DRAFT Minutes of South West, West of Scotland & South East Gazetteer Group
Wednesday 03rd May 2023, Teams Meeting

Present:- Graeme Robin (North Ayrshire Council)
John O'Boyle (North Ayrshire Council)
Alan Armour (Ayrshire Roads Alliance)
Jamie Barr (East Renfrewshire Council)
Brenda McDonald (Inverclyde Council)
Kenneth Brown (West Lothian Council)
Brian Clark (Dumfries and Galloway Council)
John Dale (Argyle and Bute)
David Allen (Ayrshire Roads Alliance)
David Shaw (Ayrshire Roads Alliance)
Jack Doogan (Scottish Borders)
Eleni Gigourtaki (East Lothian Council)
Jed Hamilton (Scottish Borders)
Jordan Robertson (Autolink m6)
Joe Gray (Inverclyde Council)
Kenny Robertson (Renfrewshire Council)
Stewart Mackenzie (Balfour Beatty)
Percy Gerard (Glasgow City Council)
Shaun Robertson (Dumfries and Galloway Council)
Roger Garbett (Improvement Service)
Tony Thom (North Lanarkshire Council)

Item		Action

1a Welcome and Introductions

GR welcomed all to meeting and everyone introduced themselves.

1b Apologies

Apologies were received from:
- Carol-ann Dodds (Midlothian)
- Jennie Wills (West Dunbartonshire)
- John Hassall (Amey)
- David Carter (South Lanarkshire)
- John Dale (Argyll & Bute) connection issues
- Eileen McIntyre (Edinburgh) connection issues

2 Minutes of Previous Meeting

2nd February 2023
No Issues

3   **Issues with Gazetteer Submissions**
Base Gazetteer / Associated Data / Areas of Interest

- Update from Roger around the email from the SRWC regarding National Street Gazetteer Validation.
  - There have been differences between the two reports, SRWC & IS. It has taken up until Friday 28th April to get all of IR coding working with RG data.
  - One of the tests had been showing zero occurrences, however the script hadn't been working. This related to situations where point items had been turned into line items by adding 10m to x coordinate and 10m to y coordinate.
  - Roger and Iain have been meeting to discuss the scripts and testing requirements.
  - 12 Authorities passed the original validation.
  - 21 Authorities are now passing following a half time check.
  - Many outstanding are false positives, but Iain is doing a visual check and the first actual fail he comes across, he is including that in the body of the email, however there might be more.
  - Reinstatement category & maintenance responsibility ASD should follow the geometry of the road. Only Special designation may go perpendicular or away from the carriageway.
  - RG is preparing a guidance document that shows how the geometry should be captured. Most of this detail is already in the conventions document, but this one will expand on it.

- There was concerned that the emails going to HoS contained technical details that they didn't understand. Teams have been working constantly with the improvement service and had been told that their data was good with no errors and this is being reported back up to management. Then the HoS are receiving emails with reports that shows numerous errors and this is causing issues for the team working on it.

- There needs to be more consistency between the information that is being given out by the IS on a weekly basis compared to the information that is going out from the SRWC on a less frequent basis.

- RG wasn't sure how to get around the issue of the false positives because of the way the checks are being run but will help anyone that requires it to make sense of the reports.

- RG showed the currently SRWC list of authorities error count across the country.

- DS was surprised to see SAC were shown to have 1 error on that as the last email they received from SRWC stated they had no errors. He will investigate this particular one.

- JoB wanting to clarify that if the email RG sends out states NB no errors and no spreadsheets are attached, then this means you have no issues. RG confirmed this was correct, however, there had been a few errors with this weeks reports and updates would be required.

- Clarification was also sought on what data the SRWC was using to run the checks on. They are getting an export from the OSG on a Sunday night and then using that to run the tests on. If the data doesn't comply, they are then not importing it to the SRWR.

- RG discussed the example of NAC error. The esu was in the OSG but it wasn't in the SRWC dataset so this needed to be investigated further. RG is trying to get a meeting with IR prior to the end of month import.

- KB stated that West Lothian have had some people trained and are going to start working through the list. The problem they are finding is that if you are a new person coming to the gazetteer with zero experience, it is like a foreign language. RG suggested speaking to Inverclyde as they use the same software so might be able to give some guidance on best ways of working.

- JD had an email from RG saying no errors, but the spreadsheet shown on the screen shows that they have some. RG suggested going back to the commissioners email from around 18th April and check what was shown on that and double check each entry. If he is having problems, to send the email to RG and he will add further meat to the bones around what the error might be.

- RG is running his report on a weekly basis and progress is fantastic and the improvement across the whole country is great.

- KR asked if the IS live and test systems were mirrored now. Could he import to test until he knew it had passed all the checks and then import a successful submission to live?
The tests IS run isn't something that can be put into the portal due to time issues. It does 600 data checks on submission as it is and then gets processed in a couple of minutes. If you add in the geometry tests, the e file would need to be loaded, create the network, create the buffer network and then run the checks on that data. IS concerned that it would bring the portal to a standstill. You still need to load to live as that is where the data comes from for RG to run the manual checks.

- JoB stated that NAC uploads to OSG were happening automatically now from WDM, however he wasn't receiving any automatic alerts to say if the upload was successful or not. Particularly interested in getting the failed alerts. TT confirmed that he wasn't getting them originally but RG had resolved this. EG confirmed they are getting emails, but is isn't clear if the upload had been successful or not, example of the emails to be sent to RG. DS also confirmed that he wasn't receiving any automatic emails.

- RG showed examples of particular issues with the underlying geometry of motorway junctions where the slips road joining hadn't been taken far enough down the main carriageway. This meant that some ASD that had been correctly allocated against the slip roads was giving an error so the ESU had to be corrected to be positioned at the slips actual start / end point.

- If the underlining geometry of the Trunk Road is amended, there is a 6 week lag between the LA making the change and it appearing in the TRO system. RG can't streamline the process and is exporting the whole of Scotland in the 3rd week of every month and sending this across to the TRO software suppliers.

- There are still discussions to be had about off-street drainage system and how they should be recorded. It could be that they may have to be drawn in the gazetteer along the ESU but in vault as its actual position. This seems like it would be problematic as users would have to duplicate data but in separate places. Whoever is collecting the data will also struggle if they are collecting multiple things and some of it goes on the road & some of it goes in actual locations.

- Apparatus at shallower depth is for anything that is shallower than it should be. Some users are using this to record loops, however they are at the depth they should be so don't belong in this category.

- RG will be looking for feedback from users on the usefulness of the current conventions and if clarifications are required around anything. This would then be taken to RAUCS so the document could be updated as it should be a living document and constantly evolving.

4 Self Validation Issues

- Nothing Raised

5 TRO / Utility Related Issues

- Not all authorities have regular contact with their counter parts in the Trunk Roads. Need to meet regularly to discuss areas that impact both parties and agree resolutions. If anyone is unsure who the contact is in either organisation, please contact Roger <mark>ALL</mark>

6 CAG Issues

- Nothing Raised

Item		Action

7   Issues on Agenda at Request of National Group

7a   Contact List
- Any changes to the contact details for custodians should be sent to Roger & Graeme who will reissue the list.   <mark>ALL</mark>

7b   Update from the National Meeting
GP gave us an update on points raised at the national meeting:

- Open data set is available from the spatial hub for anyone to use, but nothing that contains gazetteers data.
- Coordination code of practice is being reviewed. DS & EG are on this group and will be in touch with RG as chair of the national gazetteer group.
- Most of the conversation was around the validation reports.

7c   Update from the Improvement Service
RG gave us an update:

- ASD has been the main talking point recently.
- Ensuring we have full maintenance and reinstatement categories against USRNs. This is checked via the portal on upload.
- We almost have full coverage for the trunk road network.
- If you are making any changes to the trunk road network you must coordinate this with the local TRO.

8   Any Other Competent Business
- How are people recording cycle tracks as there are some grey areas? Getting the off road ones are easy enough, but how are people dealing with on road or shared / segregated areas?
  JoB - if it is part of NCN then Type 3 record should be used to identify this for its full length. This might result in you having to split some ESU if the cycle network deviates when the carriageway doesn't.
  GP – Glasgow has lots that are segregated by concrete bollards or furniture. They were thinking about creating new ESU / USRN for these sections. RG not sure about this approach and would need to discuss further.
  BC – Use type 3 for NCN, but what about local cycle network?
  RG - If it was named then it could be a Type 4? This is coming up a lot because of the active travel routes.
  Could they be called LCN and given a number? Need to discuss further. To be raised at next national meeting.

- Guidance on the above would be good, particularly what do you do if it isn't on carriageway but is segregated or shared surface on a footway. Possibly code identify using the reinstatement codes, would need to look at it in more detail.

- Poll was carried out to see roughly how many people would attend in person if the next meeting was Hybrid. Approx. 7, so will get a meeting room to accommodate 12.

9   **Date & Venue of Next Meeting**
- 10am Wednesday 2nd August 2023
  Hybrid
  Microsoft Teams Meeting & Cunninghame House Three Towns Committee Room