

Public Transport Information Coordination Group

Notes of meeting

Held on 11 June 2014 at the Tech Hub, Old Street, London

Present :

Mark Cartwright (RTIG –chairman part 1), Peter Stoner (Ito – chairman part 2), Helen Pattington (DfT), Jonathan Shewell-Cooper (Atos), David Houston (First), Ian Barratt (ATCO), Richard Warwick (Arriva), Roger Slevin (independent), John Carr (independent), Nick Knowles (independent), Jonathan Raper / Harry Wood (Placr), David Batchelor (independent), John Prince (Traveline), James Bunting (for Roger Wilson-Hinds of CFBDP), John Rowe (Systra), Russell Gard (Nimbus)

Apologies :

Kieran Holmes (independent), Paul Everson (Trapeze), Graham Browne (Metro)

Notes of last meeting

Graham Browne was representing Metro and not PTEG.

Matters arising from last meeting

None

TransXChange v2.5

PS felt that there was some progress with organisations thinking about implementation of this. Assurances still awaited for acceptance of v2.5 by DVSA. Richard Warwick advised that no local authority has asked Arriva for v2.5 data. Likewise David Houston said that First had had no requests for this. RS commented that there is a demand for features from 2.5 but it is in a catch 22 situation in that either upstream or downstream systems (or both) are unable to handle this, so it is not asked for. HP commented that traveline and TD have been looking at how to get more out of TNDS – and are looking at a TXC v2.5 **version** of TNDS, alongside the existing v2.1 version. This might be a helpful catalyst as users will then have access to a source in v2.5. DVSA have been asked to accept v2.5 – but this has not yet happened (although it is not expected to be a problem as they only need to have publisher capability).

The change to v2.5 is not a big deal in itself – as it is only significant in terms of the aspects that have been changed and are used in the files.

In response to a comment from PS, NK advised that the publisher documentation lists the validation checks which the publisher undertakes.

Discussion about what wheelchair-accessible means – with expectations by some that it includes large motorised wheelchairs. Are we now at the point where “not accessible” is more relevant than “accessible” (for standard-sized wheelchairs)? It was noted that CPT has a code of practice in relation to motorised wheelchairs.

Where are the problems which lead to ATCO-CIF still being used? – there needs to be more pressure to move data flows to TXC wherever possible. JP feels that TD ought to be funding changes in systems to improve the quality of information available.

DH thought that we are ahead of much of Europe in terms of public transport info, but others noted that Scandinavia and Germany were probably at a similar position to the UK.

JC commented that there are some parallels with the situation that existed with ITSO on the smartcard side of the business – and the ITSO’s vision has had to change to make things happen. The parallels with ITSO are painfully close – and ITSO is a long way behind its original vision.

Prioritisation within TXC should be informed by the views of users (eg Passenger Focus) – and by affordability.

RS commented that the meeting Paul Everson had hoped to have held with other software providers, and with the bus operator clients of all these software providers, is still very much needed. He would also like to access a report prepared by KH for TD, and the traveline JIRA, related to TNDS. It was suggested that the KH report had led to issues being added to the JIRA, so the JIRA should be a single source of issues (and JP will find out if and how it can be made accessible to Paul Everson and others). TNDS however is different from the operators' TXC input. Linked registrations or linked services for guaranteed connections is an issue that might need to be revisited – RS and NK will discuss.

JC wondered if there would be some value in having some regional workshops to discuss the features of TXC 2.5 that would be helpful. JSC wondered if the publisher might take on a more active validation process – “did you mean to omit x and y from this document?” RS, JSC and others asked to look at this. It was suggested that this might be appropriate for this to be in a separate routine that might be written so it can be built into other software systems used by those who create TXC data. The meeting encouraged Paul Everson to go ahead with his meeting as soon as possible, and noted that may be a need for the involvement of local authority or traveline regions in these discussions at some point.

[MC had to leave for another commitment, and PS took over the chairmanship of the meeting]

091 – update to publisher

HP introduced this item. There had been no feedback on the TD proposals, other than the general view that it is important to get DVSA to accept v2.5 files. TD proposes to go forward with their option 3 as circulated (which avoids clutter in the outputs). The timescale hoped for is 3-4 months. JSC asked if there was an opportunity to make the publisher available in a modular form to build into other software – NK suggested that if this is to be done it should be made an open source publication. TD will consider this.

RS will advise all PTIC members that TD will commission this work after 23 June unless there are any final comments from PTIC members in the meantime.

092- NOC

JP noted that this is a whinge on his part as the NOC is not as neat as he would wish it to be. Parts of the data flow require multiple operator codes to differentiate between duplicated line names. There is also an issue about different public facing names of operators requiring separate operator codes. And there is no system for unique and persistent service references sufficiently upstream to be useful. ‘What is an operator?’ remains a significant question.

PS also asked if there is progress on being able to access operator licensing data in a less constrained way.

RS referred to two recent examples in his own traveline region where the needs of public information dictated that multiple national operator codes were associated with a single operator licence. PS commented that the current arrangements are working reasonably well and that the definition of “what is an operator” is best handled through the traveline regions. It is important to maintain the focus on the purpose of NOC being to deliver good public information; it cannot be all things to all men. However it would be good if it can sit alongside the DVSA operator database, so that the two can be considered together where relevant.

PTIC Issue Register

PS noted that the two issues above will be added to the Register, which he continues to maintain. If another PTIC member could offer to take on the maintenance of the Issues Register that would be welcomed by PS.

DfT Consultation

RS noted that he had submitted a response on behalf of PTIC on the basis of the limited comments that had been submitted to him, and it reflected the technical nature of PTIC's remit. DH was happy on behalf of First with what had been submitted. HP commented that the responses are being worked on, with the initial focus on the Competition Commission aspects. However Anthony Ferguson of DfT has expressed an interest in the comments about EBSR as well.

Future of TD and role in maintaining standards

TD still does not have final approvals for its future role and functions, but it is clear that there is now a move in the marketplace towards national journey planning. TD's role of filling a gap in the market is no longer required – and if this is confirmed by Ministers then TD as a web site will fade out. The future role of TD will be more about governance, standards, national databases, etc. PS wondered whether TD not being directly involved in delivering information will make the standards role more difficult. TD is expecting to publish data that it has collated for its own purposes “as is” so that others could make use of it. JC wondered whether anyone is going to have a responsibility for ensuring that UK has good quality information services, and checking this against those available in other countries. TD may be doing this in the immediate future as it seeks to assess the capabilities of the various suppliers' systems to take on the functions previously offered by TD.

Updating of Transmodel

RS and NK reported on this work which is now under way in CEN under French lead. The first three of probably nine modules are currently being worked on. The Standards & Technical Specifications such as SIRI and NeTEx are more related to implementation requirements whilst Transmodel provides the structured framework for these implementations. JSC asked how Transmodel relates to Inspire – NK suggested that these are at very different levels, and Transmodel builds features on top of a GIS model.

Distributed Journey Planning

RS explained that this new work item was eventually approved and work has now started. The group which met a few days previously comprised UK, DE, FR and SI representatives (and there is one from AT that has not responded to communications). It has been agreed that the Open API for Distributed Journey Planning will be based on the work arising from the IP-KOM project in Germany which has created a TRIAS schema. This will need a little augmentation to meet all of the Open API requirements. It was not envisaged that the Open API will replace existing APIs that have been optimised for local systems – but would rather provide a single gateway for relatively infrequent collaboration with other journey planning systems.

Other standards work

NeTEx parts 1 and 2 have been published and part 3 is well on track for publication later this year. SIRI is also going through a review to add small extra bits including light-weight technologies such as JSON. NeTEx is going to aim to offer explanatory material to help users – part 3 will be of particular interest in the UK (which relates to the FareXChange study of many years ago). NK suggested a PTIC workshop for this might be appropriate at some point.

Other business

PS raised the question about contact people for other groups : RTIG, Traveline, and ATCO are the sponsors of PTIC. For RTIG it is MC. IB for ATCO. There is a gap for traveline – JP was asked to take on this role (previously held by PS) or provide an alternate

HP noted that traveline and TD are working on TXC TNDS data. Cross border duplicates being investigated as are file sizes and persistent service IDs. An update on this can be expected at the

next PTIC meeting.

HP also noted that the TXC web site has changed recently as it has been migrated to gov.uk – comments on the format and content should be passed to TD. Other standards sites will follow. This will also cover all the functional links on the PT data management site.

Next meeting

It was agreed that this should take place on Wednesday 8 October – rather than 15 October which had been suggested in the agenda. Metro and SYPTE had both offered to host the next meeting and checks will now be made to ensure that accommodation is available at one or other of these hosts for the new date. Arrangements will be confirmed in the near future. [post-meeting note : it has been necessary to change the date again to **Thursday 9 October, and will be held at Metro's offices in Leeds**, starting at 1030 and due to end by 1330.]