



PTIC meeting 18 September 2025

Video: <https://youtu.be/pw4fnlHkFW8>

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 18 September 2025	1
Attendees	2
1. Introduction	2
1.1. Apologies	2
2. Notes of last meeting 6 June 2025 (1:45 - 17:00)	3
3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (17:00 - 43:00)	4
Procurement update	4
4. NaPTAN (43:00 - 1:06:00)	8
Rail replacement Bus (RRB) Data - main priority	8
Audit for NaPTAN rail data	9
NaPTAN A++	11
5. Traveline Update (1:22:50 - 1:32:10)	12
6. Scottish Bus Open Data (1:06:00 - 1:22:50)	13
7. Local Government Reorganisation – Impact on Standards and Data (1:32:10 - 1:44:30)	16
8. RTIG Update (1:44:30 - 1:50:40)	18
9. EU Standards Development	19
10. Issue Log (1:50:40 - 1:57:00)	19
9.1. Issue_103 - Personalised Fare Zones in NeTEx	19
9.2. Issue_104 - Supporting Block Number	19
9.3. Issue_105 - Distance based Fares in BODS Fares NeTEx Profile	19
9.4. NEW Issue_106 – Updating Transport Authority	19
11. Next Meeting (1:57:00 - end)	20
AOB	20



Attendees

Ian Barratt, Lancashire Council
Devon Barrett, Podaris
David Batchelor, Ticketer
Mike Baxter, Leicester City Council
Emily Bollands, DfT
Amy Brown, Traveline
John Carr, ATCO
John Cartledge, Independent
Nic Cary, DEFT153
Josh Goodwin, bustimes.org
Tess Harwood, Kodergarten
Teresa Jolley, DEFT153
Mark Jones, Transport for Wales
Jamie Kerslake, Passenger
Neil MacKinnon, Stagecoach
Mike Nolan, Traveline
Triumph Okojie, DfT
Kat Quane, Transport Scotland
Tim Rivett, RTIG
Dan Saunders, Basemap
Geetanjali Sehgal, DfT
Richard Senvewo, DfT
Peter Stoner, ItoWorld
Nick Truscott, Cornwall Council
Keith Willis, React Accessibility
Tricia Wright, Nottinghamshire Council
Rob West, Elydium

1. Introduction

1.1. Apologies

Graham Browne (ex WYCA, now independent)
Justin Bloom, Vix



2. Notes of last meeting 6 June 2025 (1:45 - 17:00)

Opportunity for discussion with Triumph about disruptions and SIRI SX

Triumph and Nick Truscott to talk about Excel TXC tool

- Nick: nothing further on that, but we've moved on and looking at another tool.
- Triumph: looking at options for updating that tool, and addressing the identified issues that users are having. Hopefully by December PTIC meeting, we'll have an update on this work. We are updating the tool and dealing with issues around dates that are making it difficult to use.

Triumph, Dan and Mike to talk about coach data

- Triumph: we did. Had conversation with Amy Brown about NCSD data. We've taken away that feedback and BODS team / KPMG will be working on implementing changes as a result of this.
- Also getting additional resources to proactively fill in gaps in the data, and contacting coach operators in ways that the automation we assumed would solve the issue doesn't. Some resource from KPMG to assist to proactively look at the data. DfT - we need to have a longer-term view on data quality. In short-term dealing with the issues in NCSD.
 - Dan: was keen to meet with Triumph - believe I was excluded on purpose
 - Mike: Coach services data - quick google now - confusion as to where it is located. Some links to Traveline, and some to Gov.uk data, but not up to date. Not easy to find.
 - **Triumph: as part of migration/novation of NCSD, it is now downloadable on BODS platform, and this is the intention for future. Download data function on BODS for Coach data.** In terms of old API links, it has been retired for a while, but we're finding how to take the old reference down.
 - Mike/Amy: So this data.gov.uk link is now defunct:
<https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/3a3b32f3-d727-4623-aa17-daa2f39aaf92/national-coach-services>
 - Jonathan Raper: a fair amount of pain out there about NCSD quality data especially at Airports. Lot of duplicate data. We've traced it to a non-statutory aspect, so coach companies see it as a nice to have rather than a must do. **To register with you Triumph: Heathrow are very unhappy this hasn't been resolved.**
- Tricia: following on Jonathan Raper's observations on Data Quality for NCSD, we use it for RT predictions, and we have had to exclude some routes as using non-recognisable NaPTAN codes (9000). Our overnight data compiler was failing and slipping because of this. Did report it to BODS helpdesk, but use of non-NaPTAN codes have caused it a bit of an issue in downstream uses
- Dan: there is a 9000-to-NaPTAN lookup we used. When the service moved to KPMG and BODS, this lookup may not be being maintained. Might be useful to find that lookup to assist with this.



Tim and Triumph: **Flixbus restriction issues on timetables - not concluded this yet - not simple to achieve in TransXChange or GTFS.**

Tim to chat with NaPTAN team about Local Authorities creating dummy 999 operational stops - **now on backlog**

Tim: Likewise, Country stops, Festival stops like Glastonbury - also on list of things to revise when we produce an updated TransXChange profile document relatively soon.

Tim: Code for non-UK bus stops - discussed briefly with NaPTAN team

Tim didn't talk to John Cartledge about Hertfordshire's stops but did chat to Herts about this. John Cartledge - will go back and check. Tim: have noticed a number of updates after a period of quiet

Mike Nolan and Nick Truscott - **talk about disruptions and passenger app.**

- Mike N: had that conversation - we are looking at implementing on the new Traveline site coming soon.
- Nick: good conversation - if we can bring it forward, that would be good for everyone.
- Jonathan Raper: we are publishing SIRI SX data in our API. Documentation is on our document page

Tim: failed to find any docs on how TfN were doing language for disruptions

- **Jonathan Raper: we provided that service to TfN - let us know and we're try and dig it out for you. Action for Tim and Jonathan to find this,**

Tim: not yet circulated link for the European work yet as its not been published yet

Tim: failed to organise discussion about block number - but will send something round tomorrow

3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (17:00 - 43:00)

Update from Triumph.

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20250918%20BODS%20Update.pdf

Procurement update

We're in the process of reprocurring BODS, in two parts: technical and engagement



Technical procurement

In June just about to launch ITT. Concluded process, and we now have a preferred supplier. No names yet - post ITT governance and commercial activities are continuing. In coming months before next PTIC meeting, we'll all know who it is.

Engagement (BODS connect) supplier - process is not concluded, so no update yet.

Given the timelines of existing contract expiry, we have decelerated pace of delivery. Work done in last 3 months has been ensuring we are addressing technical debt and completing commitments we made in terms of assimilating things into DfT architecture. Also commitments for improving documentation and system performance enhancement. Continue to do that between now and end of September 2025 when current contract closes.

Work done includes:

- **Improving processing speeds** - to give significant performance improvements for data processing pipeline.
- **Moved to serverless architecture** - enabling scalability and parallel data processing, so as to reduce time necessary to validate and publish datasets.
- **Publishing integrity and workflow enhancement** - ensuring duplication prevention, and flagging when datasets for same service are being published. Believe this addresses the issues of multiple publication of data, and helps quality and accuracy of data in BODS
- **Streamlining the Operator and Local Transport Authority pages** - includes providing an at-a-glance service and data quality picture across the various datasets available on BODS. Also providing an easily understandable picture on health indicators to support data owners triage and resolve issues more efficiently re: data quality
- **Integrated fare data health review** into service review workflow
- **Included view of vehicle locations in Real Time** - now shows actual real-time movement of vehicles aligned against the route map using timetable data in BODS. Designed to help Local Authorities and bus operators verify accuracy of data on BODS
- **Overhauling the front end** - bringing BODS into compliance with revised GDS standards and user expectations. We've enhanced accessibility and responsiveness of the service, and general UI and UX improvement over last few months.

For ABODS:

- **Enhanced the on-time performance and journey analysis features** - now distinguish between inbound and outbound trip directions, which improves route-level and stop-level insights, and addresses analytical gaps where aggregated figures could obscure directional performance issues
- **Introduced Stop analysis features to show geographical tool visualising stop-level performance.** Every stop nationwide now has this - can see performance of that stop. Will help with identifying and improving route line challenges that local authorities may have. Helps with diagnosing recurring patterns with particular stops - helping users understand which stops have got issues.



- **New dashboard to supply BODS compliance metrics** - for local authorities and bus operators and operators. Launch expected around 25 September 2025. Designed to enhance monitoring and reporting across both BODS platforms
- **Journeys feature developed** - to help LAs or DfT in performance analysis of vehicle journeys and distance travelled. Now select on particular line over particular period, to see distance travelled on that line or service.
- **Improvements made to GTFS and GTFS-RT** - to ensure that data is closer to source, and facilitates potential future expansion of GTFS to include fares data, disruptions data and greater accessibility information

Discussions / QA

Tim: one thing with ABODS - team working with First group to validate and compare results what operators get in their own systems to ABODS - to help improve confidence in ABODS. Confidence does seem to be building up confidence - First group might be nearing completion of this work and might be able to share that.

Nic C: Statement: Triumph - customary modesty!! Fantastic - know just how much you and team have done; a lot of work and thinking - a hugely complex procurement. Thank you.

Question: **any movement on block number?**

Triumph: some, but not enough movement to provide a confirmed update. Hopefully we'll have one by the next PTIC meeting in December 2025.

Ian from Lancashire:

1. Out-of-scope services to manage more easily on BODS?

Ian: September is always a nightmare for Local Authorities - school contracts and registrations. Can we circumnavigate out of scope services so we don't have to go through BODS? Can we not create within proforma we provide in first place a tickbox for out of scope - so we save ourselves 3-4 hours of work for every service?

Triumph: take this on board. Can we discuss and flesh out further. Action to follow up to discuss between Triumph and Ian Barratt.

2: multi-operator ticket problem where Local Authority is not agent for all bus operators wanting to be part of it

Ian: we've been pinged about multi operator tickets to go through BODS. Have raised a few tickets and chatted with Stephen Penn on this, but as a Local Authority that publishes for a number of operators, we can't add operators we aren't agents for into multi-operator tickets. What is the solution?



Triumph: need to understand more about this multi-operator scheme proposed. Action to follow up for Triumph and Ian Barratt to understand issues before proffer a solution. Update next time we meet.

Dan Saunders:

1) data for compliance levels of timetables and fares?

Triumph: we do have figures on ABODS, but not to hands. I can provide these separately. On 25th release date, everyone will have their figures for their areas. Can provide general data for BODS overall.

Dan: did talk previously of maybe making a public version of the high-level compliance page nationally- given ABODS is behind login. Any further thought on this?

Triumph: there have been discussion around this, in DfT there are implications of opening ABODS - want to understand and manage this. Conversations continue internally and with bus operators to consider implications to manage these before decision is made.

Findings on post-implementation review of BODS?

Dan: we all got pinged email about participation in post-implementation review of BODS, to supply by July. Didn't see output of findings - dates for results of this to be shared?

Triumph: can take this away, it's not part of my work. Action for Triumph to find this out and provide update on this work to this group.

Tim: shared screenshots from ABODS on compliance

Mileage data availability

Nick T: Mileage data - any way we get to that now - or do we need to export into a usable form? Need to be able to extract that - especially for the data collection we're being asked to do

Triumph: Action to follow up and provide your information and a general update to this.

OTC processing delays affecting compliance figures in BODS

Nick T: how much confidence we have in compliance figures when there are still delays in OTC processing service registrations

Triumph: compliance figures are subject to the data we consume from OTC. Very good question to ask. Continue to engage with OTC and internally in DfT re: possible solutions and downstream effects on analysis that rely on that data. Once we agree a position on how we deal with interaction on BODS and OTC data, will provide an update.



Nick T: Cornwall example - most services changed on 31 Aug and were duly registered 42 days in advance, but were only processed by OTC last week, 2 weeks before they begin. Don't know if this is a wider issue across the country? Tim - what happens if an operator needs to change something due to an emergency road closure?

Tim: This is a national issue and OTC are well aware of it.

Supporting TXC tool users

Tess Harwood re: Kodergarten Offboarding users we've had for the last five years - understand you are reinvesting in TXC tool - when do we expect that to be ready, so I can inform users?

Triumph: don't have definite timeframes yet. Will continue conversations internally, and will share once we are satisfied there is a timeframes can share, we will do with PTIC and others.

Tess: we'll be offboarding 18 operators and 200 services. To expect some degradation in small operator data at end of September.

4. NaPTAN (43:00 - 1:06:00)

Update from:

- Emily Bollands - delivery manager on NaPTAN team
- Geeta Sehgal, NaPTAN

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/20250918%20NaPTAN%20Update.pdf

Rail replacement Bus (RRB) Data - main priority

In line with [PSV AIR regulations](#) bringing in digital visual and audible information about routes and upcoming stops on Public Service Vehicles, including RRB services

Currently in NaPTAN - don't have all the information on all RRB stops - working to get that ready.

To meet regulatory requirements and improve passenger experience we need accurate and structured data on RRB, and this means integrating RRB into NaPTAN to ensure consistency of naming conventions of bus stops.

Working on MVP for this - integrating Corpus and stations.xml dataset - using CRS and TIPLOC data to join up the datasets

Also working with RDG to source the information on RRB services and get information on Lat/Long locations to support the required digital visual and audio information



RDG working with 3rd party Fabrik to collate that data.

Next Steps:

- analyse data from RDG and ensure we have what we need
- introduce RRB data into NaPTAN
- update NAPTAN API so that developers and transport operators can access it

Audit for NaPTAN rail data

Geeta: ongoing concerns about accuracy and data quality - need to understand data issues and how best to address.

Using stations dataset as reference point to compare 910 dataset against and spot differences. Stations dataset is from RDG in marketplace.

Audit identified discrepancies between both datasets in these 3 predefined topics:

- Missing rail stops,
- mismatch in station names
- Differences in Lat/Longs.

Also uncovered additional insights - 910 data issues that also need attention. I'm processing report along with findings and recommendations.

One question for PTIC membership on NaPTAN 901 dataset: are there any planning or operational services using 910 stops in journey planning or operational services, as we want to understand impact of data discrepancies in NaPTAN, and understand alternative sources - if NaPTAN not being used what is used to plan these journeys?

Discussion / Q+A:

Dan Saunders (Basemap): We take the National Rail ATOC timetable file and we use NaPTAN 910 codes to convert it, because we want a singular view. We have about 1900 users of our data cutter tool that are consuming that type of data downstream. It's also used in our Track software to do journey planning, so its an important aspect for us, using NaPTAN as a single source of truth over the ATOC data.

Peter Stoner: we are also using the 910. What about platform positions? For Lat/Long of a station is not particularly definitive - which bit of the station? Concourse? Ticketing area? Mid-point on tracks? We do our own adjustments on account of those things. Further discussion would be most useful

Geeta: realise Lat/Long not there. For us it is referring to the mid-point in the platform. If there is more information on the issues with 910 - would be great to here.



Peter Stoner: Local Authorities provide entrance locations usually. Would be good to get them from a rail source.

Action for Tim: put you all (Dan, Peter, Geeta, Emily) in contact with each other to discuss in detail

Nick T: anomalies in Cornwall - RRB stop at a different station (e.g. Menheniot station nowhere near the village). How will these get handled? Important we don't get random floating stops in a village.

Geeta: we are getting data from RDG for RRB stops. First we need to review data and what information it is holding. Then in next meeting we can provide more information around this.

Jonathan Raper: We serve out the schedules of tube, metro, subway services using the 910, so a lot of services built on that so would appreciate being kept in the loop if any changes to it through NaPTAN

John Carr (ATCO/Independent): for users, surely most important thing is where RRB is going to stop? In Cornwall e.g. this can be quite different from where station entrance is? Can we be assured it is the RRB stop that is being identified and incorporated into journey planning being done, rather than the station entrance and exit?

Tim: if NaPTAN team can deal with it if it's the entrance - RDG are involved because no-one has the official dataset of where the buses actually go from - hence need for this exercise. It will be where the TOCS think they are requesting bus operators to leave from. It might be different from reality...!

Emily: RRB data will be from RDG. Hopefully can give update on this in the next meeting. We have raised this with RDG. Accuracy of where RRB stop is obviously really important so RDG will be looking at that.

Mark Jones (TfW): once audit complete, who is responsible for maintaining data?

Geeta: dataset we are creating at the moment is a one-time data acquisition. On-going management - updates in NaPTAN space - all these considerations are part of the process. MVP currently focused on current image of where RRB bus stops are in the country as a starting point. Discussion and solution space will be where your question will be explored.



NaPTAN A++

Geeta update:

Background: problem statement - multiple operator multi mode - accessibility information right now is patchy and unreliable. Users with accessibility needs can't plan journeys with confidence. Network is less inclusive than it should be.

Private Beta: focusing on bus stop accessibility - wheelchair users. Local Authority data will always take priority over any other source of accessibility data. e.g., Street-related data for Newcastle using AI, and then Newcastle then shares their audit accessibility data with us, we will switch to use local data, and we will only use AI to fill in gaps.

1. data pipeline
2. how we generate the data (using AI models)

Data pipeline: built and ready.

1. **Ingests and stores accessibility data from various sources** including Local Authorities, NaPTAN team, AI source etc. Lots of different shapes, forms and formats, which are normalised into a consistent format
2. **Predict accessibility of a bus stop** based on street furniture
3. **Publish the data** to data participants

Currently the data pipeline is holding data for 6 Local Authorities - where we have created manual data for them. There is also data for 2 Local Authorities who provided accessibility data to us.

Why do we need AI models?

400,00 stops in country - manual approach is not physically scalable. Cannot ask Local Authorities to create or provide accessibility data if they don't have it. So we are testing if AI models can help us. Testing different AI tools to understand feasibility and viability of collecting street furniture.

We have picked a suitable AI model to test, and process created for testing the accuracy of the results the model produces.

Next steps:

for AI model testing: entering pilot phase where we will run experiments with set data, to see if this approach is accurate and scalable. We will report on these findings in coming weeks. We will report on these findings.

for data pipeline: data research with data consumers - important feedback from them - rather than us give a binary accessible or not Y/N, if we could provide raw furniture data. Reason is that accessibility is different for different needs. Want to allow people to make choices based on their needs. This is a change we are going to make - we will remove Y/N, and we will provide raw furniture data to data consumers.



Discussion / further information

Tim: for questions and comments on NaPTAN work, suggest you attend public meetings by NaPTAN team. Next one on Accessibility is Thursday 25th Sep. Suggest you attend that, or send questions through to the NaPTAN team email address.

5. Traveline Update (1:22:50 - 1:32:10)

Update from Mike Nolan

Working with DfT on BODS data healthcheck

Invested in Elydium software which enables us to analyse completeness and quality from our perspective as a potential user of the data. We're feeding back through various forums and can bring insights back to this group.

Web services contract with Passenger

- Traveline website and journey planner
- Plusbus website
- Traveline data website
- New Traveline app

We've been working on the requirements and delivery of this, and are signing off on designs for the new websites for Traveline and Plusbus. We'll have something to share shortly.

We plan to go live with Plusbus website first, to complement eticket loud publicity. Beta version in coming weeks and look to go live shortly afterwards

Traveline website and app will be next - more discussions around user journeys, search filters etc Will ensure minimal disruption to current site.

Improvements include:

- Disruptions information form Disruptions messaging tool on BODS
- Vehicle tracking
- Fares
- Working with Good Journey - promoting car-free days out, with discounts for attractions using public transport to access. Content will be on website too, which should also help with SEO opportunities too.
- Traveline data website - we're making it cleaner to access TNDS and other open datasets

Plusbus eticket



Biggest thing launched this year, 23 weeks ago:

- Now have 3 major retailers: Trip, TrainPal and TrainSplit alongside number of TOCS
- Haven't promoted this yet - just let retailers pick it up.
 - Point of Sale for bus ticket when buying rail tickets has been a major boon.
 - 28% of sales across Plusbus range on eticket.
 - Sales increase 55% on same period last year. New sales with 47% increase in revenue are genuine, not just shift from paper.

Loud launch once we've overcome obstacles:

- website launch
- Trip.com - we're requiring suppression codes on their apps to prevent NFC conflict - it's in Android version but not yet in Apple. Once that's in - we can move to loud launch.
- 77 items of feedback for issues scanning tickets, or being refused travel by drivers etc. We're working with local scheme coordinators to resolve these issues, including re-issuing tickets and doing driver training. Relatively pleased with this. Not receiving volume of complaints / feedback we might have anticipated.

Introduced 2 new schemes - Hucknorth and Burnham. Have also received significant number of requests 18 or so for new schemes or amendments to existing schemes.

Addressing some local authority BSIP obligations too. Already 280 schemes, but now its in a form that is useful for customers, we're seeing it being requested more.

New requests from Jurassic coast - visitor market for summer months.

Discussions / Q+A

John Cartledge: Outskirts of London - not covered here? Movement on this front?

Mike: no plans afoot. London is currently excluded from Plusbus for the reasons you mentioned.

6. Scottish Bus Open Data (1:06:00 - 1:22:50)

update by Kat Quane

General Updates:

In-house review of findings and results, still being finalised, but quick highlights:

- 100% support for NaPTAN being the standard that we use for bus stop data



- We framed questions - based on our analysis, our view is X - what do you think about X?
Largely there is support for the ones we have suggested:
 - SIRI-VM for real time data
 - TransXChange for timetables
 - NETEX for fares and money stuff

Feedback on different barriers for smaller operators - might not have in-house systems, expertise or costs. Analysis and results on the support and training requirements is not completed yet.

Likely to be some caveats for operators that don't have systems in place yet, such as transitional arrangements for moving from nothing or current manual methods to software-supported solutions.

Lots of really good informative feedback, covering things like:

- stay with England
- do you own thing
- you have BODS - why are you consulting on it?! (We don't currently have BODS!)

We structured the consultation so that the first bank of questions was about experience of buses and use of them, and the second bank were more technology-focused.

Worried we get a lot of technical content in the response, but the results were quite balanced, with about 50% respondents being users and 50% from the technology / operational side.

77 responses - for us that's quite good and representative. For context, the Traffic Commissioner has 136 bus companies, but out of them 4 of them do about 90 percent of the routes.

A few people were confused and thought it was about the English KPMG BODS. Might need to do more engagement to make sure everyone is completely up to speed, such as for local authorities for any future mandatory use of NaPTAN.

Discussion / Q+A

Timescales for publication of consultation response

Tim: do you have a idea of when formal response might be issued?

Kat: working toward end of September. Number are fairly easy to analyse. Some of the points are great technical points, but too detailed for published consultation response.

There will be a short three-paragraph summary: 'We asked, You said, We did' on TransScot website.



Improvement Service for supporting data management?

Neil MacKinnon: for ScotBODS - is there any thoughts to have the Improvement Service manage / support NaPTAN for Scottish Local Authorities? <https://www.improvementservice.org.uk/>

Kat: Previously I was head of Roadworks policy for Transport Scotland and the Roadworks Commissioners database they use for all live roadworks in Scotland is managed by the Improvement Service (they take the data from the 32 local authorities, clean, organise and normalise it, and make it available for use in this website). We did approach them and it is something they are aware of. No formal agreements or anything made yet, but we gave them an early heads up, and local authorities will be asked to do, we think you are best placed to support them, and they agreed.

Neil: was previously with Scottish Homes, where we created standard formats for data collection and the Improvement service took it on. They do it for planning, land registry, etc it doesn't matter the subject, it's what they do.

Kat: They do a great job, and there is usually a very small team handling data stuff with in Local Authorities

Neil: Previous experience - 32 councils, 32 different ways of doing things. Improving service is helpful.

Kat: they're aware, and have signed up to the public meeting next week.

Tess: any findings on how to support small and medium operators to provide quality passenger data?

Kat: We got two types of responses

- people raising the point about unique hardships that smaller operators will face
- we didn't get any direct responses from small to medium operators

Response from CPT - thought this realistically might include views of medium-sized operator. Welsh group - asked them. Not actually heard from any directly from small Scottish operators. Lots of suggestions for things they will face.

Anybody ideas on group who is aware of representing their views? We'd rather they spoke for themselves, rather than us rely on others speaking for them

Nick T: interesting given current position in Dumfries and Galloway, where a lot of smaller operators have stepped up to fill gaps. In the south west, we have national PTI (formerly Traveline South West) provide an agent service for BODS data.

Kat: we have Traveline Scotland - people have suggested we ask if Traveline Scotland have a role



in this agency approach. Could small operators be represented by a larger organisation to save them all individually procuring things?

Nick T: works well for us. All our small operators are using the national PTI to do it on an agent basis

Need for guidance, user guide(s)

Kat: there were a lot of calls for guidance too - technical guidance / users guide. How do we get data from A-B. What is meant by this term?.

Need to consider services beyond just local

Kat: We'd initially though people would only want to hear about things that the Traffic Commissioner would consider to be local services. Feedback is for what we would called long distance coaches and Rail Replacement Bus services to be included too.

Do reach out and message / email me to follow up on anything:

Kat.Quane@transport.gov.scot

7. Local Government Reorganisation – Impact on Standards and Data (1:32:10 - 1:44:30)

Update from Tim

In Local Authority world, number of authorities have combined or split e.g. Bournemouth Christchurch Poole created from existing authorities, and took transport authority powers meaning they are responsible for bus stops, and are a statutory consultee for bus registrations.

More recently, authorities like Northamptonshire split into West Northamptonshire and North Northamptonshire. Cumbria split into Cumberland and Westmorland and Furness.

Likely to see more of these in coming years - Local Devolution and community empowerment bill going through parliament will make it easier for Local Authorities to do what they want in terms of adjusting boundaries, creating new mayoral authorities etc. Bids / proposals already submitted.

Why important?

When a local authority takes transport authority powers - they need to be able to receive registration data, and tend to start to look after bus stops - both of which are important from a data standards port of view. Changing ATCO codes - NaPTAN team did split of Northants stops into the two new authorities. That is the only change I'm aware of to authority ownership in NaTPAN, but significant thing is impact on TransXchange.



In TransXchange, there is an enumerated predefined list of transport authorities. That list is as of 2010, so it is a little out of date. We need to work out what we're going to do on that. Action: added to Issues log - proposal to changes to TXC to cope with that.

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/Issue_106%20-%20Updating%20Transport%20Authority%20in%20TXC.pdf

Going to need to be more aware of and on top of changes to ATCO codes, area codes, creating new ones, removal of old ones.

Those of you consuming NaPTAN data / deal with TransXchange - you will need to keep up to date with changes etc.

Other things that might need to change as a result of local authority changes?

Discussion / Q+A

Nick T: CPIC codes in the world concessionary fares. Lots of problems in Cornwall with Unitary status. Every NaPTAN is allocated to a CPIC to identify the local authority where the journey starts.

Peter Stoner: Northants transition was not as smooth as we would have liked. In data terms - if there are going to be more of these, do we have some sort of alias to list 2 numbers as paired for a transition period. Not necessarily the answer, but recognise there are things that need to be considered. Something in the transxchange approach could consider this.

Tim: Northants was first time it had been done, and was relatively simple. BCP was more challenging.

Neil Mackinnon (Stagecoach): Look up thing might be a pragmatic solution. There is a GSS code for geographies - get updated through time. Could have a look up for ATCO to GSS code - updating a lookup table instead.

Mike Baxter: Something happened in Nottingham/Nottinghamshire? Some pain involved in changing NaPTAN?

Peter Stoner: Several - Northants has not been the first. Warrington split too and was challenging

John Cartledge: some cities have merged in counties in 1970s.

John Carr: ATCO is concerned that in some cases you may be splitting up integrated transport units. Would be useful if officers can say to members this is not sensible to do. Authorities can agree to work together under existing legislation as far as we're concerned.



Inevitably it will cause quite a lot of disruption if going to see number of authorities slated for changes under legislation going to happen, and take the eye off ball of good integrated transport

Tim: all we can do is react to changes as they are confirmed and take place. And offer advice.

8. RTIG Update (1:44:30 - 1:50:40)

Relatively quiet over the summer

We released guide on how Real Time Information is produced, and different roles and responsibilities of people / teams involved.

We are in process of updating guidance on avoiding low bridge strikes, given high-profile recent incidents to help ensure avoided in future

About to ask suppliers of data systems for their christmas advice to their user base - we will be releasing the advice on christmas, which is relatively easy this year, in a couple of weeks.

Discussion / Q+A

John Cartledge: who is 'We'? KSI group. leading on this.

Tim: We is RTIG. I'm well aware of KSI work, and I'm liaising with Kerry who sits on Centre of Excellence working group.

Two week October half-terms / Academies choosing own half-terms

Nick T: other local authorities facing new challenge of two October half-terms - consistent message to customer on services running. Just under half of academies are going for 2-week half-terms. Secondary's choosing one or other of these.

Dan S: Surrey has rolled out 2 week October break for all schools now.

Nick T: academies seem to be doing it differently. Changes in July too - some finishing mid-July and others going to late July.

Dan: Wild west at the moment. Local Authority consulted on it.

Dan Saunders and Nick Truscott to follow up and action on. Others to assist Nick Truscott with experience here.



9. EU Standards Development

No new updates

10. Issue Log (1:50:40 - 1:57:00)

9.1. Issue_103 - Personalised Fare Zones in NeTEx

No update

9.2. Issue_104 - Supporting Block Number

No update

9.3. Issue_105 - Distance based Fares in BODS Fares NeTEx Profile

No update

9.4. NEW Issue_106 – Updating Transport Authority

https://www.pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/Issue_106%20-%20Updating%20Transport%20Authority%20in%20TXC.pdf

TransXchange is used by DVSA for electronic registrations. The fact the list is out of date means they can't make sure the right authorities are receiving the registration notification.

DVSA are requesting an update to the list. this means we will need to update the enumerations in TXC. Which means we need to release updates to the Schema. Big question for this group - do we restrict that that 2.4 and 2.5. Is it necessary to update 2.1 (as not used for EBSR or BODS if providing information about contracting authority)

Nick T: Designation of Cornwall and Isles of Scilly - we are separate local authorities and Isles of Scilly does not have local bus service licensing

Tim: big problem I'm working through with DVSA is trying to identify list of all transport authorities. Some Combined Authorities are transport authorities, but not all! Working through constitution of authorities to define this list!

Neil Mackinnon: think I found a list of this - for devolution. Mapping where Stagecoach is and where they might change into Combined Authorities. Sure there was something tucked in the end of a PDF from DfT.

Tim: every list DVSA and I have found has not been accurate!



TJ: has a list of all Local Authorities. Updated it with planned devolution information. Might be useful. **Action for TJ to share with Tim.**

Tim: Take new North Yorkshire and York Combined Authority, the two individual authorities retain consultative powers for bus services, but in other combined authority areas this has moved to a single CA role.

Tim: are we happy if we don't update 2.1 - as not used for BODS or electronic registration?

Dan Saunders: might be worth chatting with Amy on this. **Traveline still provide TNDS. Action for Amy and Tim to chat about this further.**

Neil MacKinnon: Think I've found a list of all transport authorities. Will send shapefile

Tim: That FOI request is not current. **Action for Tim to check and review**

11. Next Meeting (1:57:00 - end)

Thursday 4 December 2025 14:00

AOB

John Cartledge: My interest in these matters is as an end consumer of this rather than provider. Experience of London counterpart of Transport Focus. Debating with transport providers what information to be provided, and how to make it intelligible to end users, to make journeys with confidence. Collected large library of docs exploring this subject from across English speaking world. A lot of this precedes Real Time era. But still has currency in terms of end output. I have digitised all of this. Happy to make it / a list of it available.

Tim: Action for John Cartledge to send this round with your contact details.

Ian Barratt: **Registrations on EBSR.** Basis that files available from download are not the same anymore, since July, on operators we use. The document summary showing stops being used, and times/dates no longer being provided?

Nick T: I did get it a couple of weeks ago.

Ian B: we get the mapping and xml file, not the option for the document summary to check/compare it against. A problem across 3 operators.

Notes and Actions from the 18 September 2025 meeting

[Next meeting 4 December 2025 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Nick T: True, I've just tried it and get the same issue as you have said. Now have to run it through TXC publisher to make a readable file out of it. So, pretty useless as unlikely to have a working TXC publisher service.

Tim: first time heard of this issue. Action with Tim, Ian and Nick T to explore

John Carr: John Cartledge work - recommendation that hard copy is held of everything. Worth reiterating this - given age of all sorts of interference can go on.

John Cartledge: important that hard copies find their way to archive for future researchers.

Mike: hard copies of timetables are few and far between these days. Local Leicester Transport Heritage Trust maintain an archive and I give them copies of timetables we have for the purpose you explain.