

Minutes

Board meeting

Date: Wednesday 17 February 2010
Location: Holiday Inn
 500 Saxon Gate West,
 Milton Keynes,
 MK9 2HQ
Time: 10.00 – 12.50

Present

Board Members

Colin Foxall CBE	CF	Chairman
David Leibling	DLb	
Dr Derek Langslow CBE	DL	
David Burton	DB	
James King	JK	
Deryk Mead CBE	DM	
Christine Knights	CK	
Barbara Saunders OBE	BSa	
Stella Mair Thomas	SMT	
Bill Samuel	BS	
Nigel Walmsley	NW	

Apologies

Mark Seale	MS
Phil Davis	PD

Executive in attendance

Ashwin Kumar	AK	Rail Passenger Director
Jon Carter	JCa	Head of Corporate Services
David Sidebottom	DS	Bus Passenger Director
Mike Bartram	MB	Bus Policy Consultant
Julie Warburton	JW	Passenger Link Manager
Sharon Hedges	SH	Passenger Link Manager
Ashley Grumble	AG	Passenger Link Executive

7 members of the public attended the meeting.

External Guests

David Scorey	DS	Franchise Improvement Director, Southern
Jane Lee	JL	Head of Corporate Relations, Southern
Mike Hodson	MH	Managing Director, London Midland

Minutes

David Tooley	DT	<i>The Gazette</i> , Hemel Hempstead
N.J. Dennis	ND	
Alan Francis	AF	Green Party and Milton Keynes Rail User Group
S. Watts	SW	BBC3 Counties

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks and Apologies

Apologies were noted from Phil Davis, Marc Seale, and Anthony Smith.

2. Minutes of the Board Meeting held in Liverpool on 16 December 2009

As there were no comments, the Board **approved** the minutes and **authorised** the Chairman to sign them.

3. Action Matrix

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due	Status
BM105	15/10/09	Breakdown of performance data for Scotrail (recommended by Audit Scotland in report on First ScotRail)	Discuss with Transport Scotland.	James King/ Robert Samson	February 2010	Complete. Delete.
BM106	16/12/09	ATOC's journey planning tool for passengers with disabilities.	Report to be circulated to the Board.	Ashwin Kumar	January 2010	Complete. Delete.
BM107	16/12/09	Review and sharpen the Quarterly Performance Report format.	Work on a concise format.	Colin Foxall and Anthony Smith	May 2010	Q3 report shortened. Final short format awaits Business Plan. The Chairman acknowledged an improvement, but looked forward to seeing the first report in the new format.
BM108	16/12/09	Proposed Government	Presentation to the Board.	Anthony Smith	Deferred	Secretary of State announced

Minutes

		Delivery of rolling stock.				postponement of IEP shortly after the meeting. DfT to brief the board later in the year.
BM109	16/12/09	Distinguish between train and stations as root of concerns about provision of information during disruption on FTPE in the NPS.	Report back to the Board.	Ian Wright	January 2010	Not possible to follow up this action: cannot identify with confidence whether passengers are rating information provided at the station or on the train. Delete

4. Chairman's Report

The Chairman expressed his hope that the legislation, providing Passenger Focus's formal remit to address the concerns of bus passengers, would be signed by the Minister of State within a week. In view of this, the organisation's name would change from the Rail Passengers' Council to the Passengers' Council. Thanks and congratulations were extended, in advance, to those who had worked hard to get the organisation into the position it currently found itself.

A further name change had been proposed in order to reflect the work undertaken by Passenger Focus for the benefit of passengers in Scotland and Wales. While the exact name had yet to be decided, it would be along the lines of Passenger Focus Scotland and Passenger Focus Wales. This would take effect from the beginning of the 2010-2011 financial year.

In order to facilitate the hearing of passengers' voices in the event of a change of government following the forthcoming general election, Passenger Focus had been engaging in wide-ranging discussions with political parties and had learned that, to a significant extent, its agenda was shared by the country's current and potential leaders. It was noted that Passenger Focus's ability to produce robust, reliable evidence-based research was welcomed among, and commended by, those with whom the organisation had spoken.

A topic of significant concern, the Chairman noted, was the response of rail services to the snow experienced towards the end of 2009 and into 2010. While the response of the GB TOCs had been encouraging, with many demonstrating a commitment to the running of trains and communicating well with their passengers, the Eurostar response to the Channel Tunnel problems in general, and the management of the consequential disruption at St Pancras in particular, was widely recognised to have been below the

Minutes

standard expected. Passenger Focus shared the responsibility for the concerns of passengers on this service with LondonTravelWatch and would work on the issues that had been thrown up by the poor weather in order to deliver a report later in the year.

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due
BM110	17/02/10	Eurostar/St Pancras response to poor weather conditions.	Report to be produced on St Pancras passenger disruption	Anthony Smith	ASAP

With regard to the UK TOCs, the performance of First Capital Connect (FCC) remained a concern. In light of this, Passenger Focus had put the views of passengers to both the Department of Transport (DfT) and the TOC. In light of the impending redevelopment work on Thameslink, there was a need for continued monitoring of performance. The issue itself recalled previous concerns expressed with regard to FCC's reliance on voluntary overtime in order to staff a seven-day service.

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due
BM111	17/02/10	First Capital Connect	Update on FCC performance	Ashwin Kumar	April 2010

5. Chief Executive's Report

AK explained that the DfT had decided at the end of November to re let the Greater Anglia franchise to the same timetable as the Essex Thameside and the East Coast franchises. This did not provide enough time to carry out passenger research prior to the department issuing its franchise consultation document in the third week of January. So we had sent them a summary of previous research in that area and are currently carrying out new research which will inform our response to the DfT consultation. While concerns about inadequate time periods had led to doubt as to whether or not Passenger Focus should participate in the processes, it was decided that it must be in the interests of passengers to do so. Work was also underway in preparation for the re letting of the West Coast and TransPennine franchises. =

The Board expressed its formal dissatisfaction with the proposed East Coast timetable. AK indicated that it was only after encouragement from Passenger Focus that a consultation had been agreed upon, and what had been instigated had proved inadequate, as a full timetable had yet to have been produced. It was felt that the issue required escalation to the DfT, as it was not in the interest of passengers for each TOC to produce a timetable for its services without thought to those of its neighbouring TOCs. CK indicated that the timetable remained especially unclear with regard to Newcastle and the North East. DL identified particular issues with the timetabling, indicating that it appeared it had been led by the requirements of Network Rail and not those of passengers. Board members recalled that this resembled events that had occurred on the West Coast mainline in recent memory and that lessons could be drawn from that experience.

Minutes

It was noted that Lord Adonis had recently facilitated a conversation between TOCs and Network Rail on the matter of possessions. A similar approach was considered a potential solution to the difficulties with timetabling between TOCs.

Bearing in mind the effect that the inadequacies of the East Coast consultation process would have upon passengers, the Chairman considered it necessary for Passenger Focus to write a cogently argued letter on the inadequacy of the process to date to the DfT.

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due
BM112	17/02/10	East Coast concerns about a silo approach to timetabling.	To produce a letter outlining concerns to be sent to the DfT.	Anthony Smith and Colin Foxall	April 2010

The publication of the Passenger Focus report on antisocial behaviour was welcomed. It was noted that the Rail Safety and Standards Board has also recently completed research on the impact of alcohol on the railway, which addresses some of the same issues. and makes similar findings. The fact that the timing and the conclusions of the reports coincide will reinforce the points made and, hopefully, lead to greater recognition of an issue that seriously affected the way passengers used rail services.

It was noted that the 17 March Board meeting would provide the Board with the opportunity to hear from the DfT spokesperson on the Intercity Express Programme (IEP) and the delivery of the expected rolling stock. This would be a particularly useful exercise, given the current uncertainty as to whether the delivery of the rolling stock plan had been delayed in order for the DfT to calculate what it could or could not afford or whether it planned to deliver the proposed 1,300 rail vehicles.

Note: The Secretary of State announced a postponement to the IEP shortly after this meeting; DfT will now brief the board later in the year.

6.1 Audit Committee Draft minutes

DL introduced the draft minutes of what had been an excellent meeting. In response to a question from DLb on the business continuity exercise mentioned in the document, JCa explained that a simulation of Passenger Focus's response to numerous scenarios had been run, proving a useful experience which had enabled those involved to learn a lot, with the adequacy and proportion of the response being taken into consideration. The Executive planned to bring its completed business continuity plan back to the Audit Committee in April.

The Board **adopted** the draft minutes subject to their endorsement at the next meeting of the Audit Committee.

Minutes

6.2 Q3 Performance Report

The Chairman recorded the Board's thanks for Sarah Hampshire's work in compiling the informative performance reports, and noted in particular the extent to which she had taken account of the views expressed in Liverpool.

It was felt that the prevalence of 'green status' targets met by the Executive should not obscure the fact that teams and, in particular the research team, were working at full, or even beyond full, capacity. It was noted however that challenging targets were meant to be difficult to achieve in order to drive performance and that there were numerous discretionary actions contained within the plan that could be relaxed in the event of the Executive being overstretched. CF noted that he was less concerned about failing to meet a given target than understanding why.

With regard to the phrasing of the report, the Board reiterated its concern that the bus pilot work reflected the **provisional remit** conferred upon Passenger Focus. Another stylistic improvement concerned the utilisation of the comments column to provide details about a project. On certain items in this column, there was concern about the 'no budget allocation' comments. This was considered unhelpful, with a suggestion that the column contained a reference to either the plan to follow up on the item in the next financial year or an explanation as to why this was not deemed appropriate. Factually, it was noted that the Board's conference had since been put back from November to December.

As regards working methodology, SMT expressed approval for the increased use of internet conferencing. It was explained that the organisation would attempt to explore information provision for those employees, such as Passenger Link Managers, who were not office-based. Overall, the Executive was commended for its training and information-sharing initiatives, but it was felt that this needed to be built into the work plan for 2010-11, in light of the need to develop clear communication lines when formally taking on the work on buses.

A question was asked as to how Passenger Focus ensured that its contact details were easy to find for rail users wishing to get in touch. Although an answer was not forthcoming in the meeting, AK committed to providing the Board with an answer.

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due
BM114	17/02/10	Availability of contact information for passengers wishing to get in touch with Passenger Focus	Issue to be reviewed to ensure contact details are readily available	Ashwin Kumar	April 2010

Minutes

Item 35 provoked significant discussion, with the scale of Passenger Focus's achievement in encouraging the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) to take up a consumer protection agenda being noted. In the past, the ORR had focused almost exclusively on licensing, but with this new development it was hoped that it would begin to address other issues of concern to those using rail services. However, there was a need for Passenger Focus to consider the ways in which it could engage with ORR in order to obtain the best possible outcome for passengers.

The Chairman noted that the number of wins recorded appeared low. AK reminded the Board that it had not agreed a target for wins this year, but that issues were identified on a case-by-case basis. With regard to the classification of wins, AK indicated that Passenger Link Managers were also able to comment on wins in their areas on the website and via the intranet.

DLb noted the low level of unplanned absences which suggested that Passenger Focus was well managed and demonstrated high levels of morale. He commended the management team for this fact. CF thanked DLb for drawing the Board's attention to this not inconsiderable achievement.

The Board **noted** the performance report.

6.3 Business Plan and indicative budget 2010-11

It was noted that a detailed budget would follow in March 2010.

The Board, having previously had the opportunity to consider it, and noting that Members' comments (as well as those from our sponsor) had been taken into account, **endorsed** the business plan and indicative budget for 2010-11.

7. London Midland

7.1 Passenger Link Report

MH was congratulated on London Midland's high NPS scores, although, as JW noted, the recent periods had not been without problems. One of these concerned the provision of information during disruption. In order to address this, the TOC was working with its front-line staff to ensure the best possible communication with passengers in the event of a delay. In addition, both London Midland and Virgin had been suffering punctuality problems due, in part, to issues with the line. There was a need to address this formally with Network Rail.

Developing a theme from the Board Meeting in Liverpool, it was noted that a joint meeting between London Midland and Merseyrail was planned to enable the sharing of best practice on changing the behaviour of staff. JW thanked MH for his contribution to the improved relationship between London Midland and

Minutes

Passenger Focus and expressed her belief in the benefits for passengers to which this close relationship would lead.

7.2 Response from London Midland

Picking up on mention of the NPS scores, MH indicated that overall satisfaction on London Midland was up 7% year-on-year to 87%, while performance scores had moved from 70 to 79%. The PPM for punctuality and reliability was at 88.9%, but the TOC was confident that it could operate above 90% in coming years. While the improvement had been largely facilitated by new electric trains, the rise was evident across the service as a whole, 45% of which was not served by the electric fleet. The TOC was in fact working to obtain the most from its newest and oldest train models and was doing so effectively, with the miles-per-casualty rate of London Midland's 150s the highest in the UK. In line with this, the TOC-on-TOC cancellation rate was low, at 0.33%.

At times, the TOC had been able to perform well above 90%, but had been repeatedly set back by Network Rail issues; these accounted for all of the top 50 major incidents. The TOC needed to work with Network Rail to improve infrastructure issues. A further problem had been fatalities on the line, and London Midland had been working closely with Network Rail and the Samaritans to minimise the number of these incidents.

In order to engage passengers, the TOC had been running meet-the-manager sessions, which it had concentrated at Euston and Birmingham New Street, while making attendance mandatory for senior staff.

London Midland had also taken a methodological approach to quality issues important to the passenger experience, by setting in place a Quality Management System (QMS) that built up a detailed picture of station performance on service specifications. There was a dedicated team working on the QMS, producing 300 audits per quarter and delivering notices in a formalised manner to stations that failed to meet the required standards. In line with the QMS, training in customer service was in place, integrated with NVQ and Investors in People schemes. Surveys that supplemented the NPS were also undertaken in order to ensure that the TOC had as much information on rail users and their requirements as possible. This additional measure focused on stations and included a larger sample than the NPS drew on; the quarterly work, for instance, mirrored that undertaken by the NPS, while other surveys addressed site-specific issues. Currently expensive work was being undertaken on mapping passenger flow routes through Euston station. In response to the qualms about the NPS sample, the Chairman indicated that, with additional funding from the TOC, Passenger Focus would be happy to extend the sample size.

While the TOC was happy that the Network Rail upgrades were safe, there were concerns about their reliability. In addition to this, areas of the West Coast South had received no upgrade at all and the expiry of fixtures was also playing a role. A task group had been set in place to address these concerns.

Although London Midland deferred to Network Rail on numerous technical issues, it was clear that it needed to improve upon its recoveries to major incidents. A number of solutions were proposed to implement the desired improvement. In line with poor recovery, communication during disruption was also acknowledged to be sub-standard, although the NPS scores had improved in this area. Euston had proved a particular problem and the TOC now had a dedicated manager at the site. London Midland had also

Minutes

funded a shared central concourse information point at the station, in dialogue with Virgin and Network Rail, having already instigated a joint control room.

A procedure for the deployment of managers from other stations to areas affected by disruption was also in place, along with an attempt, particularly at Euston, to increase the presence of the TOC at the stations on problematic occasions, providing answers where possible and empathy with passengers when information was not available. Passenger Focus articulated a clear position on the importance of information provision in times of disruption as it was an issue which strongly affected passengers and their journey choices. MH concurred on the importance of the issue, indicating that London Midland was committed to communicating honestly and clearly with passengers during delays. It was felt that front-line staff made the biggest difference in this situation, with those able to engage with passengers performing the most useful function.

In response to a question from the Chairman, MH indicated that London Midland was engaged with Network Rail at all levels, with the relationship itself improving, although it had a significant way to go in this regard. In order to facilitate the actions required on the line, MH was always willing to take issues to a higher level. The TOC itself ran a bilateral performance system with Network Rail, which was multilateral on the West Coast. It was indicated that London Midland could benefit from speaking to TOCs who had experienced similar problems. There was also room for recording and charting disruptions on a TOC-on-TOC basis against those resulting from a Network Rail issue.

This concern for passengers was evident in the QMS, where the improvements instigated were maintained, as outlined in response to a question from DM, through the systematic approach that outlined expected standards, provisions for audit, the feedback required, and resolution to any issues arising. The ability to deliver customer service would also be a particular recruitment area and ongoing training would be provided, with special reference to NVQ and Investors in People programmes. However the only sure method to maintain improvements was by means of a consistent effort over time. Passenger Focus would play a key role in ensuring this effort was maintained and that the TOC's commitment to customer service was delivered upon.

NW addressed the seven-day service issue, asking whether London Midland delivered its commitment through volunteerism. The situation within the TOC was complex, with some routes being staffed through a work roster, which could include working hours on Sundays, and others relying on staff volunteering to work overtime. The only solution would be to buy a contractual commitment. The Chairman indicated that Passenger Focus would liaise with the DfT to ensure that the ability to offer a seven-day service was stipulated in future franchise agreements to ensure that passengers were able to access rail services throughout the week.

In response to a question from DLb, MH indicated that the Chase Line in the West Midlands had been excluded from London Midland's new penalty fare regime because the provisions for pre-boarding tickets had been deemed inadequate.

The representative of the Milton Keynes Rail Users Group, AF, asked two questions: the first related to insufficient availability of a Christmas and New Year timetable, and the second to the number of free rover tickets taken up over the holiday period. While there had been a high number of rover downloads, the number used had been considerably lower. MH was unable to produce the exact figure, but would locate it

Minutes

and would relay it to Passenger Focus. London Midland was reviewing the holiday timetable for 2010. The Chairman expressed uncertainty as to whether the penalty that translated into free tickets best compensated rail users for disruption.

Item	Date	Issue	Action	Owner	Due
BM115	17/02/10	London Midland Rover Tickets	Breakdown of Rover ticket sales over the Christmas / New Year period to be sent to MKRUG	Julie Warburton	April 2010

9 Southern

9.1 Passenger Link Report

SH explained that Southern had recently embarked on a new franchise, which notwithstanding their being the incumbent, had been resource-intensive. It was noted that this franchise was passenger focused with significant emphasis on quality issues. Southern's commitment to passenger engagement through structures such as a web-based passenger panel and stakeholder meetings, as well as direct links with local groups was commended. The PLM observed that although the principle would be for strategic engagement with the TOC, there were many areas where input was requested and gave examples of recent invitations to: input into the NPS; respond to a consultation on a cycle scheme in Brighton; and comment on journey quality strategy. The focus for future work would have to be increasingly on strategic issues to which it could add value and thereby improve the quality of the service for rail users.

Capacity issues on the service had been addressed by way of additional rolling stock. However, this consisted of old 313s, which had neither toilets nor air conditioning. Passenger satisfaction had been driven in the previous franchise by new rolling stock, so it was likely to have a negative impact upon the perception of the service. In addition, an increased number of 412s had been brought into the service when the performance of the existing models was erratic at best concerns with regard to the continuity of service. In addition, an increased number of 442s will be brought into the service although the performance on the existing 442 units, was erratic at best and there remain concerns with regard to the continuity of service.

The Sussex Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) had recently been produced with input from industry and Passenger Focus, which acknowledged the capacity issues on the service. However, the expectations of many passengers exceeded those outlined in the report, with there being a desire for a modal shift in transport provision. However, the investment was not present and there were concerns that interventions would continue to leave passengers standing. The RUS confirmed findings of a Passenger Focus report that recommended intermediary stops on the Gatwick Express.

Performance overall had been variable, with record highs accompanied by severe lows. Communication around the latter had been poor and Passenger Focus was working with the TOC to improve the

Minutes

information provision. There was a focus on four stages: acknowledge, apologise, explain and provide options.

An exciting development involved the rolling out of the first ITSO smartcard on Southern. Passenger Focus would examine closely the impact of this on passengers and fare structures.

9.2 Response by Southern

DS indicated that Southern's emphasis upon passenger engagement was evident in the structure of their business, centring, as it did, on its Service Delivery Directorate, within which those involved in delivery service to passengers sat. The directorate was supported by those who facilitated service delivery. The tagline for the new franchise was the multivalent phrase, 'Making every journey better'. A new senior leadership team had been put in place alongside business objectives, which focused on issues such as safety, environment, developing people, leadership, change management, partnership and improving the journey quality of passengers. Each objective had a Board dedicated to its delivery; one target would not be prioritised over another.

Over the first five months of the franchise, the TOC had delivered on 40 of its 125 franchise commitments, although it recognised that those it would begin to tackle over the next 18 months would be increasingly complex.

In terms of performance, the TOC had experienced its best autumn, and, while challenging, winter had seen some successes. The 442s, in particular, had been effective in the poor weather and the TOC had run a first-to-last service nearly every day. Southern's website had also been able to meet demand.

The TOC's short-term focus was to drive up performance on the Sussex Coast line above 90%. In addition, the first batch of additional 313s would come into service in May, with maintenance work carried out over the months following, alongside work to address the toilet issues. A Safe Travel team had also been created, consisting of Southern employees and British Transport Police officers, which would allow the TOC to maintain a visible presence on its services. BlackBerrys would also be provided to front-line staff, in order to ensure access to real-time information. The East London line would open in May. In the longer term, the 460s were being phased out; ITSO smartcards would be rolled out; and access to the network would be considered, alongside relationships and station quality improvements.

While the Chairman was pleased to note the many passenger-orientated developments in the new franchise, discussion focused on the introduction of 313s, which, given the commitments Southern had given, seemed a retrograde step. Southern explained that a winning bid for the franchise relied upon utilisation of existing rolling stock and the 313s had been available. In order to mitigate the effect on passengers, these trains would first be used for short services, although the length of journey would increase. Research had indicated that passengers did not travel the length of the line on which the service would be running and work would be done with stations on toilet facilities. Notwithstanding these attempts at mitigating the impact, the Chairman expressed his concern for passengers using the lines on which the 313s would run.

Minutes

There was a communication plan in place around the initiative, with contact occurring via the website and at the stakeholder forum. In addition, there would be 313 road shows in the affected areas, with staff explaining the reasoning behind the altered trains and sharing an artist representation of the model. A lot of effort was being expended in the training of front-line staff such as the conductors, as they were the ones who were required to field questions on a day-to-day basis. As to the May timetable changes, there would be announcements at the stations with additional leaflets.

The maintenance implications for the 313s were significant, given that the current TOC hoped to obtain 7,500 miles per casualty on them, when the trains the 313s were replacing achieved 26,000 miles per casualty. There was much work being done with train crews to raise their familiarity with the models. As to the maintenance strategy, the 313s would be maintained at Brighton, although pressure would have to be relieved at this site to prevent overburdening. As such, 442 maintenance would be moved out of Brighton. CK noted that the NPS score for car-parking facilities had dropped 5.2% since 2009. The reason for this was thought to be the growth in service users, which had led to more and more passengers attempting to access car-parking facilities. In order to address this concern, the TOC had committed to making available an additional 1,100 spaces, with potential ad hoc development as and when opportunities arose.

NW asked for possible reasons for the repeatedly stronger performance of South West Trains as compared to Southern. One of the factors was thought to be the success of the timetable re-write, which had slowed services, but delivered a timetable to which South West could work. Southern had put in place a structured methodology for addressing issues and tools for tracking progress. It was hoped that that this would help to close the gap. Southern, however, could not be re-writing its timetable, as it was working to tight specifications.

The Chairman reiterated his approval of the passenger-orientated franchise agenda and indicated the Board's willingness to engage with Southern over the term of the new franchise.

8. Chiltern

8.1 Passenger Link Report

Ashley Grumble noted that Chiltern was a high-performing TOC, with 12 passenger service commitments, all of which were on target. The interests of passengers were being addressed in many ways, not least through the training of front-line staff. There were two action areas: toilets and attitudes of staff. There had been some improvement on the toilets, and the NPS figures showed movement on the attitudes of staff. However progress was likely to be limited due to the driver-only set up of the line. This also hindered the responses to disruption.

Passenger Focus had contributed to the designs of Evergreen 3 trains, relaying the features that passengers wanted. Passenger Focus had also been involved in the consultation on the timetable; in anticipation of the new service, a significant timetable change would come into force in December 2010, which would see a faster service, but lead to concerns about intermediate stops.

Minutes

Passenger Focus was also engaged with the Chiltern passenger panel, which would be meeting later in February to discuss the NPS results, and it would work with the panel on the delivery of proposed measures. While the panel remain committed to their own methods of working, it was hoped that it would begin to develop an increasingly collaborative approach with Passenger Focus; this would need to come from within. It was a welcome development that half of the quarterly passenger panels were dedicated to considerations of the NPS, which showed an increasing concern for the views of passengers. It was recalled that, throughout this, Passenger Focus keenly maintained its independence from the panel to enable it to continue to issue challenges to the TOC on behalf of rail users. In order to achieve this, relationships were maintained with senior management alongside the passenger panel.

Overall, the Board thought that Chiltern was thought to favour a 'sparse' management structure, and wondered whether this delivered the best service for passengers; however the Board **noted** the Passenger Link report, **accepted** that the high scores for punctuality and reliability drove other issues, and **commended** AG for his engagement with passengers and the TOC on this important franchise.

11. Bus Passenger Policy Priorities: Roadmap

DS indicated that the roadmap used the results of Passenger Focus's preparatory work on bus travel, particularly the bus priorities studies, to outline and direct policies that would allow the best possible representation of bus users' views. The roadmap, alongside other related documents, would be useful in providing direction internally and also in representing what Passenger Focus stood for in respect of external parties. This would allow Passenger Focus to develop a specific and useful role among the stakeholders, operators, local authorities and trade bodies in the sector, as well as clearly influencing the work it undertook on behalf of bus, coach and tram passengers. DS also mentioned that following discussion with the board bus group, MB would be producing a green paper strategy document for further discussions with stakeholders.

There was concern about the allocation of time to bus, coach and tram issues at Board level. JCa reminded the Board that he had recently, and successfully, consulted Board Members on a new template agenda for Board meetings for 2010-11, and that bus, coach and tram issues would feature as highly as rail issues in the new reporting year. PLM reports would be developed for the new remit along the lines that had proved successful for rail. The Board were **content** with this approach.

6.4 Approval of bus research contract arrangements for one year from 01/04/10

The Board **resolved** that, pursuant to the provisions of the Railways Act 2005, Schedule 5, Part 6, members of the public shall be excluded from the meeting for the discussion set out below having regard to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted:

"The discussion is commercially confidential: the affairs of an individual or organisations will be disclosed, and such disclosure may 'seriously and prejudicially' affect their interests."

Proposed by: Nigel Walmsley

Minutes

Seconded by: Dr Derek Langslow

The Chairman countersigned the resolution.

The public were excluded from the discussion from 12.45 until the close of the meeting at 12.50

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting:

Colin Foxall CBE
Chairman, Passenger Focus

Date