Notes of PTIC meeting 25 May 2017
CPT, London

Attendees: Chas Allen (Stagecoach), John Austin (Independent), Ian Barrett (Lancashire CC), Richard Batchelor (Independent), John Carr (Independent / ATCO), Mark Cartwright (Centaur Consulting / PTIC Chair), Sherri Davis (DfT), Paul Everson (Trapeze), Ian Gray (Mentz), Russell Guard (Nimbus), Miles Jackson (DfT), Nick Knowles (Independent), Richard Mason (TfN), Steven Penn (Traveline Information Limited), Jonathan Raper (Placr), Stuart Reynolds (Independent / PTIC co-Secretary), Tim Rivett (Independent), Jonathan Shewell-Cooper (ATOS), Peter Stoner (Ito / PTIC co-Secretary), Mark Taylor (Staffordshire CC), Peter Warman (FWT), Richard Warwick (Arriva), Rob West (Omni)

Apologies: Lisa Geraldie (WYPTE), Gordon Hanning (Transport Scotland), Roger Slevin (Independent)

1. Changes to minutes.
    a. SR noted that Chas Allen had pointed out that the first version of the minutes of the last meeting incorrectly reflected the meeting date (unchanged since the previous minutes), and that PS had corrected and then posted an update on the meeting invite.
    b. Tim Rivett noted that he was incorrectly shown as working for TfN. He is independent.

2. Actions Arising
    a. These will be covered in the agenda items below.

3. Bus Services Act 2017 (SD)
    a. Secondary legislation. The consultation on franchising, partnerships, and the information to be provided on varied & cancelled service registrations finished on 21 March. Responses will be collated and sent to new ministers as soon as they are in place. DfT hopes to publish draft regulations before summer recess, and to have these regulations in place by Autumn.
    b. Open data is on a slower timescale. DfT will meet with new ministers once appointed and agree a timeline. The aspirations for what data will be provided as open data are contained in the Act, and have not change. Also in the Act are now enabling provisions to require local authorities to maintain NaPTAN data in the event that some decide to stop maintaining it voluntarily.
    c. DfT is in the process of scoping the Business Case for the data hub. Again, will discuss internally and then present to the new ministers.
    d. Meeting welcomed inclusion of provisions for local authorities to maintain NaPTAN.

4. Traveline (SP)
    a. TIL is currently assessing ITT responses for the new journey planner. The contract award date is scheduled to be 26th June, with a go-live planned for end October. It will be a three-year contract. It is still an aspiration to provide APIs to the wider community, but this will depend on whether the winning

contract allows this (SP also noted that First are a current third-party user of the existing API).

    b. Isle of Man are not yet sending stop data, the revised 2.5.1 standard notwithstanding, because they do not have the software to allow them to create it. It is understood that this is being procured at present, but is being help up in administration.

5. Fares Paper (SR)

    a. SR reported that he is still tidying up the paper to remove DfT material and to reflect changes since the original was written (the original version went to Buses & Taxis team in December). SR will issue revised paper by end June.

6. TXC Publisher - Discovery Phase (MJ)

    a. MJ reported that his team has been wound up and that he now has different job title (Digital Services, User Researcher). TXC Publisher Discovery has now been passed to a new team within Digital Services who will need to decide what to do about it. MJ will retain his existing role for NaPTAN until someone is able to take it over. Matthew Griffin's new role is not yet confirmed, but he is likely to become an apprentice.

    b. Support for the existing version of TXC Publisher is provided by Trapeze, but only until December.

    c. It is likely to be Sherri's Buses & Taxis team that takes on TXC Publisher (etc.) but this has not yet been decided or approved.

7. Rail Replacement Buses (JR)

    a. Rail replacement buses fall into 2 categories - those in working timetable that are in effect permanent replacements for closed lines; and engineering replacements.

    b. When JPs show results, they treat buses as starting from same place as the train. But this is not the case, because there is often a rail replacement bus service somewhere else.

    c. JR believes that there are 182 TIPLOCs in the rail timetables representing rail replacement bus stops. But there is no (or very poor) alignment between them and AtcoCodes. Very difficult, then, to know what can be displayed on departure boards particularly when there are scheduled services.

    d. There is also a problem especially at unstaffed stations with passengers knowing where to go to find the buses. For example, Leigh in Lancs has a rail replacement stop that is >100m from station, outside a local pub. JC also mentioned an example in London where Double Deckers cannot access a stop which is flagged for replacement buses, so the buses then stop at TfL on the road outside instead.

    e. JR asked how DfT are wanting to address this issue. MJ/SD agreed to investigate. JR will send a statement to DfT with some of the more difficult problems (and will circulate to wider group).

8. SIRI SX – any developments?

a. Discussion about SIRI, and how disruption data must be put out in coherent standards so that software doesn't have to be developed for every instance.
b. This also dependent on a set of tools that allow easy capture of the data so that people are inclined to enter the data, which in turn leads to a set of processes around this in order to enable it.
c. Discussion about the role, types and uses of real time information for customers.

9. EU Directive Priority Action A & CEN (MC)
a. MC noted about possibility of a future directive relating to Connected Vehicles impacting on UK.
b. Tom Lake has been representing UK in SIRI working group, and does not wish to do so any more. Don't know if UK needs a formal rep on the SIRI WG, but if anyone wishes to put themselves forward they are welcome to do so.
c. New WGs in TC278, one on connected vehicles and one on urban standards. At fairly early stage.
d. NK noted the OpRa working group, looking at performance data. There is no UK representation on this group at present. SR had noted this group at the last PTIC meeting, and referenced this back to the provisions in the Act for historic performance data.

    POST MEETING NOTE – EC has now adopted the Priority Action A regulations. These can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/c-2017-3574_en.

10. Updates on UK standards
a. SIRI Change Requests. TR had asked about feeding back change requests. The meeting heard that there is no change request form, as such; users should contact the relevant WG and outline the details of what is being requested and the justification for it.
b. NeTEx (NK) – NeTEx WG is reviewing the change requests (mostly minor) and making small changes to allow mapping of local standards. Other activity is developing a common European profile. Not just what is in the schema, but how you use it and what you exchange. A profile spells out what data should be exchanged, what elements that should be used, etc. Since NeTEx is nominated in Priority Action A, it is thought useful to create a minimum European profile for NeTEx.

    From UK point of view, need to think of profiles in two headings. EU profile, and UK profile (which would/should be wider). A UK profile for now would include all of the things that are in NaPTAN/TXC but would also want to include future things such as fares (although perhaps as a third "UK future" profile).

    Common European profile, there are no issues for the UK as UK has the data to populate it. One point left open but which will need to be closed down soon is whether there should be fare data in the common profile. From

operator point of view, we don't have this, but from a user point of view there is a need to have it.

SR asked whether European profile would be mandatory. NK reported that it would not. The directive could attach the profile as a recommended profile.

JR stated that argument to ministers (regarding NeTEx) should be that this is not about sovereignty, but about adopting the best standard to allow UK suppliers to sell into our largest market.

For UK profile, TXC maps into NeTEx except for some of the registration details e.g. O-licences, EBSR requirements, which are UK specific. But NeTEx is extensible, and can add additional modules for the UK to cover these aspects. There is a lot of validation done in the NaPTAN and TXC schemas via enums, etc. (and then through publisher) which does not exist in NeTEx. But there are ways that these can be achieved.

JSC noted that rail timetables don't map well to TransXChange. Could potentially map this to NeTEx, but not sufficient just to map TXC to NeTEx – other things need to be considered.

NeTEx can be found at http://netex-cen.eu/. The standards documentation is not available there (has to be bought from BSI) but the schema (XSD) is there, and also several very useful white papers. The schema includes worked examples, by function and also by national standard. Includes examples of how TXC maps into NeTEx. NK also noted that while standard is in draft, he can circulate copies of the draft for comment and that these should be requested from him.

c. Transmodel is being developed to version 6. Parts 4-8 will be put out for vote next year. Parts 4 & 5 are well developed, and part 7 has now come on a long way.

d. Distributed journey planning standard is now out to formal vote. Roger Slevin expects the UK to vote to accept the standard.

11. Transport Data Initiative
    a. JR presented on TDI. He has discussed PTIC with TDI, but PTIC has a minimal web presence and it is not easy for TDI to find out about PTIC. JR suggested that PTIC members might wish to attend the (roughly quarterly) meetings to influence them. Next one is 13 June in Edinburgh.
    b. TDI stakeholders are local office holders, and it is important to influence them and demonstrate the need for using PT standards, etc.

12. Issues register
    a. No issues to report

13. AOB
    a. Private stops. Should stops be created in NaPTAN for closed services?
       Discussion. Meeting agreed that:
        i. Registered services should have all their stops in NaPTAN, regardless
           of whether they are "public" or not.
        ii. DfT should be asked to hold NaPTAN data in v2.4 so that Private flags
            can be set. SR to write a short paper to support the request and
            setting out the benefits that will be achieved.
    b. RM (TfN) discussed TravelHack day on 20th June. Assess what gaps there are in
       data and what they can do to improve the customer offering. Message was
       circulated, and RM encouraged members to attend.
    c. TfN also has a supplier page, and encourages potential suppliers to sign up.
       http://www.transportforthenorth.com/suppliers/
    d. JR brought up the issue of traveline south east & anglia's (TSEA's) imminent
       "closure" and what would happen to the data aggregation process. SR
       provided background to the meeting, and highlighted that TSEA was not
       ceasing altogether, but seemed most likely to stop providing journey planning
       services – although in that case they would still act as a data aggregator.
       However, the position after March 2018 was not yet agreed.
    e. This lead to a discussion about mandatory data requirements and what can
       be done to ensure good quality data throughout the data chain.

14. Next meeting
    a. Tuesday 3rd October 2017.