



MINUTES

6TH EXPERT MEETING

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

WHEN: 14 September 2015, 10.00 – 16.00,

WHERE: Philippe le Bon 3, Meeting Room 3/45, Schuman BE-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 5 th Meeting
10.10	Adoption of the meeting's agenda
10.15	Interim Report and 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

Claire Depré (CD) welcomed and thanked all MS experts for attending the 6th Expert Group meeting in Brussels.

Adoption of the minutes of the 5th Meeting

The minutes of the fifth meeting held on 2 June 2015 were circulated to the experts ahead of the meeting. No comments in writing were provided.

A MS highlighted that in the fifth expert meeting part of the discussion focused upon the differing opinions regarding the definition of public transport and queried whether the writing of the definition in the minutes confirmed the position of the Commission or merely provided a description of the discussion.

DG MOVE confirmed that the minutes provided a description of the discussion that took place.

No further comments were made by MS and the minutes are therefore accepted.

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.

Interim Report

As part of the supporting cost-benefit analysis, a first key deliverable that provides an extensive and comprehensive overview of the current market of multimodal travel information data and services in Europe including relevant gaps and barriers along with potential mechanisms the specifications could take into account was submitted to DG MOVE in July 2015. Experts were sent the first draft of the interim report via email and thereafter a summary presentation of the revised report submitted in August 2015 which mainly improved the structure and readability of the report.

The presentation was structured around the different items of the draft specifications and discussions focused on key findings of each item and the current text of the draft specifications.

DG MOVE also highlighted that as part of the stakeholder consultation process of the development of the specifications, the public consultation had been launched and actively encouraged MS experts to promote the consultation within their MS and that a stakeholder workshop would take place in Brussels on 4th November.

A MS highlighted one overall comment that the chapter on service quality was in fact more focused on data quality.

A MS raised the question if the recommendations in the interim report were conclusive or merely first-step recommendations?

DG MOVE responded that the interim report is the first deliverable of the cost-benefit analysis but a key element is to identify the potential mechanisms to help tackle the identified gaps and barriers but key milestones such as the public consultation and the stakeholder workshop might identify additional elements the Commission could consider to include in the specifications.

MMTIP Functionalities and supporting data needs

The first main discussion point of the interim report presentation was based on the functionalities and supporting data needs for multimodal travel information services. DG MOVE reminded experts that the main purpose of this exercise was to identify the appropriate data scope for the specifications to support the required functionalities of multimodal travel information services. DG MOVE highlighted that the consultant had divided the functionalities into three categories to reflect their level of desired usage according to their estimates and also available and accessible supporting data based on their expertise, team knowledge and available evidence.

A MS and A MS highlighted that at present the consultant has allocated all accessibility related functions for persons with reduced mobility within the final 'nice to have category' but this should be given higher priority and allocated possibly in the 2nd group additional functionality.

A MS and A MS specified that the connection times in between different transport modes at nodes/transport stations should be included.

A MS commented that the parking information and availability at urban nodes/stations should also be included.

A MS highlighted that cycling information should be more clearly identified.

A MS and A MS specified that the handover points between multimodal travel information services needs to be included.

A MS highlighted that although dynamic data is important it is also difficult to manage.

Scope of specifications – opening text and geographical/modal elements

A MS and A MS highlighted that the opening text needs to more clearly reflect two key elements of the specifications: the direct exchange of travel and traffic data and the exchange of routing results via the linking of services. Moreover, the categorisation of transport modes could be clearer as well i.e. if road includes bus or coach etc.

A MS specified that the draft text needs to make it more clear what the geographical scope of the specification apply to.

A MS stated that TEN-T does not include all cities and are essential for multimodal travel information services.

A MS highlighted that by definition multimodal travel information services are door to door and thus the entire network but cycling should not be specifically categorised as a transport mode along with public transport and rail etc. MS queried if it was feasible to categorise modes by individual or collective basis rather than modes.

A MS queried if waterborne transport modes (i.e. ferries etc.) should be included in the scope of the specifications. Moreover, to make door-to-door travel possible, the text should read 'at least on the trans-European network'.

A MS – highlighted the geographical scope of the specifications would by definition define the modal scope i.e. if public transport and demand responsive transport modes are included. **MS** suggested that the geographical scope for the access point could be applied to TEN-T but the linking services could be applicable for the entire network but the handover points can be identified along TEN-T.

A MS, A MS and A MS highlighted that the definition of public transport varies across EU MS and it is essential in the frame of the specifications to find a common agreed definition.

Data standards

DG MOVE highlighted that the consultant matched the identified MMTIP functionality and data needs with the relevant and appropriate data format/exchange protocol standards which identified NeTEx and SIRI as the main standards that could cover all of the MMTIP functionality prescribed. It was also identified that the TAP-TSI regulation for the rail sector also included the provision that when exchanging rail data with other modes NeTEx, SIRI and IFOPT should be used. On this basis the Commission proposed to harmonize these standards in the frame of the specifications.

A MS enquired why the interim report had identified NeTEx as covering the vast majority of public transport related data requirements even though it is not widely used and if DATEX II is specifically mentioned in the ITS Directive. **A MS** highlighted that the specifications should also include that any machine readable format compatible with the standards should be suitable to use. **A MS** also confirmed that any standard prescribed by the specifications would have to be approved by the national standardization board but in **A MS** all operators are obliged to publish their timetables in XML format on their website.

A MS also supported the point of **A MS** that any machine readable format compatible with the prescribed standard should be included like in real-time traffic information specifications.

A MS highlighted that the text should indicate that the identified standards should be compatible with the relevant formats. **A MS** also stated in that the wording should make a distinction between public and private transport.

A MS highlighted that we should focus on standardising essential data such as timetables and interchanges/nodes.

A MS, A MS and A MS stated that the use of any machine readable formats that are compatible with NeTEx should be considered citing the same process which was included in real-time traffic information specifications and there should also be an adjustment period to conform with new standards to help support this process.

A MS and A MS queried if aviation or waterborne modes were covered by the standard table in the interim report.

DG MOVE highlighted that this point was already raised with the consultant and this aspect would be addressed in the 3rd version of the interim report.

Access point

DG MOVE presented Item 3 of the draft specifications which includes the provision of an access to point for static related travel and traffic data for when it already exists within a MS. **DG MOVE** reminded experts that this follows the same approach for what was adopted in real-time traffic information and safety related information in the ITS Directive and in the last MS expert meeting no vocal calls not to include an access point for this delegated act were raised. No MS raised any objections to the provision of an access point for the multimodal travel information specifications.

Linking services

DG MOVE highlighted that the provision of linking services is included in the draft specifications but the key findings of the interim report showed that for now the relevant standards to link services are relatively premature and would propose at this stage not to mandate the use of any specific standard and keep the door open for innovation.

A MS agreed with the statement of **DG MOVE** that for the time being is more suitable to leave it open and not prescribe any specific standard. Moreover, the consultant should also take into account in the interim report a new 'hybrid architecture of linking services'.

A MS stated that the identification of handover points for service providers is important and suggested to identify those along the TEN-T network.

A MS and **A MS** queried whether or not the handover points could essentially be all over Europe and not necessarily just on TEN-T.

DG MOVE commented for the linking of services if it is necessary to have a unique identification code for all stations/nodes of all transport modes?

A MS highlighted that for public transport there is IFOPT but for road based modes it is difficult.

A MS what could be suitable for a handover point i.e. if a small airport in **A MS** could be a hand point?

DG MOVE and other **MS** stated this example could be a handover point.

A MS queried why linking services only refers to the exchange of routing results based on at least dynamic related information?

DG MOVE explained that the current text of the specifications does not prohibit the exchange of static based information but based on previous MS expert discussions the key type of information used for the linking of services is the exchange of real-time information.

A MS asked if the experts should continue to discuss the data requirements to be included as the annex to the specifications held from earlier meetings?

A MS highlighted that in the next meeting it is essential to return to the support data and service needs to finalise the supporting annex before advancing with other areas.

DG MOVE stated that a key activity for the next MS meeting would be to finalise the supporting data and service requirements but at this stage in the development of the specifications it was necessary to advance with the other elements of the specifications and have a mature draft specification identifying all the key instruments to be considered.

Conclusion

DG MOVE concluded the meeting asking all experts to provide feedback on the table of MMTIP functionality and supporting data requirements within the interim report in preparation of the next MS expert meeting on 20 October in Brussels. In addition, MS experts should also review the description of MMTIP activities in their MS in the interim report and also provide feedback to the consultant. The chairwoman thanked all participants for their efforts.