

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Video on RTIG You Tube Channel: <https://youtu.be/NZignt8dtMU>

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

Actions in red text.

Contents

Attendees	1
1. Introduction	2
2. Actions from last meeting 20 June 2020 (3:48 - 7:02)	2
3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (09:00)	2
4. BODS Issue Log (36:50)	5
5. Location Data SIRI VM Profile (47:40).....	6
6. TransXChange profile (1:02:00).....	7
7. NaPTAN (1:20:18)	9
7.1. OpenNaPTAN Check System (1:20:18).....	9
7.2. Stop announcement name (1:22:22)	9
8. Issue Log.....	9
9. Next Meeting.....	10
AOB.....	10

Attendees

John Carr, Independent

Nick Knowles, independent

Mike Baxter, Leicester City Council

David Batchelor, Ticketer

Kalyani Homkar-Desai, Basemap

Mark Jones, EP Morris

Dan Saunders, Basemap

Rob West, Elydium data solutions

Justin Bloom, Vix

Ian Barratt, Lancashire County Council

Nic Cary, Waysphere

Meera Nayyer, DfT

Amy Brown, Traveline

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Peter Stoner, ITO World
Mark Taylor, Staffordshire County Council
Tricia Wright, Nottinghamshire County Council
Keith Willis, React
Graham Browne, WYCA
Tim Rivett, RTIG/PTIC
Teresa Jolley

1. Introduction

try and keep this meeting shorter

2. Actions from last meeting 20 June 2020 (3:48 - 7:02)

A few issues with new email distribution list, so not sure everyone got it.

A couple of Actions from the last meeting (watch video for details)

3. Bus Open Data Digital Service (09:00)

slides available here:

https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/BoD%20PTIC%20Update%20July%202020.pdf

overview

- Timetable service: in progress, and working with industry to iron out issues and work out what does and doesn't work from a data publishing perspective.
- Covid19: Bus Open Data work identified as priority, and team have been continuing to work on the project.
- key stats:
 - 39 bus registered bus operators out of 300 (and have been pushing West Mids since 13th July)
 - 22 publishers [question; is this a current live number, or people who have published at least once, not necessarily regularly and up to date? answer: it is the latter, and the publishing flows issues below is to try and help improve this].
 - Omnibus updating their software to include an export and validator, which will enable National Express to publish their route and timetable data from September
 - DfT team are working on publishing flows, to try and automate these and operators can integrate BODS with their business as usual operations
 - Helping operators to publish multiple services in one file, without disrupting the whole file
 - Average session duration on BODS has dropped quite a bit (from approx 5 to 3 minutes). Think this is a proxy for people becoming more familiar with the site, although 'session' could be anything, not necessarily publishing data.



- map of where data is being published at the moment:
 - less in the South East and East Anglia
 - Midlands and North doing well
 - South West growing

Business change plans (16:15)

- was going to have a team to do roadshows, but not possible so far due to Covid-19;
- will put together a face to face team, probably Spring 2021, which we think in retrospect will be more useful then. Do what we can now digitally / virtually, and the face-to-face team can support everyone with the three different types of data to be published on BODS. Just launched (13 Jul) business change plan, for this year up to March 2021, focuses on 87 LAs across England, and targeting different ones each quarter, getting operators to register for the service before autumn. Current focus on West Mids;
- DVSA will be much more involved next year, to give support to operators etc;
- 2022 onwards, will be more focused on compliance.

Regulations (19:25)

legally enforceable dates for operators to publish data on BODS:

- for operators:
 - timetable data requirements: 31 Dec 2020
 - Fares data requirements: 7 Jan 2021
 - location data requirements: 7 Jan 2021
 - historic punctuality reports: 31 March 2021 (for previous 3 months in first instance, then the previous 12 months thereafter)
- for local authorities:
 - maintenance and updating of stops data in NaPTAN

Giuseppe's team are improving the NaPTAN service and data quality, and have a longer term plan to provide improvements to speed up updates.

Publishing data timeline (22:00)

- **timetables data**
 - DfT team working closely with data publishers to get flows right
 - data consumers are starting to use the site, dabbling a bit. Probably be using it more from autumn onwards.
- **Location data**
 - test site with 17 operators testing. first got lots of teams on it.
 - going from test to live and will migrate operators input into test is carried across to live when it happens; an incentive for early involvement.



- **Fares data**

- DfT work closely with TfN team, who are sending test files through to DfT team.
- Just started to invite publishers and data consumers to test it.
- Exciting, interesting and complex.

Priority for next couple of months

DfT team entering a period of high intensity audits and assessments now, in next couple of months now:

- Accessibility audits, security assessments, PEN tests, GDS mock and live assessments, to complete by end of October;
- Gives us until Christmas to implement the service so people can deliver against the legal requirements from 31st December 2020 / 7th Jan 2021;
- estimate of 4% error rate in NaPTAN data, so working with Local Authorities to address data quality issues
- Reporting and Analytics now incorporated into BODS
 - want to fully realise the benefits beyond data consumers building apps for passengers, such as:
 - for local authorities (to support route optimisation, transport planning and traffic management),
 - for operators (to support punctuality reporting, and see their own location data and network coverage)
 - Improvements to delivery of some of DVSA's statutory functions
 - BODS data compliance issues
 - Statisticians in DfT, where the reporting and analytics service can improve data flows for statistics.

Integrated Transit Model

Will provide data in GTFS, as well as other formats of TXC beyond 2.4. Convert the SIRI-VM provided, into GTFS-RT for data consumers as they have requested, which can help stimulate TransTech sector.

Other bits (31:30)

BODS team are doing a lot of work with upstream suppliers for data such as for timetables: Trapeze, onmibus and optibus etc to provide exports from their systems compliant with BODS 2.4 TXC profile. Also ticket machine suppliers for NeTEx exports and SIRI-VM profiles.

SIRI-VM profile updates: awaiting final updates on this, to be published soon.

Industry worked well to provide capacity and crowding data. Extending of peak through to 11am in mornings. Government message for public transport has been challenging for the services, want to make messages more positive and supportive for the sector, but need to stay in line with main



government position on Covid-19. Nervousness about return to school and work in September (expecting about a 1/3 of people returning to workplaces), and are keen to support continued delivery of crowdedness and capacity data, looking to expedite / support this via BODS, for the long term.

Team are focused on agent mode functionality for BODS, which will enable local authorities to publish data on behalf of operators if they choose and wish to. Expected to be available / released around autumn time. Location Data service should be released in the autumn, and will also publish updated guidance at the same time.

Questions (35:00)

Who will monitor operators and liaise with those who haven't maintained their BODS datasets?

answer: legislative duty is with DVSA. In practice to begin with, will be a combination of the BODS team and DVSA.

4. BODS Issue Log (36:50)

ALL:

- Process in place now for a weekly update cycle for issues for BODS.
- PTIC members can submit issues through to Tim tim.rivett@rtig.org.uk

Operator Digital Initiative, Traveline regions, RTIG and PTIC are feeding in to Traveline who are administering the log, and sharing with DfT BODS team. Purpose to try and help focus on key issues, and not get flooded with lots of similar issues from different groups / individuals.

Get update the following week on progress.

How does this fit in with Meera (DfT)?

- At the weekly Tech Tuesday sessions, there is a dedicated session on issues log.
- BODS team study the issues raised, and explore what their response is:
 - provide help to navigate the service as it is in current live;
 - the issue is relevant to functionality in development;
 - the issue raises something we need to think study further because its not being addressed in the development plan yet.

A number of the points raised are related to future functionality requests, and some of these are being addressed. Some issues raised are novel or new which we haven't thought of.

Meera has the meeting, updates the issues log, and shares progress:

Action: encouragement for all to submit issues, constructive and positive feedback to Tim to feed it into the team, and get a response back to you:

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

- **Constructive comment and feedback is most useful, as team want to get most of the issues sorted by Sept/autumn;**
- **Positive feedback also useful;**
- **important to share stuff, even you think it's not**

Action: Meera happy to share a update of issues at next meeting.

Question: Is the Implementation Group going to restart?

Answer: We will restart Implementation Group at some point; once got bulk of development out of the way, possibly around September 2020. Had the first programme board meeting since Feb last week. Next one in September. Once we have delivered the service, will consider whether to do more board meetings more regularly in 2021.

5. Location Data SIRI VM Profile (47:40)

see RTIG slide deck for details:

https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/BODS%20SIRI%20VM%20Profile.pdf

link to Profile document:

<https://pti.org.uk/system/files/files/TransXChange%20UK%20PTI%20Profile%20v1.0.pdf>

There has been a lot of development work to figure this out, some of which has been shared. The Mandatory elements of SIRI-VM for BODS have now been bottomed out and confirmed, and details are in the RTIG slide deck linked above.

Most of the data requirements are related to scheduled data. Vehicle ref and location, and time of location, are the only 'live' things. Rest of it all links back to what the vehicle is planned to be doing, to help journey matching.

Expecting a few questions / challenges to be raised on provision of the mandatory requirements, such as:

- BlockRef: is an example of a challenge for smaller operators who don't use running boards, but the field is essential for predictions.
- Destination Aired Arrival Time: not regularly provided, but is actually really useful and time saving for data consumers.
- ProducerRef: likely to cause a few confusion issues. This is unique to the source, and essential to help track back where data is being sourced from, rather than who aggregates it.
- VehicleRef: needs to be vehicle number plate, BUT at the moment, this is most likely to be an internal ref number, but will need to be changed to number plate to allow other lookups etc.



- VehicleJourneyRef: at the moment it is optional field, but Stuart is in process of updating to make it mandatory in the BODS TXC profile. Helps people track people to track back to schedules and plans.
- OperatorRef: will need to be National Operator Code (NOC)
- LineRef: this ID needs to refer back to what is in timetable data in BODS
- OriginRef and Destination Ref: has to be ATCO codes from NaPTAN, and got to match what is in the timetable. Tim sees this being a challenge, especially where authorities providing data on behalf of operators. Typically this data comes from registration data, and if operator is making little tweaks, doesn't need re-registration, but can cause problems to match the data, such as as Vehicle and Blockref which wouldn't typically be available at time of registration.

Location data update frequency:

- minimum update of vehicle position every 30 secs (compliance issue if more than this). Think highest frequency that will be acceptable will be every 10 secs.
- Meera adding: Yes, the 30 second is the maximum limit, and slower than this will be a legal compliance issue. Wasn't aware we'd set a 10 second limit as know e.g., Hogia can be faster than every 10 secs. Meera will check with team whether quicker than this would not be accepted. Tim thinks this came from BODS technical team.
- Nic: we should be moving to more frequent updates as soon as we can. Appreciate we have to start somewhere.
- Meera: Readiness assessment suggests most of industry can cope with 30 secs right now.

6. TransXChange profile (1:02:00)

Guidance doc has been out for a couple of months now. Stuart is working on update to it to clarify things from feedback. Block Ref and Vehicle Ref will become mandatory. Next version won't otherwise been significantly different.

Tim requesting feedback, as it's a bit worrying when we get nothing back.

comment: it's hard to comment whilst its still in development / changing. How much are you expecting operators to implement a moving target? would be good to have a published draft document which we can invest time in exploring it in detail.

Tim: its a fair point, but until we have feedback, its hard to know whether people need a fixed version.

Rob: has done some assessment, but has more tests in mind that hasn't felt ready to do yet. Also, most of the data in BODS doesn't respect the Profile at the moment, so, it's difficult to do anything with it data in BODS so far.

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

Meera: DfT have asked for the Profile not to be mandated for data files supplied to BODS at the moment. When we are confident suppliers can provide converters /importers / exporters, and operators can integrate this as part of their business as usual processes, then we can start to mandate compliance with 2.4 profile but it is a question of timing.

All of the major timetable software suppliers (Trapeze, Omni and Opti) have committed to provide compliant exports and validators by autumn.

Question: in terms of data going into BODS, where does the checking come in? Correctness of what might be being published? Experience of real time in Leicestershire. Data from some operators and suppliers includes lots of errors in data files, which need to be corrected every time (e.g., missing stops apart from timing points, dynamic destinations get dropped). If you just put it in as you receive it, quality in BODS would be not at all good from public point of view. Checking is a boring job, but it has to be done! Operators don't always have time and resource to do that.

Answer: Meera - ultimately BODS is a repository for data. DfT can encourage operators to publish high quality of data, but there is no legislative mandate to define quality of the data. We do have:

- Validator in BODS, with 20 tests checking for set things. Can provide more info on full range of tests. Operator chance to correct these.
- Agent Mode functionality being developed where new Enhanced Partnerships, such as Herts, who might want to take on this mode, and the legal mandate to publish data on behalf of operators. Opportunity for Local Authorities to take much stronger role if they wish to, but DfT won't require this.
- Considering future of BSOG and reform of this in future. Talk of an uplift to this related to data quality. during transitional period, will be essentially provide service to data consumers, and will take data from BODS, augment it from other datasets, correcting and improving the dataset, to give consumers complete and comprehensive dataset whilst ironing out issues during few couple of years.

Peter Stoner: data quality reports at the moment only seen by Operators. That might change. No requirement for operator to do anything other than check box to say they have acknowledged it, not change anything. and others can't see this.

Another layer of data quality, is for operators who really want to see richness of reporting for those who are engaged. Various levels of those who want to improve their quality, and those not so interested.

How will results of quality checking and reporting be available?

Meera: Yes, reports only available to operators at the moment. Thinking about options for making quality level accessible to others.

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

7. NaPTAN (1:20:18)

7.1. OpenNaPTAN Check System (1:20:18)

Opportunity in the market to be involved in next stage of this project.

Since last meeting:

- made OpenNaPTAN checking system open source and on GitHub.
https://github.com/departmentfortransport/Open_NaPTAN
- Passenger have made their tools open source too: <https://www.busstopchecker.com/>
- slides from Giuseppe's team:
https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/PTIC%20NaPTAN%20Slides.pdf

7.2. Stop announcement name (1:22:22)

Link to paper:

https://pti.org.uk/system/files/meeting_files/papers/NaPTAN%20Short%20Common%20Name%20Length.pdf

Only 86k short common names populated, out of total of 373k NaPTAN stops. So more work to do to complete the empty fields.

Only 50k full length common names over 19 characters which is max length for most displays, so not too much of a problem. Of these, approx 36k stops have a real problem that can't be solved by e.g., shortening 'Street' to 'St'.

Wales seems to be using the short common name field as an alternative language field.

Next step: how to go about addressing these with LAs. Is there a more automatic way to complete this field? **Tim looking for volunteers, who met in August, to help solve this problem.**

Peter S: will the field take into account location?

Tim: Express services able to do something different that fits for them

Nick Knowles: are you assuming some intelligence in text to speech services to understand e.g., St is Street, or Rd is Road?

Tim: yes, and we have checked with text to speech suppliers who say this is possible, and yes we will need a reference list to work from for consistency on this.

Justin Bloom: asking for copy of SIRI-VM profile.

Action: Tim will put slides onto PTIC & RTIG websites and circulate it.

8. Issue Log

None raised.

Notes and Actions from the 23 July 2020 meeting

[Next meeting 07 Oct 1400-1600, Online](#)

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



**Public Transport
Information Coordination**

9. Next Meeting

7th October at 14:00, to bring in line with normal cycle. Will be virtual.

Will have more on NaPTAN with Giuseppe end Aug/beginning Sept.

AOB

None