disruptions data set as well. Planned events initially. Lots of work in how things work outside of system (processes). Looking to publish those data sets as open data. No desire to create & provide another journey planner but want to publish data in an open format for others to use.
    c. Engagement with open data community. Saw lots of sample fare data at last meeting in October. Had great feedback.

d. Working closely with DfT/TIL. In a period of market engagement. Going out to tender at the end of this month and are on schedule to do this. By next meeting will be able to give clearer picture and timescales, etc.

e. Aspiration is to make this universal across all operators in the north. MC asked to what extent information is being mandated/enforced in particular ways / according to particular standards. RM – taking what there is and endeavouring to reformat / repurpose it into a consistent format. PE noted that Trapeze had had to write extensions to GTFS to accommodate the structures that were needed. TIL are using what Wales had. But will the TfN "standard" be published / shared? Yes, it will.

f. Doesn't do zones, though – would make fares seem very unattractive if published in a JP. How do we overcome that issue? RM – at present want to take it in small steps and not put operators to more work than they are able to do at present.

6. DfT data support functions
   a. PS – the Ito NaPTAN tool has been renewed from DfT, and Ito have taken the opportunity to add some additional functions.
      i. Have moved from OS to OSM. Wanted to include IOM, and that was the easiest way to do it. Also OSM can be updated more frequently / quickly than OS so to allow viewing of e.g. new estates
      ii. Warning counts have increased in a number of areas (stop road distance, stops with wrong bearing, stop road unknown).
      iii. Stop Area tests have been added. Missing stopareas (where stops are close together and could be put into an area), stop proximity to stop (based on stop type, so doesn't try to put bus stops into a ferry stop area, for example), stop too far from stoparea, stop entrance without area of correct type, station stop area without entrances of correct type.
      iv. SR asked what could be done to persuade people who need to look at the data to actually look at the data, and to correct it. MT suggests that DfT needs to lead, working through regional coordinators.

7. Other Ongoing Issues
   a. DfT Publisher. Still awaiting outcome of the process. SR to ask Miles Jackson the question
   b. Priority Action A now adopted.
   c. NeTEx / SIRI / Transmodel work is ongoing. NK is developing the European profile for NeTEx. Will ensure that UK interests are represented so that doesn't include things that UK doesn't want / need.
   d. Issues register – nothing further to add
   e. NeTEx profile – dft will be procuring experts to develop a UK profile in consultation wtith industry. Will be published ahead of requirements of the Act being enacted

8. AOB
   a. Thanks to RS.
   b. Next meeting 5th June at DfT.