

## DCIS Consultation Response Form

Name	Tim Rivett
Organisation	RTIG Inform
Role	General Manager

Please answer the following questions, giving details where appropriate.

1. Do you believe that creating a DCIS specification (not necessarily the one proposed) has the potential for real benefit? If so, how?

Response:

Yes we believe that there would be benefit from a DCIS.

A standardised format for all signals would ensure that it is easier to implement public transport priority schemes by reducing the effort required to collect information during scheme design and implementation.

Where bus operators and their routes operate across authority boundaries there would no longer be a need for authorities to agree how numbering between the authorities work and in some cases remove the requirement for signal ID translation on the fly when priority requests are received.

2. Do you believe that the proposed 4-step approach meets the principal requirements of such a specification? If not, what is the shortfall?

Response:

The 4-step approach in principle looks appropriate.

Within the approach we believe that there are some challenges which need to be addressed for the detail of the proposal to be successful.

The support for private operators is welcomed, we do not however consider that allowing 99 IDs is sufficient.

There are a large number of potential private operators who could fall within the requirement to provide data to a national scheme, particularly when longer term requirements from connected private vehicles are required.

It is unclear if toll road operators would be under National Highways for example.

More immediately for a national standard to be of maximum use for public transport it needs to be able to support the multitude of signals on private roads where bus priority systems are already in use. For example:

Airports and sea ports for shuttle buses, signals land side and air/sea side are managed and controlled by separate organisations – so should have separate RoadRegulatorIDs,

Private business parks and works where internal junctions are signal controlled,

Long term building projects and site such as Hinkley Point which have signals on site.

The requirement for a single IntersectionID “for now” for complex sites is of concern and does not provide the for many of the current processes and integrations that could usefully otherwise use the standard much sooner.

We would encourage a move to have each intersection with a unique IntersectionID as quickly as possible and ideally from the start, perhaps on the basis that if an Authority can supply the data it should, but all must do it by X. This is important if you are to get some early uses cased which can demonstrate the value for example public transport priority requests.

3. Does the proposed numbering approach create risks or problems with your current systems?

Response:

There would be a requirement to update existing standards for bus priority to ensure compliance with a new standard.

There would be a requirement over time, assuming existing signal numbers and configurations continue to be accepted, for public transport operator and authorities bus information and management systems to be updated to support a new standard. The time allowed for supporting existing data structured by an authorities traffic managers will be key to ensuring changes can be achieved without impacting on operational delivery.

4. Do you have any further comments or suggestions on how the proposed approach could be improved?

Response:

Who will manage the RoadRegularID? There needs to be long term stability as organisations such as TTF, UTMC etc come and go.

How will the splitting, merging and creation of new road authorities be handled? Recent examples include Northamptonshire splitting, and Cumbria in April 2023.

Consideration should be given to how the proposed approach could be extended to other areas which could benefit from standardisation – for example barriers, gates etc.

There are potential lessons to learn from the bus open data service and bus stop database (NaPTAN) around data quality management and expectations about updates and authorities capabilities.

If you would like to be involved in further work on the specification, please provide contact details:

Email:	<a href="mailto:Tim.rivett@RTIG.org.uk">Tim.rivett@RTIG.org.uk</a>	Tel:	01226 762712
--------	--	------	--------------