

NOCResponses & Traveline Comments 22 May 2015

No	Source	Comment	Response
1	Respondent	Local input and administration is required	Agreed. It will be important to gain support from local authorities and regions to ensure that NOC is kept up to date and errors in the existing version of NOC are corrected. Central data maintenance will be retained with updates submitted by regions/authorities
2	Respondent	Operator Public Name should allow multiple entries for alternatives although the need for this in Stagecoach is diminishing	Agreed
3	Respondent	One public name can be shared by many licence numbers.	Agreed
4	Respondent	The current database needs checking in conjunction with the operator; the Traveline view can be incorrect	Agreed. (Although, there may be differences of opinion as to the correct record)
5	Peter Stoner	Support the linking with the DVSA records	See point 22 below
6	Peter Stoner	Would like exported data to be in XML format, not proprietary SQL formats	Exports will be in an open format. No decision has been made on this as yet.
7	Mark Cartwright	O-licence should be mandatory	See point 22 below
8	Mark Cartwright	Identify company parenthood is difficult and the need for it should be confirmed	To be discussed
9	Respondent	One company has developed an internet tool to view and update the NOC spreadsheet	Will be reviewed with the developer
10	Ian Miller	Support the development of a relational database with web-based access; SWPTI can help with this.	Agreed
11	Ian Miller	The database should become the main repository of operator detail and contact information for all Traveline purposes	See point 23 below
12	Ian Miller	Suggest a workshop pre or post next Working Group or Traveline Regional Board meeting to resolve conflict	A presentation will be made to PTIC outlining proposed changes to NOC. TIL has been working to reduce the number of errors in the existing data but a clean set of data will need further input from regions/authorities.

No	Source	Comment	Response
13	Jonathan Brain	Need unique NOC code, public name on vehicle, website address or phone number; single website should suffice	Agreed - would like to clarify the meaning of the term "unique".
14	Jonathan Brain	Should be available under traveline's Open Data Services	Agreed but provided now
15	Jonathan Brain	Prime aim should be information for travelling public but also with business / legal information	Agreed
16	Jonathan Brain	A company may have more than one operator (e.g. different geographic area); will each operation have its own VOSA	Companies are granted licences to operate depots, and from these depots are run bus services. The licences are granted by the Traffic Area that the depot is in and the same operator might therefore have more than one licence for depots in different Traffic Areas. The areas that the vehicles travel in have no relevance to this. NB Operator in the current NOC database is the limited company to whom DVSA has granted a licence.
17	Jonathan Brain	Implement using Oracle Apex or Oracle XE or MySQL/PHP and e.g. Joomla	Are there any specific advantages in using one of these?
18	Jonathan Brain	Integrate with EBSR?	TXC allows for NOC, Licence Name and Number to be declared; Basemap add NOC Code to TNDS if required. Is further integration needed?
19	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Information systems and admin (licensing) system requirement should be recognised as different	Whilst they are different there is some commonality between them that should be provided for.
20	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The same 4 character code can be used anywhere e.g. JourneyWeb or SIRI but this prevents identically-numbered services from the same operator from being distinguished in CIF	NOC is intended to provide a set of unique codes to distinguish between operators. Use of these codes to distinguish dublicately-numbered services would be a misuse of the concept of an operator identifier
21	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Changes that compromise the NOC database have been made without consultation; in particular, reference name and public name have been swapped	Inconsistent descriptions led to the need to make these changes. They were swapped back for all those regions that requested it, and further amendments have been made to improve the data quality of the new database. Further work is needed on this issue.

NOCResponses & Traveline Comments 22 May 2015

No	Source	Comment	Response
22	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Any need to identify O-licence number will be a significant burden of work in the SEAM regions where it forms no part of the regional operation	The licence number was in the original NOC database draft sent out for comment and it has been essential in resolving queries of alleged duplication of NOC entries. See points 5 and 7 above
23	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The tightly-defined purpose of the database (that of holding public name) should be respected and little if any extra data added to it	A relational database should be able to hold additional data separately and as "not mandatory" to avoid confusion
24	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	All regions should be engaged in NOC	There is a need to consider how to overcome a great resistance to further involvement
25	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The database should allow fuzzy searching and provide the data in table form	Agreed but we need to define the scope of fuzzy searching and consider using wild cards in the search
26	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Depot / garage details should be kept separately	Use of contact details by garage / depot requires knowledge of which service was involved and which garage it operates from
27	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	It is not clear what information regarding fares or ticketing could be universally held for all operators; what was intended?	A web link can be provided to operator fares information. This could potentially provide onward links to a number of sites.
28	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	What additional information is meant by licence holder names? Director names would serve no useful purpose	Agreed
29	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	What contact name is suggested; for what usage? Some contact details are not for public use	This field is not considered relevant
30	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Several email contact addresses might be required for different purposes and the purpose must be associated with the address in the database	Agreed
31	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Several telephone numbers might be required for different purposes and the purpose must be associated with the number in the database	Agreed
32	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Who uses fax numbers now?	Still quoted on many communications

No	Source	Comment	Response
33	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	DVSA Licence Expiry Data - not relevant for NOC	It is felt that this is relevant, for example, when licences switch from one number to another and to clarify legal names etc. TIL has been investigating linking NOC to the DVSA open data to provide a link to Licence Numbers To be reviewed
34	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	DVSA Licence Status - not relevant for NOC	See 33 above
35	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	DVSA Licence Classification - not relevant for NOC	See 33 above
36	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Local authority areas the services run in; this requires constant maintenance best determined by analysis of TNDS (and not included in NOC as static data)	Agreed
37	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	EBSR user; not relevant to NOC	Agreed
38	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Social media addresses also required with provision for additional fields as social media continues to evolve	Agreed
39	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Principles of data ownership need to be established before the web data management tool is specified	Agreed but at this stage this is considered to be complex because of the problems of defining who has ownership of each data field and managing data editing. At this stage no online data editing will be provided
40	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Provisional allocation of codes is not required but administrator should have ability to reject edits	Agreed
41	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Fuzzy searching should search Public, Reference and O-licence names	Agreed
42	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	NOC codes should never be deleted or re-used	Agreed
43	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Consideration should be given to collapsing SE and EA regions into one	Basemap requires a column for each "source" of exports to TNDS; will the sources combine into one?
44	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The term "Audit" is misleading since there is no third party auditing and approval of the database.	This is currently being used to record changes made to the database. Will consider changing terms to "Change Details"
45	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	It is essential that changes to NOC database must not require changes to other systems and pre and post change versions of the data base must be available for a transition period	Every effort will be made to minimise the extent of changes required. Is it still expected that local systems will adopt the NOC code eventually ?

No	Source	Comment	Response
46	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The DVSA open data of operators and licences should not be linked to NOC database	The two databases have already been linked in a development database showing extensive use of ceased licence numbers in NOC. We cannot see a problem in linking the two in a proper relational database.
47	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Operators of all modes of transport should be included with clear rules of ownership of data, some of which might be national. Provision should be made for ownership at local authority level to cope with any demise of regions	Agreed but experience shows that it is not always possible to furnish the parentage of certain operators. It is agreed that ownership at local authority level may be needed at some point in the future and the need for that will be kept under review
48	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Are Metro, Tram, Ferry codes in the same format as Bus and Coach?	Yes; only Rail has a format of its own. The use of two and three character NOC codes contravenes one of the principles of NOC namely that all NOC codes should be four characters to avoid clashing with legacy local regional codes
49	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	It is essential that all changes are consistent with the rules of the database and are agreed individually with the relevant data owners (for example changes by operators to public names)	Current discussion of ownership seems heavily influenced by the current format of the database of a flat, denormalised spreadsheet. When the data is properly normalised into separate tables, would the operators not be entitled to change the name of the overall holding group without regional consultation, for instance?
50	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	8 VOSA licences are not required for an NOC record	The data model currently in mind for the NOC database precludes more than one licence for an NOC code. The multiple codes that remain in the current database have simply not been cleansed yet.
51	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Is Mode a useful data item in the database and does it cope with operators of multiple modes?	It would help in cleansing the data in that all bus and coach operators should have a DVSA record (Name and Licence No). It does not cope with multiple modes and although the field definition is "primary mode" few regional data owners will know anything other than the mode that is being registered at the time.

No	Source	Comment	Response
52	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Any rules to do with joint owning group companies could result in confusing data e.g. Stagecoach owns Virgin Trains	This would presumably be the true fact that we would wish to record and we cannot see the problem if the Group is set to "Stagecoach Virgin" (making it searchable) and Public Name (the different field) is set to "Virgin Trains". Group ownership is not Public Name (nor is it an "Operator").
53	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	Why are NX and the next five codes required? They should be in one column of NC for National Coach.	Because Basemap have an automatic process to process codes based on source of data (like "Region") and the sources of data for National Coach Services are each individual operator and Basemap would not change their automatic processes.
54	SEAM (Roger Slevin)	The Yorks RT column does not fit the purpose of NOC and should not be included	The national real time system NextBuses wishes to identify the operator and some real time systems do not use regional Traveline codes. This is a valid use of NOC.
55	Essex	The use of a unique operator code, prevents multiple service numbers run by the same operators but in different areas from being distinguished. Can the new NOC accommodate different codes to enable such services to be distinguished	NOC is designed to provide one single unique code to identify an operator. Use of different operator codes locally or in CIF to make this distinction is wrong. An alternative method of distinguishing these services should be found e.g. process all data in TXC or develop and use a more complex service identity that makes the distinction.
56	Essex	Real time systems using different local codes means that blended data has conflicting operators	See comment and response 54 above
57	Tom Lake	In the interests of economy, changes to the database should be limited to those connected with the operator and not include changes arising from changes to ticketing or fares arising from changes in local authority data	Agreed
58	Tom Lake	Download formats could be SQL capable of creating and populating a database or csv, one file per table	An open format will be used see 6 above

NOCResponses & Traveline Comments 22 May 2015

No	Source	Comment	Response
59	Tom Lake	Shouldn't Parent, Grandparent etc. be in the form of a NOC code?	No, NOC codes are not issued for Parent, etc. These are not "Operators" in the strict sense of the wording being used in the administration of the NOC database
60	Respondent	GTFS allows for an "agency" entity that is like operator and fields should be in NOC to facilitate the creation of GTFS format data.	See comments 61, 62 and 62 below
61	Carl Partridge (Transix)	A field should be included for predominant branding colour in the form of hexadecimal colour code (or the like) should be included for depicting operator routes on maps	Although this is feasible it is felt to be beyond the scope of the NOC database; it would be difficult to create and maintain.
62	Carl Partridge (Transix)	A field should be included to hold URL where the operator logo can be found with the logo ideally in 1024x1024 pixels PNG format	See comment on 61 above
63	Carl Partridge (Transix)	Twitter handle should be included	Agreed see 38
64	Carl Partridge (Transix)	The web-based tool should be based on an API which is also created and made available to all, allowing APPs to access the data. The API should be based on REST/JSON	Both will be considered
65	Carl Partridge (Transix)	Would like to see the database continue to hold operators of all transport types.	Agreed