



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

Directorate C - Innovative & sustainable mobility
C.3 - Intelligent transport systems

M I N U T E S

4^{T H} E X P E R T M E E T I N G

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

WHEN: 28 April 2015, 10.00 – 16.00,

WHERE: CCAB Centre Borschette, Room 4D, Rue Froissart 36 - 1049 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 3 RD meeting
10.10	Adoption of the meeting's agenda
10.15	Analysis and discussion of different interface options
12.30 14.00	** <i>Lunch Break</i> **
14.00	Analysis and discussion of problem tree and data scope
15.30	Conclusions and the way forward
16.00	End of meeting

Welcome

Claire Depré (CD) welcomed and thanked all MS experts for attending the 4th Expert Group meeting in Brussels.

Adoption of the minutes of the 3rd Meeting

The minutes of the third meeting held on 3 February 2015 were circulated to the experts ahead of the meeting. A MS highlighted that after the 3rd meeting they provided further information on the national multimodal journey planner in the MS via email. This will be integrated in the revised minutes, as well as A MS comment which will be provided in writing after the meeting. With these modifications, the minutes are considered approved.

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 of different options for specifications

DG MOVE started the meeting off by highlighting that the discussions on root causes have so far remained at a very high level and although we have developed a narrative of the data scope, how to improve the continuity of services needs to be explored in detail. DG MOVE also highlighted that the consultant that is in charge of the supporting study for the specifications is present in the meeting today and that their activities will go in parallel to the progress of the expert group meetings.

DG MOVE then proceeded to further recap that the last MS expert meeting identified that there is a centralised and de-centralised way to conduct routing for multimodal journey planning; via direct access to raw data to conduct routing for the entire journey or connecting different services directly via an interface. DG MOVE then presented to the experts the main options that could be envisaged in this regard as possible remit for the specifications of priority action a), under the ITS directive :

Option A: direct access only to raw data for routing

Option B: connecting services only directly via an interface for routing

Option C: a combination of both

DG MOVE declared option C as the preferred one to enable comprehensive and interoperable services across the EU. CD then gave the floor to MS to identify their preferences.

A MS declared preference for option c since both elements (direct access to raw data and connecting services) are necessary in order to achieve comprehensive MMTIPS and pan EU services. On the one hand, end user should get the same kind of information through

different apps and services (consistency of information is important), on the other hand we need to identify additional information service providers might need to build upon in order to individualise services.

A MS affirmed that they support option C, that covers both access to data and connecting services. **The MS** specifically highlighted that option C addresses different sets of stakeholders

A MS highlighted that there are two main segments of journey planning, the trunk part of the journey and the first and last mile. Generally speaking, the user has already decided which mode of transport to take for the former, but not for the latter.

A MS declared that option C sounds the most efficient.

DG MOVE stated that the development of the specifications under priority action A was left until last due to complexity issues (wider range of data sources and actors involved) but also because it needs to build upon other priority action areas. Some data elements currently under discussion were already part of the data scope of the recently adopted specifications under priority action B (such as some infrastructure data and data concerning public transport stops). Those specifications do not mandate availability of data but when data is available the mechanism of the national access point to share and access data applies.

A MS referred to the ongoing debate in France on multimodal information services. Option C could be accepted though a distinction should be made between commercial services and public transport.

A MS supported option C stating however the need to be specific on what is meant by 'data exchange'.

A MS stated that they have a national data set which is a weekly snapshot of all the local public transport services across the country. **A MS** nationwide standard for exchanging bus schedules and related data already exists (transXchange). Travel Line or TFL provide APIs and those journey planners are using dynamic data and including RTTI.

A MS declared that this discussion has taken place many times in **the MS** and different actors along the service chain prefer the API option as the data is more detailed/accurate but others want to start from scratch in processing raw data to improve data and therefore we do have to provide the two indeed. Preference is given to option C.

A MS referred to the two MS databases for public transport and rail data based on TransModel and NeTEx which are quite comprehensive and provide a lot of information on stops including quality requirements. In terms of providing services, we would look at the private sector to organise it and prefer option C of direct access to data and connecting services.

A MS highlighted that when discussing the possible options (A, B or C) the nature of the data (i.e. static or dynamic) need to be taken into account. Static data (timetables etc.) can be easily shared as raw data but for dynamic data (such as real time information) it is more complicated. Therefore MS supports option C taking into account the different types of information and their uses.

A MS stated that in the MS there is an integrated travel system for buses, trains, regional trains and public transport. Option C as well.

A MS declared that option A is the best for **the MS** and we need to have a market that supports the development of new applications.

A MS highlighted that option A is that of a large international service provider. If you want to plan across regions, the regions and systems should be able to talk to each other.

A MS stated that both static and dynamic data are needed; option C sharing services and ticketing seems more realistic.

A MS queried if it is possible to have a sub option between A and B?

A MS stated that they still support option C and a national access point currently exists in the MS. Detailed information is provided at a regional level and on top of this a national travel planner exists. A MS outlined also the growing relevance of the EU spirit project to which they are partner.

Linking services

DG MOVE noted at this stage that a considerable number of MS supported option C and thus focused the discussion on linking services; how we can do this, under which circumstances should this take place and why is there is a lack of proper interfaces? DG MOVE provided the following suggestive reasons:

- **Content of services** is different and thus hard to connect them
- **Technical nature** –such an interface does not exist
- **Cost-benefit** – as a service provider, I will not earn more money by connecting my service to another
- **Obligation** – if nothing is demanded no service provider will do so
- **Legal issues** – who would be liable if something went wrong?

A MS suggested to look at examples already in place. A MS initially focused on option A as it was easier to implement but attention is now focused on linking services, given the positive experience gained in the context of the EU Spirit project. The challenge is to identify "hubs" where to handover services.

A MS described that on a national level it is better to have a national timetable database but when it comes to sophisticated services (RTTI, ticketing, persons with reduced mobility etc.) we need to rely on linking services and not just direct access to raw data.

A MS highlighted that giving access to static data is not challenging and covered a lot by PSI, but we need to focus on how to deal with dynamic data: giving access to dynamic data is complex and it is therefore better for real time information to exchange the services.

A MS highlighted that it will be hard to foresee what types of services will emerge in the future. For example, at present general national services do not fully support persons with reduced mobility but this will develop. Apps have been successful due to the way the data is presented and we should encourage the private sector to develop MMTIPS. Limited data but good quality and good coverage is important.

DG MOVE highlighted that, through the access to multimodal data initiative it intends to mandate the access to a set of basic but essential data for, for MMTIPs. Member states were then asked again how we can connect different services together and how we can draft solutions?

A MS stated that connecting regional planners is easier but problems exist for cross-border travel which we need to look at.

A MS highlighted that where there is intense traffic and real time information demand it is better to join the databases and not link services which would be slow. In such circumstances it is better to have a common database and allow data exchange in this case. Strange results can occur when linking services and they are difficult to debug. Instead with a common database you can easily detect the gaps and find the errors and thus offer better quality.

DG MOVE re-highlighting the same question posed earlier, affirmed that we need to decide when we link services i.e. if it is sensible for regional services together but not cross border.

A MS stated it is not better to link services of neighbouring countries citing that users would expect to use their device with the same graphical user interface in different countries. For a comprehensive MMJP I need both access to raw data and connecting services directly. If a service wants to become 'personalised' information for persons with reduced mobility for example they will need both.

A MS identified that the title of the presentation should read MMTIPS not MMJP in order to stay consistent.

DG MOVE re-highlighting the same question posed earlier, asked again under what circumstances is it appropriate to link services?

A MS stated that for linking services the main interface is places and we can add lots of preference details. The specific architecture of linking services is not as relevant as we are looking at a higher level. It is also important to identify that sometimes there is no clear

distinction between static and dynamic data as quite often dynamic data can influence static data (regular delays.)

A MS suggested that we should focus on services that provide fundamental functionalities that end users have a right to have and we have an obligation to provide. For example, we have the obligation to inform citizens about timetables and delays which means we have to include real time information and reasoning for delay.

DG MOVE provided a summary of the discussion so far. Direct data access and exchange via a database seems more suited for static data and connecting services is more appropriate for real-time information during the trip.

A MS suggesting that we should distinguish ticketing between fares. If fares change once per year, they can be classified as static but if we consider the way we buy tickets this can be classified as dynamic data. **A MS** thereafter confirmed that option C is still the most feasible out of the three options.

DG MOVE declared that integrated ticketing is not in the scope of specifications as explained in previous meetings but stated that the traveller should be able to have an *estimation* of how much it will cost. This level of magnitude would be important for the traveller.

A MS stated that if we have agreed to go for option C, we then need to define what functions are included.

A MS suggested that a common platform could be an option? Platform can be generic.

A MS stated that we are not looking at the detail, we are looking at a higher level and we are looking at interfaces that are compatible.

A MS highlighted that they agree with **A MS** and we have to deal with interfaces. Moreover, app developers who need everything in Europe accessible in the same way including harmonized data formats and protocols.

DG MOVE If a standardised interface to connect different services together exists, this could be used in our specifications.

A MS stated that a key aspect to ensure when linking services is the user has the same information and look/feel on their phone when linking services and the market should be active in this sector. Regarding standards, **A MS** stated that it was not clear if such a standard exists and potentially something was developed within EU Spirit.

A MS highlighted that **A MS** and **A MS** have standardised interfaces and it is aware that a work group in CEN has a task to develop a standard for an interface for MMTIPs.

Problem Tree Definition and Standards

DG MOVE displayed the problem tree to experts which was developed within the first two MS expert meetings and gave the floor to MS to comment on what is missing and what gaps are not touched upon.

A MS highlighted that ticketing is not included on the problem tree and queried why this is the case.

DG MOVE responded by stating that the Commission want a step-wise approach of information and planning first and ticketing after.

A MS provided a further comment on clarifying what the European Commission means by 'pan European.'

DG MOVE stated that our goal is not to set-up an EU MMTIPS but instead create the framework of services can become more comprehensive and the geographical scope can be enlarged across Europe by connecting different services.

A MS enquired if ticketing is an extension of the priority action?

DG MOVE responded that this is not the case but integrated ticketing is a logical subsequent step of integrated information and planning.

A MS highlighted that the main root cause is the availability of data and we have to push the public market so the data is available across the EU. In this regard open public data is key.

A MS commented that we need to link available and accessible – the public sector has data that is not accessible for service providers.

A MS queried where specifically real-time traffic information is included in the problem tree?

DG MOVE responded by stating that real-time traffic information is covered by specifications for priority action B.

A MS highlighted in as far as urban areas are concerned, the situation is different under priority action B since MS only voluntary apply the specifications to priority areas. .

A MS commented that quality of data (updates) is a problem but the issue is not expected to be solved in the specifications under preparation. Lack of clear terms and conditions could also be solved within the specifications.

A MS stated that the quality of data is not specific and not a core topic for the specifications. The availability of infrastructure data especially in real time is a problem. Regarding T&C, how much the PSI directive will work with transport data is important. If not covered by other specifications, the equal treatment and roles/responsibilities of actors along the service

chain should be explored. Austria declared that in this context we also need to focus on the formats and exchange problems.

A MS highlighted that we need to pay attention to where liability lies in cases of inaccurate data. The most ambitious part of the MMTIPs is real time information but what can be considered as static or dynamic is not fully clear.

A MS stated that a core element of MMTIPs is static data which will fulfil 90% of all journeys (in cases of severe weather conditions or congestion, users usually go directly to the transport operator for information). MMTIPs should focus on the extra 10% of providing real-time information.

A MS agreed with **A MS** and **A MS** and suggested to follow the approach of priority action C (study it in a dedicated project and once conclusions can be drawn report back to the MS experts).

A MS highlighted that lack of infrastructure data has to be addressed as this is fundamental for the services to work properly.

A MS commented that regarding interfaces, the public data and public services could be easy to get an agreement but we could face problems with private companies to share data and share services. However, in **A MS** we have an example where the three biggest telephone companies agreed to facilitate mobile payment for public transport which is apparently the first case in the world.

DG MOVE responded by stating that when there is a common interest the private players will do it – the full service model by the rail sector is a good example of this.

A MS highlighted they were able to get the access to timetables from public and neighbouring countries.

DG MOVE stated that the accompanying study for the impact assessment on access to data identified the gaps on available data. They described an ideal scenario, what are the data needs of such a system and developed typologies off existing services and what they have access to – looking at regional with or without real time information, cross-border with or without information. The study, which will be uploaded on the DG MOVE website, concluded that if we only share data we might not end up the continuity of service. We tried to draw a line between what is necessary and what is nice to have. Access to data tried to identify what data is core and not core data.

DG MOVE then presented the different MMTIPS typologies that were included in the access to data study

- Regional or national MMTIPS without RTI
- Regional or national with RTI

- Cross border without RTI
- Cross border with RTI

A MS Regarding data formats and exchange protocols DATEX II, SIRI and NeTEx are used in **A MS** but such standardised formats for demand responsive transport are missing today.

Conclusion

DG MOVE concluded the final session announcing to all experts that between the next meeting on the 2nd of June, bi-lateral meetings with some MS will take place. The 6th meeting scheduled for July will still take place and confirmation of the dates for these meetings would be sent out to experts. The chairwoman thanked all participants for their efforts.

Contact: Stephanie Leonard, Tel. +32 2 296 5512, stephanie.leonard@ec.europa.eu