



MINUTES

5TH EXPERT MEETING

TOWARDS SPECIFICATIONS FOR PRIORITY ACTION (A) 'THE PROVISION OF EU-WIDE MULTIMODAL TRAVEL INFORMATION SERVICES'

WHEN: 2 June 2015, 10.00 – 16.00,

WHERE: INEA, Meeting Room 00/41, 910, Chaussée de Wavre, BE-1040 Brussels

CHAIRWOMAN: Ms Claire Depré, Head of Unit, C3 « Intelligent Transport Systems »

| | |
|------------------|--|
| 09.30 | Registration & coffee |
| 10.00 | Welcome |
| 10.05 | Adoption of the minutes of the 4 th Meeting |
| 10.10 | Adoption of the meeting's agenda |
| 10.15 | Draft skeleton of specifications |
| 12.30 - 14.00 | ** <i>Lunch Break</i> ** |
| 14.00 | Draft skeleton of specifications |
| 15.30 | Conclusions & AOB |
| 16.00 | End of meeting |

Welcome

The chair welcomed and thanked all Member State experts for attending the 5th Expert Group meeting in Brussels.

Adoption of the minutes of the 4th Meeting

The minutes of the third meeting held on 28 April 2015 were circulated to the experts ahead of the meeting but due to timing the chair asked Member States to send feedback in writing within one week.

Adoption of the meeting's agenda

The agenda was sent with the meeting's invitation, no comments were received nor any raised at the beginning of the meeting. The agenda is therefore accepted.

Presentation and discussion of non-paper concerning the possible main parameters of specifications

DG MOVE presented to Member State experts a draft non-paper concerning the possible main parameters of specifications based on the discussions of the previous four meetings and taking into account the structure that was used for priority action 'b' real-time traffic information as a starting point. DG MOVE proposed to go through the document chapter by chapter starting with item 3.

National Access Points

MS asked what the term 'metadata' refers to?

DG MOVE explained that metadata means a structured description of the contents of the data facilitating the discovery and use of this data.

MS queried if two databases that cover the same region exist, which one should be chosen as the primary access point?

DG MOVE explained that as for priority action 'b', a single point of access can take many forms (database, data warehouse, data marketplace or registry etc.) and Member States can be given the flexibility to choose which type of access point is most suitable for them in the frame of the specifications.

MS agreed that there should be no obligation for an actual database to be set up in the scope of the specifications. Just at least a registry of where this data can be easily found. In the case of having two databases MS should be given the flexibility to determine which one should be used as the official point of access for the specifications.

MS asked what the term 'discovery services' means.

DG MOVE explained that this term refers to how you find the data in the context of the access point.

MS supported by **MS** suggested that the term 'static multimodal data' should not be used as it does not exist. Instead it should be written as 'static data of different transport modes'. The access point should store static data but what about having a registry of services to help for linking services?

MS declared that they support the MS remark regarding static data.

MS and **MS** suggested that an access point should be an opportunity for Member States.

MS highlighted that the geographical scope of where the specifications will apply to (i.e. core TEN-T, comprehensive, extended network) will affect list of static and dynamic data.

DG MOVE suggested fully discussing and exploring the geographical scope at a later stage of MS discussions and to first focus on the various potential instruments and mechanism to use in the specifications.

MS highlighted that the handover point for linking services needs to be included in the data list for the access point.

DG MOVE agreed and suggested to establish a common definition of the handover point for linking services at a later date.

MS enquired who should be responsible for deciding the handover point, is it service providers?

DG MOVE agreed that not only does the definition of the handover point need to be explored but also who is responsible to identify this and suggested the supporting study could help explore this aspect. **DG MOVE** then suggested moving on to other sections of the paragraph and asked **MS** experts if they had any comments to which there were no comments or suggestions provided.

Accessibility, exchange and re-use of static data of different transport modes

Thereafter **DG MOVE** gave the floor for comments on item 4 of the draft non-paper:

General comments

MS enquired about the need to include in the specifications provisions on how data is converted and translated and queried if the relevant metadata for the specifications requires a standard?

DG MOVE supporting further harmonization of metadata would certainly be helpful as shown in the context of the implementation of the specifications on real-time traffic information services. However, standardisation of meta-data will not be completed until after the adoption of these specifications and therefore the work would need to be defined as a follow-up activity.

MS agreed highlighting that metadata is not yet standardised or developed. Activities are ongoing for priority actions (c) and (e) but it is not yet feasible for hard definitions and thus it is better to leave it out.

Definitions/terminology

MS enquired what the term 're-use' is referring to?

DG MOVE stated that the whole item concerns the requirements and provisions under which data is to be made accessible for further re-use.

MS suggested 'collect' should be replaced with 'share' regarding data formats and exchange protocols.

MS highlighted that definitions of 'user' and 'end user' need to be included in the definitions section.

MS suggested that once the defined policy options and mechanisms are agreed then work should focus on establishing all the necessary definitions, notably travel data.

MS queried why only travel data was stated, why is it not travel and traffic data?

MS stated that specifications for priority action B cover different data and therefore the title should be travel and traffic.

MS stated that it would be clearer if all the transport modes were listed at the top of the specifications.

T&C

MS enquired if the specifications will include elements on terms and conditions on the re-use of data?

DG MOVE confirmed that this aspect is under consideration to be included in the specifications and at a later point in the meeting a set of potential provisions would be presented to experts.

Data categories

In relation to items 4 and 5, **DG MOVE** presented to **MS** experts the MMTIP data needs document that was prepared following the first two **MS** expert meetings. **DG MOVE** suggested following the same approach that was adopted in specification B in having a longer list of data as an annex and giving the flexibility to **MS** to decide from the travel and traffic data they already have available which could be shared.

Static

MS queried if infrastructure data could be included?

DG MOVE highlighted that it is important not to duplicate the INSPIRE directive and priority action B.

MS stated that in priority action B only 10 percent is related to traffic data and therefore an additional section for traffic data could be included in the annex.

MS enquired if the static data would be coming from both public and private bodies?

DG MOVE confirmed it is currently envisaged that data would come from all actors along the service chain.

MS stated that interchanges needed to be reflected more in the data scope.

MS queried if topology or topography should be used in the data scope.

The consultant stated that the correct term is topography not topology.

MS highlighted that if Point of Interest (POI) is included then this type of data needs to be fed into the access point.

MS stated that as priority action B covers the TEN-T network some of these access nodes are missing in this list and therefore it should investigate what is missing.

MS declared that for public transport the route lines along with if it is publicly or privately controlled need to be indicated.

MS confirmed that the line number needs to be detailed in the data list.

MS stated that points of interest should not be included but the names of the nodes should.

MS stated that public transport needs to be properly defined as it can be interpreted in different ways.

MS declared that putting too much information in the scope indicates too much preference.

MS stated that **MS** should be encouraged to digitize their travel and traffic information.

DG MOVE confirmed that this can only be a recommendation (included in the recital for instance) and the specifications cannot mandate the digitisation of travel and traffic data in Member States.

MS highlighted that access nodes can be static as well and the data relevant for persons with reduced mobility (PRM) and topography need to go together.

MS confirmed that 'transport on demand' is widely used but there need some differentiation between public and private.

MS highlighted that core and non-core data needs to be identified (i.e. data that is essential to the basic functioning of MMTIPS and those that are nice to have but do not impact the basic functionality).

DG MOVE re-iterated that the specifications are not mandating the access to travel and traffic data – following the same approach as priority action B Member States are given the flexibility to choose which data elements from the list will be accessible in the access point

MS stated that it is useful to know the routes of different modes so cities can join the same transport links.

AT highlighted that 'transport on demand' does not have routes, it should be kept it in but open. Taxi ranks are part of the infrastructure as well. For bike sharing the conditions for use and the price would need to be known.

Dynamic

MS highlighted that the time of booking affects the price of the ticket and needs to be taken into account for the tariff-fare info.

MS highlighted that the data of access nodes is dynamic by nature (e.g. station closed or open), vehicles equipped for the needs of persons with reduced mobility is dynamic as deployment changes, 'transport on demand' is not static as it does not have timetables.

MS declared that the following information is dynamic: point of interest (POI), ticketing, cycling and infrastructure.

DG MOVE invited the experts to reflect on the priority for cross-sectorial use of travel and traffic data. In the case of the re-use of travel and traffic data, it would go beyond MMTIPs specifically keeping the door open for innovation.

Transport modes

MS also queried if rail is included in the ITS Directive?

DG MOVE confirmed that rail is included within the scope of the ITS Directive and this draft non-paper has already reserved a section to list this at a later date. **DG MOVE** then asked experts nominated by Member States to confirm that the transport modes indicated in the list should be included in the scope of the specifications. As a result of the discussion, the following modes would be covered under the specifications:

RAIL _ YES

AIR _ YES

WATERBORNE _ YES

ROAD not indicated in spec B _ YES

PUBLIC TRANSPORT _ YES

TRANSPORT ON DEMAND – YES regarding infrastructure (stations etc.)

DG MOVE confirmed to MS experts that this list would be updated following these comments.

Terms and Conditions

DG MOVE then presented to experts nominated by Member States a set of potential general provisions of terms and conditions regarding the re-use of data in the frame of the specifications that could be included. Following the presentation DG MOVE gave the floor to MS experts for their views on the following statements:

- travel and traffic data across different modes of transport (both static and dynamic) should be accessible in a **fair and equal manner**
- the re-use of travel and traffic data does not include any **transfer of ownership**
- the transparency of **financial charges**
- the re-use of travel of traffic data should not **damage the reputation** of the data owner
- the re-use of travel of traffic data should be open to **cross-sectorial use**
- there should be **transparency** in the criteria used to rank travel options and **neutrality** in the way information is provided to the user

General T&C/re-use of data

MS enquired if there needs to be some differentiation between the categories of re-users?

MS stated that the re-use personal data needs to be considered.

DG MOVE confirmed that while the re-use of personal data is not in the scope of the specifications as MMTIPs are focused upon improving the travel information to the end user, the relevant data protection provisions would be included for the sake of clarify.

MS highlighted that the PSI Directive is already covering some aspects and it needs to be identified if the specifications need go beyond this.

DG MOVE responded that the provisions of the PSI directive might not be fit for the needs of the transport system, for example ...

MS re-iterated that the PSI Directive is a public obligation.

Charging

MS enquired about the possibility of the charging principle being included in the specifications?

DG MOVE stated that this could be included in the relevant terms and conditions.

MS enquired if the data owner can put charges on top for use and re-use?

MS stated that a minimum set of T&C is good for MMTIPS and charges should distinguish basic operational costs and extras (profit) and there should be an indication of prices for re-use which is market based. A licence given to Public Transport Operators makes it obligatory for them to give data to Public Transport Authorities.

DG MOVE stated that the topic needs further investigation. However, if charging is applied it would be expected to only cover operational costs.

MS stated that the re-use of public data should be for free.

MS stated that for charging, start-ups should pay nothing or a very small amount and bigger users should pay more.

MS stated that public data should be free for charging.

Contracts

MS highlighted that all data exchange is based on a contract and therefore the access point could include a 'sample contract'. Regarding charging, AT also highlighted that the PSI Directive might ask public data for free.

MS confirmed that within the Netherlands there is a data warehouse and the re-use of data is based on a contract but there are not guarantees of complete accuracy, up to date etc. and only on a best effort basis. Regarding general contracting, this should be left at the level of MS.

MS highlighted that for real-time information; on what basis can you reject a subscription for the data feed? Should a re-user sign up for each request-respond or an overall subscription? This needs further investigation.

Quality

MS queried if there will be a quality criteria within the specifications?

DG MOVE confirmed that there would be a section on quality.

MS enquired what 'quality' is as it can be interpreted in different ways and cover different elements (accuracy, reliability, up-to-date etc.)

MS enquired if there would be any requirements on how often the data would be updated in the access point?

MS highlighted that in their MS, if there any changes to travel data it must be updated in the national database within 15 days according to national law.

MS suggested an approach in which general timeliness could be included.

DG MOVE highlighted that there are number of different approaches including a set time-limit or simply when changes occur and the supporting study and the stakeholder consultation will provide more insight into what is most appropriate.

MS stated that someone has to validate the access point and if something goes wrong there will be issues of liability along the entire service chain.

DG MOVE highlighted that regarding this topic all actors along the data value chain need to fulfil their roles properly.

MS highlighted that it is not feasible to guarantee complete 100% accuracy of data.

MS suggested that the terms and condition should include an element regarding accuracy on the re-user not misleading the end user.

MS stated that regarding quality and the reliability of a service, operators are open to scrutiny and this drives them to improve their performance.

Linking Services

MS highlighted that linking services is exchanging services and not exchanging the data itself and the wording therefore needs to be adapted. Linking services can also improve modal coverage and this needs to be reflected as well.

MS highlighted that it is also an exchange of functions such as route searching.

MS – stated that in fact it is better to link databases directly.

MS re-iterated that service shall be accessible and re-useable.

MS stated that to link services a common interface is needed.

DG MOVE stated that a common definition of linking services will need to be developed into linking services and the supporting study is analysing all the possible ways to link services along with any relevant standards.

Conclusion

DG MOVE concluded the meeting announcing to all experts that depending on the progress of the supporting study, the next meeting may be postponed until September. Confirmation of this would be sent out to all experts at the earliest opportunity. The chairwoman thanked all participants for their efforts.