



PTIC meeting 06 March 2025

Video: <https://youtu.be/vfMLhf2u858>

Video timings for the start of each agenda item are provided below.

Actions in red text

Opportunities to engage/test/feedback in green text

Contents

PTIC meeting 06 March 2025.....	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1. Apologies	2
2 Notes of last meeting 5 December 2024 (1:52 - 7:03)	2
3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (7:03 - 1:13:06)	3
3.1 BODS Procurement (7:03 - 14:20)	3
3.2 Current Service (7:03 - 14:20)	3
3.3 ABODS (14:20 - 59:30).....	4
Introduction from Triumph.....	4
Jonathan Ramsbottom overview of ABODS (20:53 - 24:43).....	4
Next steps and key decisions (24:43).....	5
Aminah Ullah: work on developing features on BODS and ABODS (41:35).....	8
3.5 Disruptions Service (59:30 - 1:00:40)	11
3.6 Fares (1:00:40 - 1:13:06)	11
Multi-Operator Tickets (1:09:00 - 1:13:06)	12
4. NaPTAN (1:13:06 - 1:47:00).....	13
Updates:.....	13
Upcoming work:	14
Feedback to Local Authority pilot:	14
Plusbus:	15
NaPTAN field lengths:	15
NaPTAN locations:.....	15



5. Traveline Update (1:47:00 - 1:51:09).....	17
6. Bus Priority Update (1:51:09 - 1:53:09).....	18
7. EU Standards Development (1:53:09 - 1:54:56)	18
8. Issue Log (1:54:56 - 1:56:12)	18
No AOB	19

1. Introduction

Mike Nolan, Traveline

Mike Baxter, Leicester City Council

Ewa Glowacka, KPMG

Dr J Harrison, DfT

Dan Saunders, Basemap

Rob West, Elyidium

Triumph Okojie, DfT

David Fitzgerald

Mark Jones, TfW

David Batchelor, Ticketer

Jonathan Ramsbottom, KPMG

Aminah Ullah, DfT

Nic Cary, DEFT153

Josh Goodwin, Bustimes.org

Ian Walker, Systra

Steven Penn, KPMG

1.1. Apologies

Ian Barratt, Lancashire County Council

Peter Stoner, Ito World

Keith Sabin, Shropshire County Council

2 Notes of last meeting 5 December 2024 (1:52 - 7:03)

- Business Case for ABOD - Triumph asking for Use case and Business case ideas.
- Dr J: looking for Rail station data contacts - update in meeting
- Plusbus location data: please use Mike Nolan's Traveline version, not NaPTAN
- Mike Nolan and Ian Barratt: Real Time feeds for Lancashire to sort - being actioned
- Christmas Data: pick up during meeting
- Length of fields in NaPTAN - action in today's meeting



Tim: EU Standards - Tim to action

Nic / Triumph: to discuss. Nic C and TJ have liaised with Ben Murray.

Action to add to Issues Log so we can share in wider context to understand issues in a more general way.

3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (7:03 - 1:13:06)

update from Triumph, at DfT

Slides: https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20250306%20BODS%20Update.pdf

3.1 BODS Procurement (7:03 - 14:20)

- Need to retender BODS
- RFI issued in March 2024, with 29 respondents
- Supplier day in May 2024
- Selection Questionnaire in June, and again in October 2024
- Now ready to release the ITT - should be out very soon.

3.2 Current Service (7:03 - 14:20)

National Coach Dataset

Gone live with DfT National Coach Dataset (NCSD). Transitioning away from third-party supplier. The system takes TransXChange semi-automatically (still some human intervention required) and makes it available on BODS. Launched at the back end of last year, but due to user feedback re: understanding implications to their systems, we have left NCSD running for a switchover period. Intention is that at end of March 2025, DfT will cease to provide what was the NCSD, and continue forward with BODS.

Continue to work with big 5 operators to aggregate cancellations data to provide real-time updates on BODS. Not mandated by legislation - so seeking cooperation on this. We've received positive feedback on this.

Some operators have committed to provide data to us, and work with other operators so we can get as much as we can to get as full a picture as possible.

GTFS

We're transitioning away from third party supplier provision. We've developed DfT capability to provide GTFS and GTFS-RT. Nothing changes from consumer perspective, but the generation of it changes to DfT control. Will be launching these DfT GTFS / GTFS - RT services in the coming few weeks.



In the last few years, we've been looking at adopting a TXC tool - to follow on from Powys solution. Due to commercial and legal complications, we will not be adopting that tool. DfT will complete the procurement for BODS, then after that, appraise options for TXC tool provision.

Discussion / Q+A

Tim: Whilst cancellation feeds are non-mandatory, there is some work being done on to develop a recommended profile for SIRI SX to help with cancellations. Anyone who wants to provide data has a baseline to work off.

Jonathan Ramsbottom: asking for this

Tim: to share with Jonathan early next week [Action]

3.3 ABODS (14:20 - 59:30)

Update from Triumph and Jonathan Ramsbottom

Link to DfT BODS Github for [department-for-transport-BODS · GitHub](#)

Introduction from Triumph

Had ABODS for 4 years, and partly provided by third party supplier on SaaS basis. Based on DfT requirements and feedback from users, decided to bring ABODS into DfT ownership as opensource, and hosted on DfT infrastructure.

Have developed DfT-owned warehouse and logic and algorithms based on user research and feedback to improve scheduling and performance analysis.

New ABODS launched in Feb 2025. Currently engaging with users in Q+A sessions to understand issues / pain points / opportunities for improvements.

Jonathan Ramsbottom overview of ABODS (20:53 - 24:43)

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20250306%20ABODS%20Logic.pdf

Redesigned database and logic

- Make a match between Timetable and AVL data by using combination of National Operator Code, Service Name, and Journeycode fields present in both
- Departure detection logic:
 - Initiation is when a GPS signal is present within 70m of a stop.



- Wait until there are 2 successive GPS positions outside the stationary zone moving away the stop. Know bus is departed.
- If the bus moves back into the stationary zone after appearing to have left the stop, then we cancel that out. This could be where a bus is stationary and the GPS hops around.

Behaviours - start of journey:

- For the first stop, we allow 5 minutes for the reset condition, to allow for any jumping GPS or bus coming into the station from previous journey
- Mid-journey stops. Make sure once we have a sequence of stops that they are in a valid order. (to stop issues for a returning bus route up and down a road)
- Once all these conditions have been met, we record departure time as the last GPS location in the 70m stop zone

Additional estimated matching:

Where we have 2 successive GPS positions intersecting the 70m stop zone, we estimate departure time from these. This is because some services operate in areas of poor 3G coverage, so this allows for not receiving a GPS ping from within the 70m zone, but estimating it from two pings intersecting the stop.

Arrival detection logic:

- Final stop on journey: we record time of first detected position in the 70m stop zone as the arrival time. The final stop can only be marked as 'on time' or 'late'.

Next steps and key decisions (24:43)

Lots of show and tell sessions last week. **If you or bus operators and Local Authorities you know have not taken part yet, please encourage them to do so. Upcoming work in terms of compliance dashboard.**

Stop analysis: package of work upcoming that will enable you to use a map to locate stops in terms of stop performance. All stops in an area will be colour-coded using Red-Amber-Green for on-time performance. This will be useful for Local Authorities to identify locations where performance is lower than expected.

Hypercare: feedback, working on fixes and a feedback form (closes on 12th March).

Summary of each page on the ABOD site

- Dashboard: summary of on time performance and feed monitoring, similar to previously
- Feed monitoring: different behaviour for an inactive feed. Inactive feed previously reported without timetable data active. If timetable data was expected in the last hour -



can we see live location data for that timetable? Would only class feed as inactive if we can't see live data, but we were expecting live data based on timetable data.

- Feed monitoring page still reports on active feeds, and you can look at current vehicles AVL data vs expected vehicles in Timetable data

On-time performance (29:08 - 33:23)

Similar layout. Matching logic has changed, so will see changes to percentages of On-Time, Early and Late. Was previously difficult to understand incomplete statistic, and broken it down:

- stops with unspecified matching issues
- missing service
- missing journey code

We are relying on NOC, Service and JourneyCode to match between Timetable and AVL data, but there are several thousand records that don't yet match. Need to update timetable and/or AVL data with matching information in these three fields to improve departure percentage scores for On-Time, Early and Late.

Actual changes to the front end: estimated vs evidenced toggle in top right.

This allows for the estimated departure where GPS evidence of vehicle departing 70m stop zone is either actual or estimated.

Vehicle journeys

- journey-by-journey, can see actual live pings and stops
- estimated toggle. at the moment, stop not matched as not got GPS confirmation. Separate out evidenced vs estimated. So with evidence, we can be confident we saw that bus leave. For those without good GPS, can use estimated to get a good indication without evidence
- Corridors: can track Journey time over range of stops. Also has estimated vs evidenced.

Q+A / Discussion

Dan Saunders, Basemap: Now ABODS is open source and open code, can we as private organisations pull on it and use it? Is that the intention?

Triumph: GDS requirement to be open by default. All code for BODS and ABODS will be made open, for anyone to utilise that code, so long as it meets the requirement of the license.

Dan Saunders: ABODS is only open for local authorities to utilise, so us as private sector aren't able to access it. So this would be an alternative. Or is there a plan to open up ABODS?



Triumph: we are considering that in DfT, but before any decision on ABODS to be open, there is consultation required with stakeholders. Watch this space.

David Batchelor (27:57): timetable - expected run on previous slide. The Go North West one has no data, but it is not running any more. Why is it on the list?

Jon: based on NOC assigned to that organisation. Will be a case of updating their NOC on their BODS account.

Mark Jones (33:23): The 70m radius from stop, would you ever configure that differently based on Local Authority / Bus Operator knowledge of the location. Could you configure it and how would you make the change?

Jon: not currently the ability to do that. Tried to make it same size zone across the board for consistency in analysis and reporting. Zone size was created in consultation with Operators and Local Authorities. Done at 70m to account for GPS jumping, poor data quality, and NaPTAN locations being slightly different areas. Also for on-time performance when comparing to Ticketer Portal, or bus operators' own private systems, it looks similar. Been working closely to get that right. Do highlight any issues.

Mike Nolan (25:13): How is this tying up with Bus Operators' own systems - are the two tallying up?

Jon: we're about 1-2% off of operators' own systems. The more data we have to compare against, the better we can make it.

Dan Saunders (35:49): did some stuff like this in 12-13 years ago in Essex, using GPS on buses for on-time buses. Found rivers when bus would do a U. False positives as it goes up one side and down the other. Post-processing needed. Have you come across this / taken account of that?

Jon: Yep, with sessions, we asked for edge case examples with Local Authorities / operators. We do include the case you are talking about. Do send over specific journey's or areas of concern

Dan S: can't get access to see (as private sector).



Ewa (37:40): It is challenging to get algorithms on national scale. We've captured whatever we have been given as part of engagement process. But we are still getting extra use cases during User Acceptance Testing stage, so it is work in progress to address these. Re: 70m zone - so often we are being asked about this specific size. Its part of the algorithm. We started with a smaller area, but until the technology and GPS stuff improves, we have to acknowledge the GPS signals jump up and down even within the zone. The main reason for 70m zone is to capture the signal, but that is only part of the whole thing. It's crucial that when a bus leaves the stop area, 2 x pings are captured to confirm that as far as possible. We're publishing description and more details on how the algorithm has been designed and how it works. People seem to be happy with the comparison of results to private commercial products. **But we do always want feedback, as it is work in progress, so please share you experiences. comments on ABODS.**

Aminah Ullah: work on developing features on BODS and ABODS (41:35)

- Adding a new page to ABODS for Data Monitoring.
- It's a dashboard for single view of data quality on BODS, to support Local Authorities, bus operators and regulation authorities. Can generate own insights from it too.
- Currently using information from BODS on completeness and accuracy. Difficult for users to look at overview of BODS data - this dashboard is to help with that.

Continued improvements are planned, based on user requirements and feedback received. Currently focused completeness and data.

Three different dashboard views:

- Regulation Authorities - to see data for all operators with registered services
- Local Authorities - to see data for all regulated services in their areas
- Operators - to see data for the registered bus services for their organisation

Demonstration example is a Local Authority dashboard for Derbyshire with dummy data:

Top level KPI's

- High level KPIs showing completeness of data on BODS: number of regulated bus services, and % of these with complete data on BODS for Timetables, AVL and Fares
- % requiring attention: services that have an issue with their BODS data that requires action by publisher to resolve. This could be because of no data published for that service, or the data is out of date.
- Table on right: ranked list of operators with poor data quality or missing data on BODS



Breakdown of services requiring attention

- Broken down by Timetables, AVL and Fares, and how this has improved or reduced over time.
- Information on quality data: % of critical data quality issues, and types of issues ranked
- Breakdown of AVL and Fares (proportion not compliant / out of date) requiring attention
- Can click for more details - tabular format, with user filters to drill down in more detail
- Help page, with information on data sources, calculation of metrics, implication on users of low scores, and links to BODS YouTube videos for more information.

This dashboard is available on the pre-production site, and we're keen to get feedback - so please get in touch if you would like to explore it.

QA / discussion

Dan Saunders (49:03): This is a much-needed thing, fantastic piece of work. Is it available for the public?

Aminah: Only for ABODS users, who are currently operators and Local Authorities

Dan Saunders: what is the actual data?

Ewa: 86-90%. Checking it on a monthly basis. Timetables around 90%. AVL around 86%. Fares around 80%.

Dan Saunders: what is being done to get up to 100%?

Triumph: continue to engage with bus operators, and internally, speak with stakeholders. Once the BODS procurement is done, primary focus will be on data quality, and engaging with industry to get data quality and completeness.

Dan: slowly increasing the number over time, but never hit close to 100%.

Triumph: Data quality and completeness is a dynamic thing. Whether 100% consistently is realistic is a conversation to have with the industry. WE are committed that in every point in time, it is as good as it can be.

Dan: wider question - if goal is 100%, what actions and goals are we working on to achieve that. I think 100% should be goal, for good customer experience.



Ewa: agree with you Dan. In mid-90% a few months ago. Not only operators, it's also the technology suppliers supporting them, who need to collaborate, and various other factors.

Accuracy of reference dataset.

Great believer of ABODS to visually engage the industry much more rather than CSV and spreadsheets. Be able to see what is going on - make it easier to make decisions on what needs to change to improve.

Interchange conference: cutting carbon. Everyone wants accurate data. Companies benefitted from BODS so far. What can we do better in future? BODS stimulated economy in economy, it is a fantastic initiative.

Mike Nolan (55:43): following on from Dan, in terms of enforcement, is it the long-term view that Local Authorities will use ABODS to cajole operators in their area? First challenge is 100%, then manage / update it. Who will do it?

Triumph: landscape is changing since introduction of BODS. Franchising has increased Local Authority responsibility. Funding changed it too. There is opportunity there for Local Authorities to take more responsibility to ensure that data on BODS is as good quality as can be. Whether this is the official DfT policy direction of travel is not being stated, but any commitment of Local Authorities to help improve data quality is welcome. But things continue to progress in ways they are, then Local Authorities will be having more involvement in data and quality of the data. Tools to help them improve data quality in their area will be beneficial

Mike Nolan: long term operating model. Great to highlight issue, but (personal view) some Local Authorities will be very good and encourage improvements, others not so active. People's responsibility to use to and improve data.

Dan Saunders: ABODS. Open source and open code. Does that mean as private org we can pull on that? Intention?

Triumph: intention / GDS requirements to be open by default. All code for BODS and ABODs will be made open for anyone to utilise the code for whatever they want to use it for, as long as it complies with gov license. Being responsible etc. If you want to build something similar to ABODS.

Dan Saunders: private sector unable to access ABODS. Can anyone access ABODS?



Triumph: that is something we are considering / appraising within DfT. Consultation that needs to be done with stakeholders before we get to point where ABODs can be option to others aside from Local Authorities and bus operators.

3.5 Disruptions Service (59:30 - 1:00:40)

Update from Steven Penn

No changes on disruption tool since December meeting. Triumph touched on cancellations, and we are building a service to aggregate SIRI-SX cancellations direct from operators and ETM suppliers. Still working on that though.

Data structure / how operators deal with costs etc. In the pipeline. For now, only the only SIRI-SX data on BODS is the Disruptions data provided by Local Authorities.

3.6 Fares (1:00:40 - 1:13:06)

Update from Steven Penn

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20250306%20Fares.pdf

Complex Fares

Big thing is complex fares. 31 March 2025 deadline for operators to provide complex fares. Many of the things for 'complex' (carnets, group tickets, regular products via different channels and pricing structures) already published to BODS as part of simple fares.

The two major stumbling blocks:

- tap and cap
- through-tickets (edge cases - tricky)

Updating BODS fares validation routine to add conditional checks for caps etc. Light-touch validation, only 3-4 additional rules, and once released BODS will be able to handle complex fares as they are defined.

But, no ETM supplier is technically capable of producing the data. Likely the 31 March 2025 deadline won't be met.

CFDS can produce data for capped products if operators are concerned about their compliance.

Discussion / Q+A

Tim: from data format and standards perspective, it's done and dusted. It's now about how do you create and maintain it.



Mark Jones: current thinking for franchising in Wales is personal travel zones. Customer will define their centroid, and define own fare zone based on own interpretation of fare boundaries. It's some way off, but putting it on the radar for discussion.

Steven: That blows straight through the edge to be honest!!! NeTEx can't even do dynamic pricing at the moment. So personalised fare zones is a step beyond format as it is at the moment.

Tim: I'll be in contact. This is a Use Case that I need to explain to Europeans who are working on NeTEx fares to make sure they are aware of this in their work. Action for Tim Rivett and Mark Jones to chat about personalised fare zones.

Mark: We do have concept of distance-based fares that are capped. Is that in current scope?

Steven: It is in the UK profile, but not in the current BODS profile. There are no use cases in England, so it wasn't included. WE can of course go back and look at that. This is a challenge where we have separate publication platforms in different countries

Ewa: challenges for an early adopter and late adopter.

Dynamic distance based approach may require picking up some stops based on distance. Maybe Wales will be first on this?!

Steven: have spoken to people on distance-based fares, and it's clear people mean different things by this. Whether it's true distance, or approximate stops they think are in a given distance - these are two different things. Both would need modelling in NeTEx. Need a clear definition of what we mean by distance-based fares

Mark: I think it's stop-based, but it's what customer sees as distance for their pricing.

Steven: That is simple enough in NeTEx. A 1.2 release could include this if we need it

Action for Tim Rivett, Mark Jones and Steven Penn to pick it up and explore details of capping and personalised zones to make sure we can handle it. An Issue for the Issues Log

Multi-Operator Tickets (1:09:00 - 1:13:06)

CFDS: multi-operator fare issues. No data except from TfWM. OpDI proposed an arrangement of a Lead Operator for a ticketing scheme who would provide the data on behalf of all other operators. Various technical issues with this e.g., different ETM suppliers, each own data specific to retailing



tickets on those networks. Suggested by OpDI to DFT that CFDS was expanded to allow operators to collaborate on building multi-operator tickets.

We've added a new features to CFDS, where the Lead Operator is responsible for creating products and pricing, and once they've done that, share it with the other participating operators to add their own data access rights to their bits and pieces. Collaborative process. Need an account on CFDS, and share between all of you.

Should support ongoing provides of major ticketing companies and schemes producing all relevant data in 1 single XML file. Was already a multi-operator feature on there, where that one operator would build it themselves, which is still retained and repurposed. This metaoperator solution is a new feature to going alongside that. NX WM are using the original.

On-boarding the major operators and get things set up, and get data published to BODS.

4. NaPTAN (1:13:06 - 1:47:00)

Update from Dr. J Harrison

Mural Link: [Mural](#)

Updates:

Non-passenger stops

Where passengers will not be alighting / departing permanently. Have reserved 999 ATCO code for this.

- Able to be created by bus operators under a very specific circumstances **(See the service design areas on the Mural (linked above) - please do review and comment)**
 - Bus depots (head time before start of service) - to improve schedules and ABODS
 - Driver rests and driver bus changes
 - Coach stops at Motorway services
- 999+NOC+whatever numbering you like. It doesn't matter if a specific location has more than one 999 codes. They are there to make your schedules look good.

Some 999 codes are also being used for international passenger stops - please don't!!!

Stops outside of NaPTAN geography will have NeTEx codes. Use the actual country stop code, don't cheat and put 999!!

Some have already started using these. We will ensure that BODS doesn't challenge you on these - 999 stops they are effectively proper NaPTAN stops



NaPTAN data quality issues

Starting to review every field in NaPTAN for consistency, completeness and accuracy, across all 148 Local Authorities / ATCO Area codes. We're finding where things are broken!

We will be saying:

- don't use these fields:
 - **Modification** (new / pending / revised) - BUT this is crazy. London was all set to New, some using revised inconsistency, a big mess. We're looking to withdraw publishing that data. Just like Notes field - look at suppressing publication of these.
 - **Status** (active / inactive)
 - **Revision number** (some software versions have allowed updates to some fields and not others without defining certain types of changes. Makes no sense. Don't use!!)
 - **Cleardown codes have finally gone!!** No rhyme nor reason for using these. We will suppress this going forwards.

Upcoming work:

Rail Replacement buses

Working on the how to meet PRS AIR deadline for RRB, we're putting things into the schema called RRB.

- Done an audit of all rail stations. Only rail stations on National Rail will be included and listed as a 910. Everything else, including Metros will be a 940. To simplify decision-making and consistency. Will use a feed from National Rail - when they make a stop live, we'll find it from their feed and we'll create a RRB stop automatically into the 910 NaPTAN.
- In first instance, RRB suggested radius of 250m centred on the rail station for MVP. Then we will take away the 20 or so with no roads near them / in middle of nowhere - take out RRB records. Then start cleaning up and figuring out with train and bus operating companies which we need to prioritise in terms of tidying up / cleansing.
- Rail station entrances: move from Local Authorities and into the 910 data. Can get all information we need from National Rail. Some Local Authority records were missing side entrances to platforms for accessibility access.

Feedback to Local Authority pilot:

- Meeting in next few weeks - to look at pilot with FixMyStreet. As NaPTAN, we can keep an eye on requests to move/change NaPTAN stops - requests going to Local Authorities and not acted on quickly. Local Authorities only publish once a quarter. Understand request



and make data change. Will take a bit more time than we thought, as edge cases being included.

- **If you have requests - email the NaPTAN team to help us keep a track of that, and make sure it gets done. Sometimes bus stops not being moved back to stops (crash / planning permission for position close to housing)**

Plusbus:

Meeting with Julie and Katherine next week for agreement on:

- NaPTAN dataset broken
- Mike's dataset one is good
- Resolve - get rid of broken one, and fix the other. Timing - not sure when. **Don't use Plusbus published by NaTPAN**

NaPTAN field lengths:

- public meeting on data quality and what we should be looking at
- 48 characters limit so far in the CSV file
- One thing that flows up into incoming data
- propose getting rid of this arbitrary limit. Some rail stations need up to 54 characters for Station instead of St.
- need to understand downstream impacts of removing length restrictions on some of the fields, especially the name field

NaPTAN locations:

- proof of concepts - know there are a number of TransXChange stops in a different lat/long to what is in NaPTAN.
- over 80,000 stops. Will have an exception report on difference between location in TransXChange and Lat/Long. Why is bus operator changing the stop location. Issues with ABODS and BODS, and stops not being in the right place. What does right place mean - if NaPTAN needs to win, how do we change NaPTAN to reflect this.

Q+A / discussion

Dan Saunders: Field length - great you're looking at this. We have an automated process that picks up the CSV and downloads it automatically. Think we may have hard-coded field lengths in there. Lots of notice is good - as it will probably break our importer...!



Dr J: There will be lots of notice. We also want to move people away using from CSV as far as possible. We can also provide JSON rather than XML, and JSON is comma-separated - better than CSV file, as CSV downgrades everything to 2.1. If I put in RRBs in and it breaks CSV, someone's else problem to fix.

Dan S: Probably fine, as long as there is lots of notice for it.

Dr J: you are using CSV to create reporting. Don't think CSV and wrangling it in Excel is not the best way to do it. Want us sit down and look at what does good look like.

**Mike Baxter: If you don't want us using the CSV - then what should we be using?
Recommendation that is accessible and easy to use for simple people like me?**

Dr J: that's the piece I want to start. We need to identify user needs and research. You are using CSV that was designed to create a dataset, not for reporting. Want to understand what you are doing with the CSV file and figure out if there is a better way to deliver that for you?
e.g., we built a quick Microsoft BI intelligence reporting interface - built it, but could only be used inside DfT. Get what you need without all the extra random fields you don't need.

Mike B: I tend to hide half of them etc

Dr J: asking team to run me reports from the system to pull subsets of what data I need. Missed 72 suspended stops which CSV doesn't include. Edge cases starting to catch us out.

Mike B: You mentioned stops being in NaPTAN different to TXC - what TXC are you talking about?

Dr J: we use BODS and TNDS. I meant TNDS TransXChange files. Just proof of concept to explore issues for now. How many stops are moved, and if their location is different in both of these. Where it doesn't match NaPTAN, that's a problem, as both systems are not matching.

Mark Jones: perennial question from Wales - multi-language support...?!

Dr J: I have a proposed solution. It should be in spend review (will check). Alternative language would be a little add-on field and can define what alternative language would be. Currently Welsh gets put in with slash, sometimes not. We are looking for a proper solution, but it does require re-engineering of NaPTAN. I don't think NeTEx has solved it. Want to sit down and work it through with you.

Mark: It's a legal requirement for us. Using Welsh into NaPTAN as an alternative descriptor at the moment, with a flag to identify language. It is a workaround.



Dr J: yep but it only works for one field. Need it for more than one field, as a sustainable solution. Some things are translated and some things aren't. I'll create a Welsh traveller to join Beverley and Brenda. Bronwyn from Wales as a Welsh speaker!!

Mark Jones: some of the work we are doing on NaPTAN is to help Local Authorities and operators identify where NaPTAN is incorrect. Using Real Time data from Welsh BODS and working with suppliers to identify where buses are stopping at a that is different to the location in NaPTAN. Impact for Next Stop announcements which have a 30m boundary. If location isn't correct we'll be announcing stops at the wrong time.

Dr J: Will also have an impact on A+ NaPTAN, because we won't be looking at the right place for the stop. How do we do it?

Mark: Generally it's because it has moved and NaPTAN has not been updated. We've bypassed Local Authorities and doing it ourselves in TfW.

Dr J: Let's have a chat on that. Action for Dr. J and Mark to Action.

5. Traveline Update (1:47:00 - 1:51:09)

Update from Mike Nolan

Headlines:

1. **Web services procurement complete.** Press and public announcements to come shortly.
 - Traveline.info - new journey planner to come, with an app too
 - Traveline Data
 - Plusbus
- Live with Plusbus site in first instance. Other websites and app launching later in summer / autumn.
- Several improvements planned, including getting fares and BODS disruption feed in there too.
2. **data space** - commissioned piece of work to bring across PTI elements into TNDS. Includes track data in readiness for ingestion of BODS data. Work with Basemap, for delivery in next few months
3. **Plusbus e-ticket** - Trials in Cambridge, Weston-super-Mare and 7 schemes in WYCA. No issues with reporting, and promising feedback. Proceed to national rollout in end March /



early April. This will enable the product in RDG's retail systems, then Retailers and TOCS to start retailing the ticket.

eTickets are being retailed in the trial zones, and ready for country rollout.

We're working with Ticketer to validate tickets. Issue to solve re: clash with NFC - to be sorted. Suppression code into app and allowing user to transfer ticket to Apple / Google Wallet. Discussions with TRIP.com to do that.

Tim: very exciting.

6. Bus Priority Update (1:51:09 - 1:53:09)

Update from Tim

Format and standard for Bus Priority has been around for a few years and remained fairly static. It's a way to get a bus to request a green light at a traffic signal. There are two bits of work related to it:

1. **update to the current approach** - to make it fit for current purpose (traffic signals don't just use numbers, now use alphanumeric - so need to add this in)
2. **how do you provide bus priority in future** - based on how data sources have changed in last 20 years. A group is looking at how bus priority should be provided in future. Not just bus, but traffic management more broadly.

Get in touch with Tim to get involved in these Bus Priority Working Groups

7. EU Standards Development (1:53:09 - 1:54:56)

Update from Tim

Still in a quiet phase. Updates in recent years, and we've all been party to through PTIC. Updates being developed to meet largely EU regulations, such as Multimodal traveller information service and ITS directive. Development work for these is still in early stages.

Nothing of any note to share. Working out what might need to change to support regulations and legislation. Once that work has started to crystallise into definite changes, we'll go through them.

8. Issue Log (1:54:56 - 1:56:12)

Three items to add:

Notes and Actions from the 06 March 2025 meeting

[Next meeting 05 June 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

PTIC website: <http://pti.org.uk/>



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

- 1. Add Ticketer Blocknumber item here. Put together a group with issues in providing and maintaining it - useful thing to do. Let Tim / Teresa know and doodle for a couple of weeks time**
2. Distance fares for current profile
3. Personal travel zones, which will need to flow up to EU NeTEx

9. Next Meeting

- Thursday 5 June 2025 14:00
- Thursday 18 ~~June~~ September 2025 14:00
- Thursday 4 December 2025 14:00

No AOB