

PTIC meeting 13 October 2016
Stagecoach Shared Services Centre, Stockport

Attendees:

Mark Cartwright (Centaur Consulting / PTIC Chair), Stuart Reynolds (Independent / PTIC co-Secretary), Peter Stoner (Itoworld / PTIC co-Secretary), Chas Allen (Stagecoach), Ian Barrett (Lancashire CC), David Batchelor (Independent), Tom Carter (SYLTE), Lisa Geraldie (West Yorkshire), Ian Gray (Mentz), Miles Jackson (DfT), Martin Lewis (Stagecoach), Steven Penn (Traveline Information Ltd), Jonathan Raper (Placr), Andrew Steele (Silverrail), Mark Taylor (Staffordshire CC), Peter Warman (Independent), Rob West (Omnibus)

Apologies:

John Carr (Independent), James Hall (Atkins), Nick Knowles (Independent), Jonathan Shewell-Cooper (ATOS), Roger Slevin (Independent)

Notes of meeting:

1. Introduction from Mark Cartwright, who thanked Stagecoach for hosting the meeting.
2. Minutes of last meeting.

There were no comments arising from the notes of the previous meeting.

3. Actions arising
 - John Carr to contact Stephen Fiddler – John was not present, so the status of this action is unknown
 - Report from MC on (in the context of the Bus Services Bill) what is currently possible - not actioned
 - Update from MJ – the latest position (regarding the secondary legislation) was circulated the day before the meeting
 - SR to circulate Roger Slevin's notes on EU - complete
4. Update from Miles Jackson on behalf of DfT
 - a. Bus Services Bill

Policy team were invited to meeting but didn't have a significant amount of detail to impart. Secondary legislation still in discovery phase. Limited meetings with stakeholders to test thinking. More formal consultation in new year. Later workshops in November (17th) for a more restricted invite list. Visit to Staffs which was helpful and planning visit to West Berkshire.

On the real-time requirement, there was nothing to report. Likewise, on the historic performance data (*although [post meeting note] there is a CEN project, OpRa, looking at defining a standard for this*). On accessible information regulations, operators must

provide information on board in an accessible format and consult on what they propose to provide.

On fares, DfT have asked SR for information on NeTEx as a suitable fares standard (see later item).

Martin Lewis reported that (in relation to the secondary legislation in the Bus Services Bill) things are moving at quite a pace. More shape is expected to be seen at workshop on 17th October, but won't be able to make this public. Dialogues are positive in shaping what may come on the data side. On the fare side, ML understands that DfT has committed to funding development of UK profile of NeTEx fares. The registration process is being discussed internally, and especially with Traveline Information Limited (TIL). Can't say in detail but expect significant change where focus is on information requirements first and a stripped-down registration requirements process second.

In response to a question from MC asking if there was any feel for the required national architecture, or whether it was still in discovery, ML reported that TIL will be closely involved, and that DfT don't want to break what is already working. May be that DVSA no longer does the actual administration of registrations, which could instead be carried out by 3rd party organisations. Meeting agreed that we now need to understand the timescales between the decision about what should be provided through to when it must be delivered. Suggestion is to follow the EU timescales, which were hard won. These are fast, but not too fast (fares in TEN-T cities by 2020, everywhere by 2023. Routes and timetables in NeTEx the year before that)

It was noted that there are tensions in Parliament between those who want franchising to be extended to all Local Authorities, not just combined authorities, and those who see franchising as a last resort in the event of market failure.

There was also a concern that inaccuracies in interpretation of e.g. fare data would be passed back as a complaint to the operator. This should be addressed.

b. TXC Publisher

DfT have revisited the business case for the upgrade of Publisher, and there is no current business case need for an update. However, this will need to be revisited but will depend on what the secondary legislation requirements are for EBSR.

ML reported that version 2.1 is likely to be mandated (for EBSR) from the start, with an eventual move to NeTEx. The meeting felt that more work is required, however, even for 2.1, to define what is required in terms of what is populated and *how* it is populated. The meeting felt it would be useful, though, not to lose improvements especially from 2.4 to 2.5, although these were not well understood.

ACTION - SR to summarise differences between 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5

c. NaPTAN management.

System is now running smoothly - things still need to get fixed but taking up less time. Now looking to do a user survey to get feedback on how it works or what it should do next. MT asked about “mandatory” requirement on Local Authorities to maintain NaPTAN. ML reported that any new burden on Authorities because of requirements in the Bill comes under the remit of DCLG rules, and the sponsoring Department would need to fund the mandatory requirement and that DfT does not have the funds for this. It was noted that, while there is no current threat of an Authority ceasing to maintain data, if it happens it will happen overnight without warning. SR asked if secondary legislation could provide the powers to make it mandatory even if it didn’t at first implement the powers. The meeting was concerned as to how DfT could build a standardized data format / system if the fundamental building block was at risk.

It was noted that some Authorities update extremely infrequently (one hadn’t created a new stop for 3 ½ years) and that there are also problems with the quality of data that we well known. The attendees were requested to write to DfT to gain a critical mass of opinion if they hadn’t already done so.

ACTION ALL – Write to DfT regarding mandating of NaPTAN maintenance

The issue of rail replacement bus stops was raised, as these are often not where the replacement buses actually stop. It seems strange to want quality data, and yet throw passengers off a train and expect them to find their way to the middle of a village (say) to pick up the onward bus journey. There is nothing in Bus Services Bill about data quality, though, and anything will only be a nice set of words which won’t improve position necessarily. MJ asked to be sent examples.

ACTION PS – Send examples of rail replacement stop issues to MJ

5. NeTEx

SR provided an update on the evaluation of NeTEx for DfT. The conclusion was that NeTEx is a suitable fares standard that covers a wide range of fare structures that are likely to be found in the UK. It doesn’t need to use NeTEx for timetables and stops, and can (for now) link back to NaPTAN and TXC. However, it is a complicated standard to implement.

There was a discussion as to whether NeTEx ought to include rail as well, although it was noted that this won’t fit well with the rail “full service model” that had just been implemented. The meeting considered whether Transport for the North could be used to create an exemplar implementation. This was thought possible, but that TfN would resist.

ML confirmed that Stagecoach fares have been checked and can map onto NeTEx.

6. EU regulations and Brexit

The meeting felt that while, post-Brexit, there wouldn't be a specific requirement to adopt the standards & policies that have already been developed, it would be sensible to do so. It was confirmed that until Brexit is concluded the UK is still a member of the EU and consequently by EU rules and legislation. Also, the Buses Bill in many cases pre-empts the directive. It is the same, but faster, and is a way of fulfilling the UK's obligations in the directive. Brexit also does not mean that we are no longer members of CEN, and there is no suggestion that we would cease to be a member. Finally, while the UK wouldn't have same legal position (e.g. regarding single market requirements) regulations would have same technical impact (esp. in respect of procurement and selling into Europe).

Group sees little advantage in looking outside of EU for standards. GTFS doesn't have the same features, and is not a structured standard.

7. Traveline update (SP)

National Data set - NW no longer has a journey planner, and TIL is now producing the NW data using CIF data sent to them by the authorities. Also incorporating Cumbria data in NW.

Also to note that PTIC has been asked to help TIL prepare a UK profile of TXC for TNDS, so that data can be more standardized. SR noted that a profile had already been put together as a "straw man" when TNDS was first set up. SP already has this, and can be used to inform the decision. SP asked for indication of willingness to participate by 4th November.

8. Reaching out to App Developers

PS recalled that John Carr was keen, at the previous meeting, to attract app developers to being part of PTIC, and that JC felt that it was important that we had more involvement. JR noted that several members either have apps, or can reach out to developers. [PTIC is the "Spectre" of the PTI industry - the body that does all the hard work and publishes the standards.] It was also noted that app developers don't necessarily appreciate why standards have been constructed a particular way.

9. Updates on EU Standards

Mostly covered elsewhere. SR noted that Nick Knowles and SR are now responsible as part of the Transmodel update team, with SR taking over reporting of those aspects from Roger Slevin (completion of part 4, and parts 5-8).

MC reported that RS had said European Commission was also now more favourably disposed towards distributed planning rather than a large monolithic system.

It was noted that engagement with commission is much better now, but others reported that some people have found that EC have been told that they can't talk to UK personnel.

MC reported on the Urban ITS standard. New working group (WG17) on Urban ITS established by CEN TC, but not sure how this sits alongside WG3 and WG4. Thinks that WG17 deals with the things that fall between the cracks of WG3 and WG4. Thinking at moment that looking towards a handbook on how to deal with standards, and also on emissions standards.

Discussion on other standards that could be added. For example, who is looking into Account Based Ticketing? ML to ask around and see who might be working on these things?

JR asked if the new transport authorities aware of what PTIC does? MC agreed that we should make them aware of expertise. JR noted that (for example) the Transport Data Initiative (26th October meeting) is group of local authorities, and that this could be a good opportunity.

10. PTIC issues register

None

11. AOB

JR asked about disruption information. ML noted that a lot of disruption information is being delivered by operators, and this is a large piece of work for TfN. JR observed that information is unstructured. AS noted that RTIG work for SIRI SX addressed some of this. Suggested that this goes onto the next agenda.

ACTION PS – Add to agenda for next meeting

MJ asked about MainNptgLocalities in NaPTAN and whether anyone uses them, as DfT would like to delete them. The meeting agreed that they could be removed, but SR asked MJ to check whether these were in the *inputs* received from editors, or only in the back end system?

ACTION MJ – Check origin of MainNptgLocalities and delete

Date and time of next meeting: Tuesday 7 Feb 2017 (1pm-4pm). Venue to be arranged, but suggested that it should be in Birmingham.