



PTIC meeting 04 June 2026

Video: <https://youtu.be/AUzBtRX3VAA>

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 04 June 2026.....	1
Introduction	2
1.1. Apologies.....	2
2. Notes of last meeting 5 March 2026 (1:20-8:40)	2
3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (8:40-32:12).....	3
Tim on Christmas Data (15:20-32:12).....	4
4. NaPTAN (32:12-1:02:20)	5
Progress since February 2026	5
Rail Replacement Bus Data.....	5
Automated People Movers (47:00-49:00)	7
5. Traveline Update (1:02:20-1:11:31)	9
6. RTIG Update (1:11:31-1:13:41)	10
7. EU Standards Development (1:13:51-1:19:12)	11
8. Issue Log 1:19:19-1:21:19	12
9. Next Meetings:.....	12
10. AOB (1:20:43-1:33:02).....	12



Introduction

Attendees:

Mark Ashton, Kainos
Lisa Bagshaw, R2P
Ian Barrett, Lancashire Council
David Batchelor, Ticketer
Mike Baxter, Leicester City Council
Justin Bloom, Vix
Leon Byford, TfL
John Carr, ATCO
John Cartledge, Independent
Nic Cary, DEFT153
Alex Cranton, Systra
David Fitzgerald, Arriva
Josh Goodwin, Bustimes.org
Emma Ireson, DfT
Teresa Jolley, DEFT153
Lee Murphy, Transport for Wales
Ryan Murphy, DfT
Mike Nolan, Traveline
Tim Rivett, RTIG
Dan Saunders, Basemap
Peter Stoner, Ito world
Nick Truscott, Cornwall Council
Ian Walker, Systra
Rob West, Elydium
Keith Willis, React Accessibility
Tom Wilsher, Ticketer
John Whitfield, Elydium

1.1. Apologies

John Austin

2. Notes of last meeting 5 March 2026 (1:20-8:40)

Push for Multi-Operator Fares to be included into BODS: National concessionary fares scheme
- Tim consulting before policy statement is ready for issue



Strategy for single source of truth for disruptions: Tim chatting with a few people on that, work in progress. Workshop to progress further.

Circulars chat with Nick Truscott: Tim to action and follow up today.

School services - what is in and out of scope - discussions continue. Bit further to go, although DfT have got advice sought from Ministers.

Ian Barratt: Requesting changes to School services BODS proforma Part A to reduce administrative burden on Local Transport Authorities supporting smaller operators . DfT due to follow up to reduce admin by changing the format.

Tim: Will add this back in. There's also ongoing issues (Part B) being raised by operators about what's in scope and what's out of scope and lack of clarity even within that flow chart that was published back a while ago.

Action for Ryan Murphy to pick this up with Simon, as there are internal conversations around this.

3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (8:40-32:12)

Update from Ryan Murphy and Mark Ashton

Business change function - stakeholder / engagement of function to help operators publish and improve data quality

- Simon met with supplier - onboarding happening now, and developing effective ways of work.

Kainos updates on BODS:

- Background work on maintenance and improvement.
- Solved issues with API feeds in April/May
- Looking at registrations process - how we can move forward on electronic registration process. Discovery phase now to explore what do OTC, LTAs and operators want / need from it. Want to accommodate broad range of people. Started 6 weeks ago, and ramping up over next month or so, then data modelling on the back of that.

Discussion/Q+A

Keith Willis: re: StreetManager contract. How does this fit in relation to BODS?



Mark: it feeds in on disruptions side - management of roadworks and how they are planned and moved through. When KMPG ran BODS integrated with Street Manager service. We are incumbent on that, and will look at whether we can get a better feed on disruptions vis Street Manager.

Keith: Thought Street Manager was identified as a preferred situation to report problems at bus stops?

Tim: potential confusion with Fix My Street. At one point, this system was being explored for reporting issues.

Tim on Christmas Data (15:20-32:12)

Exploring how to make it easier - two Eves, with runoffs. Currently, data has to be resupplied every year.

Suggestion for making Christmas easier is to change Christmas and New Year Eve Bank Holiday references from mandatory to optional. Then, journeys that aren't operating to be flagged, rather than flagging every journey running being flagged.

Discussion / Q+A

David Batchelor: We're going to have to accommodate change for the next few years. Currently people have data in there for the Eves. So need to change it. Don't want it as a critical issue on the data.

Peter Stoner: A leap year helps a bit, so 2028 needs to adjust for a Sunday, then adjust the year later for a Monday. But this does need looking at and preparation. It's important to tackle this. It's a PTIC responsibility to help clarify this, and make it easier and left alone from year-to-year.

David: Agrees, but this is not the same message we have been giving operators the last 5 years...How do we help operators address this in time?

Tim: because they will need to take action to remove flags on the journeys currently, in order to switch over the flagging. Remove old flags and add new ones?

Peter Stoner: don't think so. If all set up Monday-Friday, then they need to remove the positive running for 2028. Do it once, and it will work thereafter, provided they have M-F, S and S marked as not running. If they don't make the change this year, data will still work. But work still has to be done for 2028.

Tim: could make it non-mandatory this year, then they have 2 years to sort the mandatory out.



Nick Truscott: operators generally run a standard M-F timetable less a few trips. It's a lot of work for not much gain. And then there are various issues with systems interpreting things differently. Easier and cleaner to show M-F timetable with amendments.

John Whitfield: when I scheduled, I would resubmit the Eves. Often would recut the duties to make it work for drivers. Need to get further / deeper on this, and chat to Rob, to understand implications on various software. I find it difficult to comprehend that some smaller operators can't submit correctly. But we will help them to do so.

Action for Tim to write this up as a formal change and run a consultation on it with Ticketer and software companies, because there will likely be a change in the validator needed.

Mike B: we end up having to do some manual intervention to make it work for the RTI system. Understand you're trying to make it automatic. Think all automatic is unlikely to work. Manual intervention is almost inevitable.

Ian B: we submit data to Traveline, so we redo all the files. In the Traveline update - check whether Traveline takes static data we send through, or whether they take BODS data? Are we doing the work for no reason?!

Mike N: we are not using BODS data, your data at the moment is what we use.

4. NaPTAN (32:12-1:02:20)

Update from Emma Ireson and Alex Cranton

Progress since February 2026

- Rail Replacement Bus - review
- Fixing obvious things through review
- Service technical aspects, making behind the scenes improvements. Secure and aligned to best practice.
- Design for automated people movers

Rail Replacement Bus Data

- go live due end July 2026
- automated people mover solution planned for June 2026
- designed to comply with Public Service Vehicle Regulations. Accessible information regulations 2023
- Not in scope: Timetables, routes or real-time guarantees



Tim: so this is a parallel dataset - a separate download from NaPTAN for those interested in it.

Emma: those using it will be doing so for a very specific purpose, so keeping it separate for foreseeable future.

Alex: have aligned it as far as possible to current main NaPTAN schema. But there are a few changes to the shape of the data, hence standalone dataset

Emma: does include Welsh language translations where relevant

Discussion / Q+A:

Accessibility for physical access of RRB stops

John Carr: are you including accessibility for disabled people in the specification of the stops?

Emma: not directly. We provide RR bus stop data. Suppliers/software developers are providing screen information, and they have accessibility requirements placed on them - audio announcement, size of font etc.

John Carr: important we cover off physical access too.

Alex: There is a separate exercise around defining accessible attributes of all stops. Still being looked at but not anything definitive yet, a big project.

Emma: where Local Authorities are responsible for providing information on physical features of stops. Who provides that information for Rail Replacement Bus stops?

Mike B: Assume Rail Replacement Bus stops will be the official ones? In Leicester, the ones that are used are often different to that.

Alex: if it recognised that some of the RRB stops use existing location and are included with ATCO codes. Both are recorded in the dataset.

Thank you for work on this - very helpful

Lee Murphy: bus operators background - currently Transport for Wales taking rail aggregation in-house. We are going out to 288 stations to identify where Rail Replacement Bus stops are, and making notes of accessibility functions.

Positive feedback on meeting for this. Understand this is a new project outside of NaPTAN - unique in Rail in understanding NaPTAN, Many thanks to the team for coordinating this work.



Language challenges for us too. Recording Rail station names is relatively easy, but bus stops are more challenging.

Access to RRB dataset on NaPTAN site?

Dan, Basemap: Not following NaPTAN structure exactly. Will it run on NaPTAN site?
Can we get a heads up insight on it before launch?

Emma: it will be on the NaPTAN site, initially as CSV and then other formats in future.
Yes there will be a preview of the data. Meeting on 23rd June.

How will NaPTAN be kept up to date within RRB dataset?

Keith: AS RRB is separate to NaPTAN, will you update RRB if it updates in NaPTAN?

Alex: challenge to agree right now. Data provided to us 3rd party to us for RRB. They will keep it aligned to NaPTAN. Alternative is that ATCO codes will be included, so could check it yourself.

Automated People Movers (47:00-49:00)

- in place mid-June
- Car-park to airport etc
- inherited these - wondering how best to integrate these into NaPTAN

We are introducing the new national admin area of 945, which will be used for these services such as the Luton Dart. These will be maintained by DfT.

Tim: Lots of discussion about modelling of it, and it's been considered as a Metro. Expecting asks for other people movers too - what to do with them? DLR? Watch this space...!

Data Quality process (49:00-1:02:20)

- Putting in validation checks to catch common human error items (bus stop location in Pacific etc), and report these back to Local Authorities to correct
- rebuilding stuff to allow for this, completed by end of year

Alex: We're trying to accommodate things like stops no longer exist in NPTG, but they are still assigned to stops; tidying these up.

Emma: Local Authority examples where they didn't even know their data was not right, and once notified, they have been quick to correct it.

Discussion / Q+A

David B: can we include a check on NaPTAN code field. Had a few recently, where the same NaPTAN code is allocated to multiple ATCO codes.

Mike B: SMS code?



Alex: we have noticed this too. Good idea for us to add, to identify and remove duplicates

Is the NPTG visual editing tool making a return?

Ian B: NPTG will this be returned to Local Authorities for editing, Will there be a visual tool to aid update to NaPTAN?

Alex: we weren't aware that sort of visual tool was previously available. **Action for Alex and team to feedback information on the old NPTG visual editing tool to the NaPTAN team and go from there.**

Emma: visual tools is something we've discussed. Possible technical limitations in making this work. Will explore.

Mike B: is this the older NaPTAN editor?

Ian: we're talking about NPTG.

Emma: yes, we want to help people editing to check and confirm accurate updates - visual maps are more helpful than coded error messages.

Local Authority splits - effect on ATCO codes?

Dan: In Surrey - split with E and W Surrey. What is the plan to ensure this will be seamless and keeps up with local boundary changes.

Tim: we have been looking at transport authorities for this - Tim's work
Another matter entirely to sort out this out in NaPTAN!

Alex: big implications of changing boundaries in NaPTAN. as boundaries are strongly tied to ATCO admin areas. Looking at how that gets reapplied when boundary areas are changed - we want to find a solution for least amount of pain. It is a high priority issue we need to explore.

Dan: Idea of brand new codes rather than rehash existing ones. Keep old as legacy ad use new for future.

Alex: cleanest idea yes, but lots of moving parts we need to take into consideration.

Tim North Northamptonshire were quite on it and swept up understanding the implications of the changes, and managing this across systems.

Ian B: in Lancashire - combined authority with a number of unitaries to come. Who will be the lucky one looking after ATCO. Dan's 'retire the codes' thought seems the best option.



5. Traveline Update (1:02:20-1:11:31)

Soft launch of new website

Mike Nolan: We soft launched the new Traveline website on 23 March to give time for feedback and trap bugs.

Some users liked the look and feel of the old website. We've worked very closely with them to bring them on board as well.

A few user issues regarding journey planning and finding various things.

Two big items of feedback:

- The omission of PDF timetables, because of discontinuity with the previous supplier. We will be bringing those in before the end of June.
- A UX issue with the new My Location feature that enables people to plan from exactly where they are. This defaults to a search that doesn't recognise the location you input in either origin or destination. As an interim measure, we're working with Passenger to serve up some messages that say you need to refine your search, but we are working on a broader fix.

Mike Baxter: We have noticed that on the Arriva site, which Passenger are the supplier for, one cannot get a PDF timetable. Is that to do with Passenger's infrastructure?

Nick Truscott: Passenger offer PDFs on the Transport for Cornwall site.

Mike Nolan: currently, you have to download PDFs manually on Passenger's infrastructure. However, they are working on a national feature to enable the automatic production of PDF timetables for Traveline. This could be a feature they might roll out to others.

Mike Baxter: Arriva have said they are expecting it as part of their service.

Mike Nolan: On the question of whether PDF timetables are still required, 45% of the feedback was on the fact that people still wanted these.

We are also working on a number of other minor bug fixes on both the app – which is a less forgiving environment – and the website and hope to launch the app very soon once we are confident of favourable reviews.

Our widget is available on our website to third parties such as Good Journey, Plus Bus, NHS Cambridge, Visit Cambridge etc.



NextBusAPI

The other big thing we are working on is the Next Bus API, under licence to Traveline, having appointed TransportAPI in place of the previous supplier to provide this. Under this arrangement, we have migrated the SMS service on tap and the QR code service to the new Traveline site. This means a lot of our services are now consolidated under one Traveline service, enabling us to retire the Next Bus site.

Overall we are pleased with the responsiveness and rapid pace at which TransportAPI has delivered to integrate these features without a drop in service.

PlusBus

PlusBus e-Tickets continue to be a main focus. We've seen significant growth over the last 12-18 months since these went live. They featured in the government's National Integrated Transport Strategy as a good example of integrated travel.

Some LTAs have since come forward with additional schemes in various areas up and down the country where they'd like to bring PlusBus in as a bus/train integration. Pleased to see that a product that has been around for a couple of decades is having new life breathed into it.

We are speaking constantly with new retailers as well to widen the retail network for that and working with providers on the validation of those products.

Questions

Tim Rivett: Previously you talked about transition to a new Traveline data site. Given that's where the National Operator Code database is hosted, I was wondering what was happening with that.

Mike Nolan: We have launched a beta site. It will be a look and feel change to align it with the new Traveline site. It should be fully live before the next PTIC meeting.

6. RTIG Update (1:11:31-1:13:41)

Update from Tim Rivett

Working on inclusive information, both print and digital, with draft documents available. Part of our work with the Campaign for Better Transport who are looking at bus stop standards etc.

We are producing a standalone document on QR codes, which DfT is looking at to make sure that there is nothing in it that would cause any policy problems if they ever wanted to reference it in their forthcoming QR code regulations and advice later on in the year.



Our next face-to-face event is on 9th of July in Birmingham, with a focus on the importance of data for planning and running franchises rather than franchising contracts.

7. EU Standards Development (1:13:51-1:19:12)

20260604 European update

https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20260604%20European%20update.pdf

Tim Rivett: big news is if you use any of the Transmodel standards, such as NeTEx, SIRI, OJP, they are moving to a new home on GitHub. They will all be under one Transmodel ecosystem, which will avoid having to remember different URLs for each of them.

If you are referencing the old URL, there's a redirect in place which works well. However, if you have a local download of the NeTEx schema, or you've branched it, then you will need to manually update your source. Otherwise you won't get any of the updated pulls and things like that.

There's a bit more involved in moving SIRI and OJP. So they will probably be moved in the autumn.

One of the things that we will be able to benefit from, once they've moved under the same structure, is that some of the standards use the same modules. So, for example, NeTEx and SIRI both reference local copies of GML structures. This will overcome validation errors, for example, because of duplicate references, which Opera really suffered from.

Under the new structure this will ultimately mean that common modules will be referenced because of the way that you can access NeTEx data, say, that includes some API type online access rather than just files. That works by reusing the SIRI subscription method. At the moment, that depends on an embedded copy of the SIRI 1.3. So an old version of that is in NeTEx, but we'll be able to spin that out into a Transmodel subscription approach that everything can use.

Changes planned once everything's moved into the one GitHub repository, include:

- Trying to do more things with more bits of data.
- Planning for the next set of updates to SIRI, NeTEx and OJP are in progress. Should be a roadmap in the next couple of months.
- Opera, which we've been talking about for a long time, is the new standard for raw data and historical data on performance. So we can know how many buses were on time yesterday, how many people were on the bus this time last year etc. That is now out for a formal vote in CEN. All of the work on development has finally been completed and we are just waiting the formal processes.



If you want to talk about and find out more about Opera, there's a webinar in a few weeks that which CEN is running and you'll be able to meet the team behind that. Or talk to me and I can help you get your head around it and get access to the currently hidden away schemas and things like that.

8. Issue Log 1:19:19-1:21:19

20260604 Issues Log

https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20260604%20Issues%20Log.pdf

Tim Rivett: Following the last PTIC meeting, we identified a TransXChange issue. Last year, the concept of non-passenger stops with 999 codes was introduced. However, one could not specify the activity at these stops correctly because they are not designed for passengers to get on and off at. So a couple of new activities have been added into the 241 and 252 schemas, which are already in drafts form for people to use.

The updated TransXChange schemas are still in draft whilst I'm waiting for feedback from BODS and OTC on when they're going to be in a position to actually receive files in the updated schema.

That's taking a little bit longer than everybody expected.

9. Next Meetings:

Thursday 17 September 2026 14:00

Thursday 3 December 2026 14:00

10. AOB (1:20:43-1:33:02)

Dan Sanders: **Any update on post-BODS Implementation Review?**

Tim Rivett: It hasn't been published yet.

Ryan Murphy: it's imminent.

Nick Truscott: **On BODS I raised an issue recently with the daily data analysis which was seemingly not interpreting timetables.** I've not had any updates for a while from Kainos as to what's happening with the case of reporting an operator as having errors with RTIG matching for journey numbers, when they are not scheduled to operate on that day.

Mark Ashton: I'd have to go back and check. Have you raised a ticket Nick?



Nick Truscott: Yes.

Action for Mark Ashton to pick this up with the support desk and see if I can find out what's going on.

Nick Truscott: Thanks. We are trying to use that data to hold operators to account on their real time data. But when I start to investigate it I find it's reporting journeys that should not be operating anyway, which makes the task trickier.

On another BODS issue: is there any progress towards getting greater access to the data and its analysis?

Mark Ashton: No, I can't report any sort of progress on that at the moment. As part of the registration exercise that we're doing, we're reviewing the data structure of the back end as well.

So there might be some major changes to the data back end over the next six to nine months. We need to go through that process first of all. After that, the aim then would be to provide greater access.

Nick Truscott: It's particularly the punctuality data that we are keen to get our hands on because we've changed our RTPI provider. We are now using SIRI-ET data in place of a prediction engine. So BODS data would probably be the best route as are doing a lot of copy, and pasting and reformatting at the moment.

David Batchelor: **A long term issue we have experienced involves days of non-operation and school terms not being interpreted properly.** During half term, two weeks ago, it came up a bit more because we had a lot of operators report the problem to us.

I don't know whether anything ever got done previously on it, but there might be something in the history.

Circular services suffer from a similar issue.

We are getting problems where operators are failing compliance because they're saying the service is anti-clockwise and BODS is saying it's inbound. That is now affecting compliance, whereas we thought anticlockwise and inbound were the same things.

Nick Truscott: I've got one operator who's getting a particularly low score every week purely on that point. Everything else is spot on in their data and they're being marked down purely because of a misinterpretation of circular services.



Tim Rivett: to my knowledge, nothing has changed on that for a while.,

David Batchelor: No, but the DVSA are now chasing down on things.

We're looking into the data more and those reports that are in there for the location data are now getting a bit more scrutiny.

We've got operators to improve their data, That's then meant that there's only this one error left. Whereas before there were lots of other things that were causing mismatches. Now it's the last journey the bus does before 9:00 each day that gets checked. So it's the same journey that gets checked five nights from Monday to Friday. And that's where the numbers come up.

The other thing we've discovered that makes a critical error is if someone comments on your data, whether the comment is right, wrong or anything, it flags a critical issue. We're trying to work with the DVSA to understand what they're complaining to operators about, so that's hopefully something that will get looked at some stage to see why its checking system is throwing the error.

Tim Rivett: Has that one about comments been raised as a ticket?

David Batchelor: Not as yet, because we're still in discussion on that, that operator performance with the DVSA, so we don't want to divert attention on it.

David Batchelor: Once we've once we've got the DVSA to agree on the running issue, then we will talk about the comments.

Nick Truscott: Another issue that's outstanding is on the incomplete data insights. We get some reasoning come up like invalid real time data within the zone of a stop, but we don't get the stopping question.

Tim Rivett: That would be useful.

Mark Ashton: OK.

Nick Truscott: I asked whether it's possible to surface the NaPTAN codes as part of that dashboard.

Nick Truscott: On missing journey codes, we can sort of tend to work them out. Missing real time data within the zone of the stop again is another one where it would help if the NaPTAN number was surfaced because that would help us to pin down whether it is a NaPTAN issue or something else.



Tim Rivett: Have you got you raised a ticket for that one as well Nick?

Nick Truscott: Yes. Joanne's dealing with that one at Kanos. That's going back a couple of months now as well.

Mark Ashton: OK.

Rob West: Some months ago there was a versioning application note that was circulated for TransXChange in BODS with the PTI profile. What is the status of that? It was covering things like having a whole service within a single TransXChange file. Did that ever get sort of formalised or has that fallen by the wayside?

Tim Rivett: No. There is an action on me to sort out getting that formally issued through the BODS e-mail list and timing the notification that so that suppliers like yourself and Ticketer and others get a copy of that in advance, so you know what is about to hit your operator customers.

Action on Tim to sort out suppliers being added to a BODS email list for notifications.

Peter Stoner: Could you look again at the examples that are quoted there. I don't think they are right.

Tim Rivett: You are right, Peter. They weren't right in the drafts. And they were so wrong, some of them, they were very confusing, even to me.

Peter Stoner: Oh, OK. Well, it would be good to avoid setting hares running if we can get them right before it's circulated further.