

# PTIC meeting 07 March 2024

video: <https://youtu.be/iOGMJEu5IJk>

## Introduction

Claire Williams - Kodergarten  
Dan Saunders, Basemap  
David Batchelor, Ticketer  
David Fitzgerald - Arriva  
Jamie Kerslake - Passenger  
John Carr, ATCO  
Keith Homer, MM Transport Planning  
Keith Willis, React accessibility  
Mark Jones, TfW  
Mike Nolan, Traveline PlusBus  
Ben Murray, KPMG  
Nic Cary, DEFT153  
Steven Penn, KPMG  
Peter Stoner, Ito World  
Amy Brown, Traveline  
Triumph Okojie, DfT  
Lisa Geraldie, WYCA  
Justin Bloom, Vix

## Apologies

Nick Truscott from Cornwall  
Ian Barratt from Lancashire

**Notes of last meeting 7 December 2023  
(1:37 - 8:00)**

Ben and Dan - talk about service codes and registered - level of coverage in BODS timetables.

Tim and Ben - Share performance data on BODS in terms of coverage - **Tim and Ben to follow up.**

Ben: do have data catalogue on BODS, just about to improve data catalogue with automated information about whether services are in scope or not. Will in future be easily accessible by any user whether logged in or not. By June PTIC meeting, should have region-based rules to determine if each registration is in scope or not, plus those managed by authorities other than the OTC.

Opportunity for authorities to engage with Ben for operators who are not providing data for BODS.

Feedback welcome for improvement on reporting and releases for BODS

Opportunity to engage with BODS team - Sprint Review meeting dates now available on PTIC website: [https://www.pti.org.uk/BODS\\_User\\_Groups\\_Support](https://www.pti.org.uk/BODS_User_Groups_Support)

Flexible services: if you have questions about data and profile - let Tim Rivett know.

Bilingual data - chat with Mark Jones in Transport for Wales.

Christmas data - see item on the Agenda.

Standardise destination blind information on buses - did get some feedback on that. UK working group will provide feedback into India / international.

Point of accuracy - page 3 - BODS talking to Andrew Varley, not Farley.

## **Bus Open Data Digital Service (8:00 - 32:30)**

Ben Murray giving update.

Data quality on BODS measured by:

- Complete
- Timely
- Accurate

Want to improve the passenger experience through these things. Measuring and working towards these.

### Since last update in December...

Making changes to BODS

- **Bringing in Disruptions data to BODS** - show disruptions in visual way. Enables you to find disruptions that exist, (was all available through the API, but can now navigate using a map). Live and available now on BODS
- **Flexible services functionality.** Update based on NaPTAN data:
  - Expanded scope of NaPTAN ingest - so BODS can now read FLX stops.
  - This means if a Flexible service file is using a zone in TXC, we'll make sure the code used is an FLX stop. Validation rules are all there ready for use.
  - Also starting to visualise zones and shapes for FLX stops.
- **Service level pages are now live** - for each individual service in a dataset, there is a page for each, with a map, where you can inspect details. Iterating with additional data and timetable in future.
- **Improving the way fares data is handled.** Carnet data is now handled correctly, so no currently outstanding work items for current validation rules, so operators publishing fares data should have a report they can trust and rely on.
- **Improving how registrations being handled.** Some operators were seeing cancelled services on the timetable data catalogue - addressed that and now improved.

### Upcoming features

- **Registrations from Enhanced Partnerships (EPs)** - WECA coming first. Just about to deploy - before end of March.
- Additional functionality on timetable data catalogue, where BODS will share the knowledge we have about Local Transport Authority associated with each registration - helpful as it shows us:
  - ATCO admin area
  - region of country

- **Filtering of timetable data catalogue** by Local Authority, ATCO admin area, region, and get a view of all services that belong to those groups, and their status / how healthy they are. Also whether in scope or not. (English - in scope . If Scottish only and not cross-border then out of scope).
- **In April - start including other Enhanced Partnerships:** TfGM, TfWM and Hertfordshire, allowing them to upload their registration data via CSV, and get feedback to check before upload. Summary of all licenses are valid etc. then, can be accessible by website and users, so can view all registrations that exist.

### **Lot of exciting stuff in May**

- **Line level analysis** - currently at service code level - will be separated out to line level. Each line associated with registration will be present on timetable data catalogue and saying whether data for it is correct. This will marry up with the line level / service level pages we are doing.

### **Dataset pages - adding more info - doing two key things:**

- visualised timetables - human-readable view of TXC
- notes on that visualised timetable - on data quality checks BODS has detected exist. Provides context of where issues exist on the data. Can see, plus benefit of BODS checks undertaken. Helpful for operators, local authorities and consumers to help see where issues exist with the data. Block numbers will not be crucial for operators to address - will be available to view if available, but will not be listed as something that is mandatory and needs attention.

### **Discussion**

Keith Homer: is there going to be combined schedule list of all registrations, irrespective of who the registration authority is?

Ben: addressed in couple of ways. Devolved registration portal will enable there to be a single repository of all registrations made by either OTC or Enhanced Partnerships. BODS will have it's data aligning with that.

Keith: previously we used to have a single source for registrations.

Ben: Devolved registration portal - will be accessible through an API. Will be able to search any registration. Will be able to see all history. Import all registrations available through OTC and combine history from here as well as CSVs from Enhanced Partnerships.

John Carr: what feel do you have for number of operators who can supply fares data, and timescale for rollout of this nationwide.

Ben: all operators are able to supply fares data, and we have a free tool to assist in this, through the fares data service. Around 3/4 of all operators have found a way to publish their fares data.

John Carr: timescales for delivery?

Ben: It's rolled out. Functionality is available. Will be iterating on the validation logic and working with technology suppliers that are now able to understand what a complete fares structure looks like, including all of the previously designated simple fares and also complex fares; complete by end of the year.

Dan Saunders: Enforcement - bit behind with uploading timetables and fares? Still relying on chivvying along, or has anything been done with enforcement approach?

Ben: Action has been taken - details available on website.

Mike Nolan: Enforcement things - where you do identify inaccuracies - is there any turnaround timescales for getting it corrected?

Ben: it's around 3 months, during which a conversation is help and support offered to help in that period. Process carried out by enforcement agencies.

Triumph: clarifying - enforcement - making data complete and more accurate - there is a dependence on other parties, e.g. DVSA and operator. Whilst 3 months is the expectation, caveat that we are dependent on other parties playing their role too.

Keith Willis: simple and complex fare in BODS - are there good examples of where it has been used by people (so that the public see it and it makes life easier for them)? Or is it in there and not being used?

Ben: Passenger probably the most active and visible user of this. Just rolled out update to journey planner to enable people to see prices for journeys based on NeTEx fares data.

Keith Willis: is it expected to be online and at ticket machines etc - all the same price? No difference to prices online vs ticket machine - these can sometimes be different.

Ben: different ways to buy tickets - different options for these can be described in the data source. Journey Planners can decide what and how to show it. Choices to be made on the level of detail needed to show in each presentation route - apps etc.

## Routes & Timetables

## Location Data

## Traveline Update (32:30 - 43:10)

Update from Mike Nolan

1. About to go out to market for our suite of front-end customer-facing websites including Traveline.info, Traveline data site, .mobi site and Plusbus. We're looking for new look and feel to bring family of sites together, improved functionality, bringing in fares data, disruptions information too, as well as enhanced content, pls linking to other areas of our work.

Go to market in next few weeks. Full procurement process. RFI PQQ, and assessing bids, with later in year announcement on winning solution.

Extending partnership with Good Journey (consortium promoting car-free days out). Promoting Plusbus. We'd like to get this content into journey planning service, to enhance the user experience.

Working with other suppliers on quality and completeness of BODS data and outputting to TNDS. Completeness for some operators looking relatively good. Some stale data - how to manage that. Report back on progress this next meeting.

Plusbus - part interim plusbus website, as previous supplier went out of business. Map cutting an fares system created last year - have set up combination of APIs to enable feeds to the website. Cute interim solution, with slicker version as part of bigger procurement.

Plusbus/Traveline Board have approved roll out of e-ticketing trial in 6 locations. Used as flashpass. Working with Ticketer, TOCs for validation and suppressing NFC.

Would like to get it out as a quiet launch in Spring, and then bigger bang later on in year.

### **Discussion**

Ben: what is a flashpass?

Mike: when you flash or show a ticket to driver. Not scanned. Plusbus currently a printed ticket, not an e-ticket. Show rather than scan.

Mike: TOC = Train Operating Company

John Carr: problems with NFC - reminds me of own experience with Oyster. General problem with android phones?

Mike: Ticketer are the main supplier of machines. NFC is on the base of the unit. But where you position the phone is on top. If you don't have NFC suppression, then machines will read that, even if you don't want to use that. Bus operators have a few lines of code to suppress NFC. Need to convince TOCs and rail retailers to insert a few lines of code to do this and a request to Apple where needed.

John: Marketing issue - Plusbus tends to be least known product....

Mike: using e-ticket to relaunch the product.

Tim: Keith raised national questions about registrations - worth saying that Scotland - on the edges of what England and Wales been doing - are this year doing work on policy for their equivalent of BODS. Shaping their early thinking of this happening now, and likely to go out to market 2025.

# Representing Christmas & Bank Holiday Data 43:10 - 48:33)

Update from Tim

To understand what different suppliers are saying in TXC files, this Christmas was a bit challenging for various reasons. Flagged a problem with how moveable extra days are handled. If Christmas falls on a weekend we get an extra Bank Holiday. But when Christmas does fall in weekday, and you get the day off anyway, what do you do with those extra days?

Then also a challenge of Christmas Eve and New Years Eve - trying to understand and solve. Where some services are running, up to a particular point, and then finish early eg. 7pm, after which no buses are running.

In BODS data at least, requires an update to the data every year, because the 'Eve's change day every year. We want to try and do something about them

Tim circulated a short paper with thoughts. Also, Scottish Holidays? How do we deal with Scottish-only services, and those that cross the border - how do we handle those?

Putting together a first call next week to get some wider views and consensus on what to do about it.

Interested in getting involved- let Tim know. Session is on 14th March at 1400. Probably need a few more after this.

## **Discussion:**

David Batchelor: Christmas Day and Christmas Day Holiday are different things in TXC, so easiest way to make them work is not allow them to be the same day.

Secondly: Christmas Eve will be as much of problem this year as last year. Where we have all services running M-W-F, we need to need to say won't run on Christmas Eve, but the Tuesday-only ones will.

Tim: every year there is a different problem that operators need to respond to.

David Batchelor: initial idea - just declare when you run on them (Bank Holidays).



# NaPTAN (48:33 - 53:00)

Tim giving update on behalf of Dr J.

Sign up to Newsletter to find out what is happening using this email address:

[naptan.nptg@dft.gov.uk](mailto:naptan.nptg@dft.gov.uk)

To get involved in events, follow NaPTAN on Eventbrite for details:

<https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/o/department-for-transport-naptan-team-39414925573>. There are 2 each month - one on a Tuesday and other on a Thursday, morning and afternoon.

In recent months:

**Managed stop-removal process** - removing stops that will never exist again.

5 key users onboarded for that process and 2500 stops removed.

Although only 5 key users, covers the majority of ATCO areas that have been onboarded because its people like Tansy in Wales who manage Welsh data, and national PTI who provide bureau services for a lot of authorities, so most ATCO areas are onboarded.

The API to find out which stops have ben removed is under development. **Can get access to a beta of this if you want.**

**Looking at bus stop accessibility** - discovery to explore what data already available.

Some work was done back in run up to Olympics in 2012. This plus also more information in asset management systems that Local Authorities have.

Understanding what is out there, and its value in helping people understand accessibility of a stop in context of NaPTAN.

Sharing findings from this process features in next month or so. Watch recorded sessions on YouTube later.

# BODS NeTEx Profile for Fares (53:00 - 1:18:50)

Update from Steven Penn

Promoting fares profile and consultation gong on.

slidedeck:

<https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/files/20240229%20BODS%20NeTEx%20profile%20Consultation%20Slides.pdf>

NeTEx highly flexible and modular. Up until this point, quite a lot of variation in how each system expresses each fare product.

Building on the work done by Stuart Reynolds and Tim Rivett, we will implement a BODS NeTEx Profile for both simple and complex fares, to:

- ensure greater standardisation of NeTEx files are structured
- ensure a minimum level of data
- establish standardised methods of referencing external datasets.

Consultation - window for feedback closed yesterday. Get in quick if you want to add anything.

Consultation opened on 20th Feb with a webinar and Q+A.

Two-week turnaround to make updates and amendments to profile document before issue as final version

Final webinar in April to show what final version looks like.

Can access the document that went out for consultation: v0.4, downloadable from PTIC

website. [https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/files/BODS\\_NeTEx\\_Fares\\_profile\\_v0-4.pdf](https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/files/BODS_NeTEx_Fares_profile_v0-4.pdf)

Recognise that NeTEx documentation is detailed and jargonistic, and we have a need for something a bit simpler. We'll issue a beginners guide to NeTEx too, and work up some real-world product type use cases to aid understanding.

**Profile itself** - not as prescriptive as the PTI Profile for TransXChange. Because fares are unregulated, and operators have a lot of freedom in how they design their products. So modelling and anticipating for this complexity in a profile is quite difficult. So, instead, the profile sets a series of minimum requirements for each file:

- file structure,
- frames used in each file,
- network requirements,
- tariff and fare structure elements,
- fare products,
- sale offer package,
- fare prices

Network Data - operators, services and stops. In Britain - looking at TXC and NaPTAN to express these things. So the BODS NeTEx profile sets out how we expect these to be used.

- Operator must be a National Operator Code NOC, and the same as that being used in other files for each service
- Line - when defined in fare product, must include same line ID as in TransXChange file
- Stops - needs to be a NaPTAN ATCO code

#### **Feedback from consultation:**

- **Fare stages.** BODS NeTEx profile mandates that every time a fare stage is included it must have at least 1 stop in it. Data is about presenting price between two points, to board and alight a service
  - there may be legitimate scenarios where a fare zone might not include stop
  - reasons why systems generating this data doesn't include stops in every fare zone
  - thinking is still currently that the requirement will remain, with workarounds suggested.
- **pricing** - quite light touch. Will be expanding it, and providing guidance on how to define a fare tringle. Priceable object we we need to see prices for.
- **File structure** - what does one file per product really mean in practice?
  - adult single for a specific line/ direction is considered a fare product, and we would we expect adult single for service 1, and adult single for service 2 to be in different files. Encouraged, rather than mandated. Ensuring everything related to a single fare product is in a single file

- **Passenger types:** Sometimes not defined at all, or if defined, just in a string in the name field which is not machine readable or usable. So we are saying that User Type should be used. Some operators have quite varied offers. We will confirm user types can be used again and again.
- **A few other data quality issues.** Adding guidance for these.
- **Confusing product names:** often in abbreviated form that is not much use for user. Provide clarity / emphasis that this field name is meant to convey something useful to downstream passenger
- **Shadow fares.** Ongoing issue. Good reason why they exist in systems that generate fares, but ensure these are not published to BODS.

### Discussion:

Dan Saunders: Data for fares so far - how much of it is line with proposed profile?

Steven: while this profile is late in issuance, and the basics had been communicated to major system suppliers back in the summer. Suppliers have done a lot of work to change their data structures. Easier for operators to conform now. Fare Zone one needs resolving. Especially now Ben's team have released the Carnet update.

Fare zones with out stops are usually mostly the issue. Been a massive improvement in quality, standardisation and consistency of data in the last year. People should feel more confident they can build something with the data now.

John Carr: How much choice data are you going to present with fares? in areas where into capping and like, might be better off buying a weekly cap rather than day tickets. Feature of fare exchange - Transport Direct to do in mid-2000's - we did envisage there would be conflicts between price of operators' own day ticket and an interoperable day ticket. Always going to be built into output had we got that far.

Still under consideration?

Steven: operators are legally obliged to provide details for all fare information as data. Nothing we'll do that will help consumers figure out what is best value to them. That's for data consumers and business cases / use models to provide.

John: expect a lot of agitation if you didn't have a standard output in mainland UK

Steven: there is a standard output.

Downstream, there is a fragmented fare offer, and that is reflected in the data itself. Legislation is written in such a way - we can ask them to provide all their fares a data, and define how that should be done. Not for BODS to push certain products

over others.

John: what is it reasonable for DfT, owner of BODS, to expect to be easily available to customer who wants to know the most economic choice.

Steven: the data allows all that. Multi-operator ticket and Single operator ticket will be different in price. Anyone consuming data can analyse it and work out what the best fare option is.

John: Suspect there might be more to follow on this

Steven: The thing about open data - we can only go so far with getting the data ready.

Tim: at a practical level, some industry groups will probably create guidance on how to present data. Rail fare data equivalent of mandating how fares are shown. Some groups might start providing advice on how to present fares for different users / user needs. To help make 'best value ticket' accessible.

First time fares data has been available, so will be some shaking down as people work out how to use them best.

John Carr: relative simplicity of rail fares and trouble they've caused. Potential for bus industry, if its not nipped in the bud.

Steven: legislation is so comprehensive that it is going to shine a light on how complex the fare offer is. People will be getting a huge variety of options. How do you get to what you want compared to niche options.

Keith Willis: John made my point earlier - where as a passenger do you go to get best price? How are Traveline working with this?

Steve: Mike did send list of questions.

Amy: we're looking at procurement of websites which would include integrating fare data in that. Still discussing what output might look like. Every type of fare version there is is not what we'd want to display on every journey plan result - too complex.

We won't know what user is planning to do holistically. What would we want to surface? Does shine a light on how complex it is.

Keith Willis: wasn't benefits to public part of the review for Fares?

Tim: customers can answer for the first time 'how much does it cost' question is part of BODS business case. BODS is all about making it open for use in different ways. Presenting it is outside the scope of BODS.

Steven Penn: GTFS fares conversion coming in the summer. That will be a first in this country too I think.

Tim: make it more accessible to people who are presenting fares in other parts of the world already. Valuable experience in how to represent some of this.

Benefits to existing GTFS stops too. Just a single dataset.

John Carr: great with points made on data providers. Might be cost for this single journey, but there are other prices for other options. Might need to be additional work stream to produce consumer guidance on different fares available and how to interrogate the database to get best for you.

Tim: Lets see when people start to consume it, struggle with, and see what guidance needs to cover in future.

## **Journey planners - John Carr (1:18:50 - 1:32:20)**

Update from John Carr

John: Initially concerned journey planning engines weren't getting good clean consistent data (catchup from video)

Increasingly, getting bad results because mapping is not correct / up to date, and inconsistent results due to grouping of stops etc.

Propose we have a session - talk with DfT, BODS, ATCO board and PTIC, and do a half-day or whole-day interactive session on:

- what the experience is;
- what ideal journey planner outputs might look like,
- to what extent is BODS inclined or likely to be asked to intervene on guidance given by DfT,
- and then down into nitty gritty of what the processes are, and what can be done to improve them

Not super urgent, but think we should be addressing in, say, late Spring, early summer.

1/2 session design, with some speakers, to give information on what current experiences are and designs looking like. Getting Transport Focus and Bus Users representing users are experiencing / need.

#### **Discussion:**

Peter Stoner: feel I'm dealing with this issue all the time in journey planners we work with. Some of the bigger Journey Planning services are focused on the areas where they have biggest footfall and where they want quality to get really good. But for us as Transport Professional might be looking at consistency across wider areas, and picking up problems.

Get involved in trying to get movement on them here and there, but it is and underlying driver. Whether the process would be hinting at some sort of legislative direction - you must get a certain level of 'competence'. Whether government departments would want to be so prescriptive?

John: reasonable for you/I to get consistent results in terms of quality in main cities. Answer might not be in the conventional legislation, but perhaps more like a kitemark. Smart card equipment suppliers need to prove to be ITSO compliant, then can compete in market. Similar for journey planners, if they have BODS mark of approval?

We've got to get a doubling of Public Transport patronage by 2035. To get to Net Zero, need to go beyond that. More we can do to consider rationally making their trip by non-private mode, the better. Journey planning is one of the first entry points a current non / adverse customer is going to come to, followed by fares.

Tim: welcome some form of discussion and event to understand it, and journey planning needs for different groups.

Dan Saunders: what is the outcome? Like idea of some form of a kitemark. Currently we have no idea when journey planners last updated their data, for example. Challenge here is getting the big Googles and Citymappers to change their ways? Unless they are round the table what is the motivation for them?

We want to increase people using journey planners and bus patronage - is there more of a marketing issue with knowledge of bus, rather than the journey planner.

Tim: In recent conversations with authorities - 10 years ago they had a stake in a regional Journey Planner as part of Traveline. Now mostly gone by the way. Local Authorities may point people to Traveline, Google, Citymapper etc. Conversations also on how do I know which ones are good or not?

What is good practice? Marketing helps, but Journey Planner accuracy is also important for nervous / new users. Also, niche ones to support people with disabilities, impairments etc.

City Mapper has good relationship with DfT, and Google through Cabinet Office. Get them round the table.

Action for Tim and John to book in a date late April early May

Ben: like idea of getting bus users and Transport Focus involved. Operators are concerned that customers don't get a great experience from suppliers. Passengers experience included in this is important.

Mindset that users will blame bus operators rather than app. Want to see whether those close to passengers have experience of this. Interesting to see where perception lies, and behaviours an experience, and actions they might take as a result of it. .

Tim: we know that the operator gets the blame. Drivers get the flack for things that are different to on the street. Complaints to bus operators because of data not updated in different journey planning.



Peter Stoner: Careful with kite mark discussion. Journey planning is expenses, and so extra cost would put pressure on operators own apps.

## Accessible Information Regulations (1:32:20 - 1:51:35)

Update from Tim Rivett

Bus operators have to, depending on age of vehicle, have AV information on their vehicle now. Also retrofitting for October, e.g., buses that are 5 years old will need to have the AV equipment fitted. Operators getting retrofits sorted out.

Beginning to hear things from authorities and operators to do with accuracy and consistency of stop names. Perhaps we should start to think about and get involved in this. Our remit is to help ensure consistency in Public Transport information.

Are others hearing similar, and whether we should do something?

PTIC work for DfT on recommendations for stop names to use. Doesn't address the consistency of data.

### Discussion

David Batchelor: we are discussing with many operators who don't know they are serving stops because they call them by different names. They've taken them them out of BODS, but now the retrofit equipment is revealing issues of stops no longer showing up. We can't use an alternative NaPTAN name.

So the challenge is between the Operators choice of name, and NaPTAN name.

John Carr: experience. Difference in stop name. [video]

This is the sort of thing that will put new users off. Experience recently, ended up counting stops as about 50% of stops were different to those in Journey Planner. Details are important for users. We should look at it.

Dan: Dr J - talked a lot about NaPTAN stops call. Pressure on teams to update the NaPTAN accurately. Pressure on the NaPTAN team to update importance of names.

Tim: yep - being brought to light due to audio-visual equipment.

Nic Cary: my view - operators are very close to customers - what they believe, is that authorities are not resourced to keep fingers on pulse to keep stop names constantly up to date. Great to see something that encourages greater responsiveness. NaPTAN is great, but missing link is the responsiveness - interfacing with authority and operators.

Ben: needs some knowledge about how to make it into a responsive system. Operators really well placed to know what would be the right name, often operators don't know what to do about it. Shrug. Some operators act on it and might make own choices and two different versions. Might not take extra step to chat with Local Authority to ensure consistency.

Lots of conversations being had - discussions between operators and authorities. Operators can feel disconnected from it and outside their responsibility. What is the right thing to do about it. Need to know who those contacts are and what process is. Work to do to encourage that relationship.

Keith: there is a guidance manual for NaPTAN - use of side roads, main roads etc. Valid but not enforced for many years. Bits that change much more rapidly.

Peter Stoner: Dr J saying earlier to us this week - NaPTAN team planning to reinstate the single contact at Local Authorities and easy way to address this feedback. We've been asking for it and have been reassured its coming. Really good to get it logged into the system.

John Carr: all very well saying that contact in each Local Authority will solve it, but if told no resources to do this work, then all you've done is get another sympathetic ear. Message back to politicians, systems need to be recognised Local Authorities need to have resources.

TJ: don't necessarily know the problem exists - unless looking for it, don't know it exists.

# EU Standards Development (1:51:35 - 1:53:12)

Tim update: quiet phase at the moment. In limbo between approvals.

Next bit of work to produce common glossary across EU. Consensus about definition of words and phrases, not just in Public Transport but also between bus and rail, and across road, walking and cycling.

## Bus Centre of Excellence (1:53:12 - 1:54:20)

Tim update:

if not a member, go and get signed up for newsletter. This gets you membership.

If you are not a member of a professional body, being part of BCoE means you can apply to be a CIHT member for free.

## Issue Log

No new issues

## Next Meeting

Thursday 6 June 2024 14:00

Thursday 26 September 2024 14:00

Thursday 5 December 2024 14:00

## AOB

John Carr: think it would be helpful and appreciated by community transport organisations if we could ensure that as much information on their Christmas and New Year services is flagged up on sites using BODS - as a community service.

Tim: will add this to Christmas/ Bank Holiday data discussions. Action.