

The purpose of this document is to create a single place where BODS issues, requests for change and questions can be raised by OpDI and TIL stakeholders and which supports progress with the BODS service in a transparent and open way, without using issue management software
This issues list was requested by DfT at a meeting with ITO, KPMG and TIL on 18 May 2020
Any issues, questions or requests for change can be sent to julie.williams@traveline.info
This document will be updated weekly and distributed to OpDI members and TIL stakeholders
If your organisation agrees with an item that another has submitted, feel free to let us know and we can record it here. This could help to indicate how important the item is.
If your organisation has had an update from the BODS team on any of the items in this document that they're able to share, we can record those here too
We'd also welcome comments about where BODS is working well
'Date Published' is the date that the issue was recorded in this document, many have been raised with the BODS team in other forums in the past
Updates to the last version of the file will be highlighted by a yellow tab; new issues will be dated and updates to existing issues will be highlighted in yellow.
Key to Type:
I Issue
Q Question
RFC Request for change
C Comment/observation

Number	Type	Date Published	Title	Description	Submitted	Impacts (Issues only)	Updates
P1	I	16/06/2020	All files being expired incorrectly	BODS expires all files in a zip or set of data when one of the services has an end date in it that moves into the past. The BODS workaround now in place is not acceptable because it involves manual intervention at 05:00 up to 7 days a week	OpDI	All data publishers	22/06/2020 - BODS has called a meeting to resolve this. It will be on 8 July and include, ITO, Kpmg, DFT, Operators and TIL 08/07/2020 - Action on ITO from meeting to provide a description of the proposed solution and data flows for review BM: Information on proposed solution has been circulated and change will be implemented unless objections are raised 01/10: BM: Fix in staging - to be pushed to production after testing (ETA mid to end of October) 20mb fix expected in production early November
P2	Q	16/06/2020	End dates	Why does BODS not permit end dates, which are common practice in TXC files and already exist and are consumed by open data users in TNDS?	TIL		22/06/2020 - BODS has called a meeting to resolve this. It will be on 8 July and include, ITO, Kpmg, DFT, Operators and TIL 08/07/2020 - Action on ITO from meeting to provide a description of the proposed solution and data flows for review BM: Information on proposed solution has been circulated and change will be implemented unless objections are raised 01/10: Resolved as per update on expiry logic
P3	RFC	16/06/2020	Duplicated services	I would like to know whether the services I am publishing in a data set are duplicated by another dataset (e.g. LA 'helping' by publishing operator services - I know this is against the guidance but already had a few queries on this; alternatively where two operations which run a joint service)	Go Ahead		Ben Murray to update - issue believed to be resolved with GP and issue to be removed from log 01/10: Agent would need to be invited by operator to publish on behalf of operator
P4	RFC	16/06/2020	Edit the description of a dataset	I would like to be able to change the 'Description' of a data set (i.e. to clearly define a change of scope)	Go Ahead		User research in progress to identify a solution that meets the needs of the industry as a whole 01/10: Change in staging, expecting to be pushed to production mid October - meets Graham's expectations
P5	Q	16/06/2020	RevisionNumber	Stuart Reynolds has confirmed that RevisionNumber is expected to be used for certain data elements in addition to the header of the file. Please clarify the data elements for which RevisionNumber is mandatory, as it's listed as mandatory element on p.9 of the profile documentation but isn't specific. And which data element RevisionNumber(s) increments trigger an increment in the file RevisionNumber in the file header?	TIL		There are many places where elements can have revision numbers / modification dates / etc. There is no expectation that everything in a file would have the same revision number. My main intention was to put the RevisionNumber onto individual Service and Line elements. This overcomes the (widespread) issue that we have of revision numbers being encoded into service codes. So you could (say) update school dates in serviced organisations, which would entail a change of revision number / dates in the header, but you would leave the revision numbers in the service & line(s) alone. After all, you aren't changing the service, just the dates it operates. However, if you encoded all of your trips with date records then you would probably be changing the revision number on vehicle journeys - and I'm slightly ambivalent about what that does to a service / line. I think that I am happy with it remaining the same, but I'm not totally stuck on that if people see over-riding issues one way or the other. If you know all the dates for operations into the next 6 weeks ahead of time, I would encourage a single file with the relevant dates in it. But they would have to be dated vehicle journeys in the one line - if you start having different versions of the same line then you duplicate keys and it all gets very messy. The summer / winter proposal was a very specific case where I was allowing that, but making the line id reflect the change. I wouldn't want to do that with week numbers!
P6	Q	16/06/2020	Dataset list sort functionality	I would like to be able to see and sort by 'Description' and 'Last updated' fields in the 'Your data sets' list	Go Ahead		Quite a straightforward change to implement- add a sort and filter functionality. Could be handled within a sprint on current estimates. Ben Murray to establish whether this has now been implemented. It appears we're still researching how we can make the change and also need to clarify what is required in Last Updated 01/10: Change in staging, expecting to be pushed to production mid October - meets Graham's expectations
P7	C	23/06/2020	Significant timescales for new TXC 2.4 profile implementation	Implementation of the new TXC 2.4 profile will be a significant task. Beyond supplier changes to exports, schedulers will need to add new data that is not in the software currently and downstream users of operator TXC data such as LAs and other suppliers will need to change their import routines.	OpDI		The major suppliers of software have confirmed that a BODS compliant export and validator should be available to clients from Autumn 2020. 01/10: Implementation is an unknown quantity.
P8	Q	23/06/2020	Serviced Organisations Data	How will operators know which code to use for a ServicedOrganisation and what the term dates are where there is not central source of this data?	OpDI		Local authority website is the key source for school term time dates or Edubase database if maintained. 01/10: This issue will remain. Requires manual exercise to bring a dataset together

P9	RFC	23/06/2020	TXC 2.4 PTI profile Registration block	For operators using TXC(2.1 and 2.4) for EBSR, the registration block that is provided in that export of TXC files is not permitted for TXC 2.4 PTI – can this be revised so that it is simply ignored?	OpDI	No, we have explored this but these will need to remain as distinct files. We will however aim to provide a 2.1 and 2.4 (PTI) version of the TransXchange tool. Ben Murray and Lisa Gouveia to test the 2.1 export with OTC to ensure it meets the registration requirements 01/10 In progress
P10	RFC	23/06/2020	TXC 2.4 PublicUse	PublicUse needs to show true or false depending on whether the service is closed. Since the SI only mandates data services which are open, and conventionally operators do not usually include PublicUse <true> in exports at present, could this not be made to default to "true"?	OpDI	Clarify whether the OpDi are referring to the timetable tool here? If so, yes would seem sensible but not necessarily for the validator in BODS.

Number	Type	Date Published	Title	Description	Submitted by	Impacts (Issues only)	Updates
DQ1	Q	16/06/2020	TXC 2.4 PTI Schema validation	As well as a TXC 2.4 schema check, will there be additional validation and/or quality checks to ensure that the mandatory fields in TXC 2/4 PTI have been populated correctly, eg, that the modification date of a file is always sequential against the last modification of that file? This data element is a search parameter for BODS API data consumers.	TIL		We do think that we can align the service validation checks with the BODS TXC 2.4 profile but we need to decide what we validate for and when the change is required i.e later in year when big five have integrated new BODS export with processes 01/10Design in process to validate meeting 2.4
DQ2	I	16/06/2020	Some Data Quality observations are incorrect	Some DQ observations are highlighting operational practices that are not errors	OpDI	All data publishers	At KPMG's request, OpDI is conducting a survey of the DQ observations to determine which are regular operational practices BM: Team are working through UX processes to identify how to classify DQ results
DQ3	I	23/06/2020	DQ reporting: Error with Missing stops	Stops are shown as missing when they are not even on the line of route	Stagecoach	All data publishers	Amy to chase George Connell for more detail and clarify whether issues have been resolved BM: Test team are working with Alex to re-create issues - this is in progress
DQ4	I	23/06/2020	DQ reporting: right operator, wrong service	Errors which relate to the same service number but in a wholly different town or city, albeit run by the same OpCo.	Stagecoach	All data publishers	Amy to chase George Connell for more detail and clarify whether issues have been resolved BM: Test team are working with Alex to re-create issues - this is in progress
DQ5	I	23/06/2020	DQ reporting: wrong operator	Errors actually relate to services provided by another operator	Stagecoach	All data publishers	Amy to chase George Connell for more detail and clarify whether issues have been resolved BM: Test team are working with Alex to re-create issues - this is in progress

Number	Type	Date Published	Title	Description	Submitted	Impacts	Updates
C1	I	16/06/2020	Download links poor	The http download gives no file extension for the download. Programmatically this is awkward to deal with and involves a lot of unnecessary load on our extraction process. With the mix of .xml and .zip files, we end up having to do a lot of work arounds. Admittedly this would be helped if we scheduled consistently but the option exists to upload both formats.	Go Ahead	All open data consumers	BM: For all Graham's queries - I'll suggest a separate session to ensure I understand item and impact. Clarification required on details and impact of request. Are there other areas where the link would need to be updated? Dev effort can be estimated once problem is fully known. Query relates to API - would like a flag to indicate 01/10 Raise item to backlog to add filetype flag on API response (TxC and Netex)
C2	I	16/06/2020	Naming of files seems random	If we download a dataset which has been uploaded from a .zip file, we do not get the original filenames from the .zip file. This means that we have to consume each file to understand it's content, rather than relying on the often useful filenames provided by scheduling software.	Go Ahead	Open data consumers needing the operator source filename	08/07/2020 - MN will contact Go Ahead to suggest solutions BM: Will short description resolve, as this can be used to input the filename? This relates to downloaded filename - which is fine, so issue can be closed 01/10: BM to add item backlog to change naming convention to prefix BODS dataset name only
C3	I	16/06/2020	Not possible to get a full set of published data from the API automatically	The dataset metadata has a status field, with mutually exclusive statuses of "expiring" and "published" . This isn't actually noted in the API documentation (we spent more than a few hours trying to work out why we weren't getting the full set of "published" data), nor does it actually make much sense in the single field as it means that the options aren't mutually exclusive for searching. Considering that if you upload a file with <7 days validity, any API call for "published" data would <i>never see that file</i> . An <i>expiring</i> file is still <i>published</i> , and this perhaps needs some consideration for amendment – it is useful to flag or warn that a dataset contains services with limited duration, but seems inappropriate for a <i>status</i> . At the very least, the API documentation needs to be updated to ensure it explicitly documents all of the possible inputs for the API.	Go Ahead	All open data consumers	BM: Expect this will be resolved with end date fix
C4	I	16/06/2020	No history in the API	While BODS must hold historic data, it's not available to download. I can't, to be clear, download data in the state it existed at a given date/time. This of course raises a further issue in the way that the site treats time – the operator may publish a future timetable and as a developer , I may want to see that as well as grab current / old timetables, particularly in the "new world" of end-dated TxC	Go Ahead	All open data consumers	BM: An operator will be able to upload and leave expired datasets on BODS, but I expect most operators will maintain existing datasets and remove expired data from the zip. 01/10 Archived data will be available through RAA

C5	I	16/06/2020	There is a 'modifiedSince' field, but not 'modifiedBefore' or 'modifiedBetween'	It's not actually possible to pull out regular updates since it relies on the job you are using to run at exactly the same time every day or hold the completion time of the last run which is awkward for most systems. For example, if I want to find everything which was updated yesterday (calendar day), I would have to create a job running at midnight requesting 'modifiedSince' yesterday at midnight – even then, this doesn't guarantee I haven't missed something, so if the job fails and we re-run it at 09:00 then the data won't be the same and I will get duplicates on the next scheduled job run.	Go Ahead	All open data consumers	BM: Require insight into impact of this request. I'm clear on the query param's being suggested, but I can also suggest other work arounds on the consumer end. 01/10 to be monitored - filenames change would help - consumers to indicate other params which may help
C6	Q	16/06/2020	What data is on BODS?	How will a data consumer know what data is on BODS, what TxC format it is in and what the look ahead is without consuming every file and making an independent assessment?	TIL	All open data consumers	BM: Different API's for different data Dataset metadata lists TxC version Require more information on phrase 'look ahead'? 01/10: Request is for a service support to indicate which operators publish frequently, what txc version - perhaps in data catalogue section
C7	Q	16/06/2020	Where to find data not on BODS	How will a data consumer know where to find data that is not on BODS, including but not limited to where bus operators have no current data published on BODS, or for other modes, and other data types such as disruption messaging?	TIL	All open data consumers	BM: Long term plan to implement signposting for other data types - not in short term plan 01/01: Also can be in data catalogue - Julie to share example
C8	Q	16/06/2020	Parts of a line in more than one TxC file	Data for a complete end to end line is sometimes supplied in more than one TxC file. This can happen for example when services cross over between 2 depots and the inbound is supplied in a file from one depot and outbound in a file from another, or where the route is long and parts of it are supplied by different opcos or depots along the route. How will data consumers know that these files make up one continuous passenger journey?	TIL	All open data consumers	BM: Query to Stuart Reynolds - BM will supply response 01/10: Query to be shared with Tim Rivett - data needs to be shared by operators/LTA's. Solution for linked services to be put to research team. Connected at a service code level. This could be helpful in API response.
C9	Q	16/06/2020	Two bus numbers, one bus	Sometimes the bus changes its number en route but its the same vehicle and the customer can stay onboard while the route number changes. How will data consumers know this?	TIL	All open data consumers	BM: Scheduling data can be supplied (blockNumber) to indicate running order from either bus or drivers perspective. 01/10: Block Ref indicates plan for the day (section 9.7 of 2.3 profile)
C10	Q	23/06/2020	Which Serviced Organisations data is correct	For the same organisation, where Serviced Organisations codes are different between operators, or of files within an operator (the details have to be in each file) and terms dates may be too, how do we know which is correct?	TIL	All open data consumers	BM: Also asked in TxC Publishing tab: Local authority website is the key source for school term time dates or Edubase database if maintained. 01/10: Can be different and will be where no source is available

C11	Q	23/06/2020	Zero notice changes to data	<p>Some non-registered changes to routes and timetables, such as for increased summer frequency, Christmas changes and COVID-19, only have to be published on BODS before the change goes live. How can will downstream app and web planner services be able to plan ahead for holiday travel? These changes are our busiest times of year for enquiries because people are taking unfamiliar journeys and changes are short notice and so they have to plan.</p>	TIL	All open data consumers and their customers	<p>BM: Variations to timetables and routes requiring an application to a traffic commissioner (i.e. where there are alterations to the principal timing points) are required to be submitted to BODS by the time of the application going to the Traffic Commissioner for final review (the 42 day period). For changes that do not trigger the variation to the registration threshold, these can be made to BODS file at any point prior to the change coming into operation.</p>
-----	---	------------	-----------------------------	---	-----	---	---

Number	Type	Title	Description	Submitted	Impacts	Updates
Timescales?						
Guidance?						
Involvement on FDB?						

Number	Type	Date Published	Title	Description	Submitted	Impacts	Updates
A1	Q	23/06/2020	Siri-vm profile for consultation?	when will the AVL guidance to operators note referenced by Dft on 29.04.20 be published so we can consult in the detail of the proposed profile, not just an overview, as we've seen to date? . In particular we need to understand what the mandatory and discretionary	OpDI	All AVL publishers and consumers	01/10: Guidance available: https://data-bodp-staging.itoworld.com/fares/

Number	Type	Date Published	Title	Description	Author	Impacts	Updates
P1	Q	16/06/2020	Enforcement	What will the enforcement dates be for each data type?	OpDI	All current and future publishers, consumers and suppliers of software and systems	16.06.20, SI approved, Rachael Maclean told Parliament It is a civil offence for any operator of a service to be in breach of the requirements in the regulations and the regulations will be commenced in a phased manner, with timetables and stop data requirements being enforceable from 31 December 2020 (note Enactment of Enforcement dates currently being agreed with DVSA and OTC). 18.06.20 DfT Presentation to PTIC set out extension to BODS to include taking (note correction - providing multiple TXC formats as exports to data consumers during transition (Dec 20 to Dec 22)
P2	Q	23/06/2020	NaPTAN Attributes required by SI	The SI requires operators to supply Ordnance Survey grid reference, relevant landmarks and topographic references for stops; these aren't permitted in the TXC 2.4 PTI profile, so are they assumed not to be relevant to the TXC data supply because they're already in NaPTAN ? (the SI requirement states 'where relevant') If so please note that the Landmark field is not mandatory and often not populated, and the Topographical Reference is ambiguous as there isn't an obvious mandatory field in either NaPTAN or NPTG	OpDI	All current and future publishers, consumers and suppliers of software and systems	Currently being explored
P3	Q	23/06/2020	Arrive and depart times required by SI	The SI requires arrival and departure times at each stopping place. The departure time is mandated in TXC 2.4 PTI but not the arrival time. TXC assumes that the arrival and departure time is the same and if this is not the case, it should be defined by setting a Wait time at each stop. Can we clarify that this covers the requirement for arrive and depart times, and that open data users will be told this?	OpDI	All current and future publishers, consumers and suppliers of software and systems	
P4	RFC	23/06/2020	Different notice periods for franchised services	SI requires only 28 days' notice for any franchised service changes, this notice period should be the same as for registered services (42 days) as this is all about making data public in good time	OpDI	All current and future publishers, consumers and suppliers of software and systems	
P5	RFC	23/06/2020	Removal of past services	The SI requires removal of data as soon as a service stops operating – would it not be easier just to have the new data for the service (using its registration reference) overwritten by the new data, and the old data would simply not be read by a journey planner or timetable enquiry system?	OpDI	All current and future publishers	
P6	I	23/06/2020	Dynamic demand based pricing (single fares)	Dynamic demand based pricing (single fares) is not included in the SI	OpDI		