

Board Meeting Paper	
May 15 BM C 2.0	
Purpose of report	<input type="checkbox"/> Decision ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion / debate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information only ²
Sensitive Information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If sensitive, protective marking³	
Date of Meeting	14 May 2015
Agenda Item	C 2
Report Title	Road user representation
Sponsor	Anthony Smith
Author(s)	Guy Dangerfield



1. Summary
<p>This paper summarises the changes made as a result of Government's "roads reform" initiative, sets out progress in establishing the Transport Focus road user function and provides an update on the road user research programme.</p>
2. Recommendations / decision required
<p>This report is for noting and / or discussion only.</p>
3. Further details
<p>The government's "roads reform" initiative reached an important stage in late March/early April. The following changes have taken place:</p> <p>Five year periods for outputs and funding: Government has set a five specification (Road Investment Strategy) and made funds available (Statement of Funds Available) for the operation and development of the Strategic Road Network in England.</p> <p>Highways England: Management of the Strategic Road Network in England transferred from the Department for Transport's Highways Agency (part of the Civil Service) to a new government-owned company "Highways England Company Limited" on 1 April 2015.</p> <p>The Monitor The Office of Rail Regulation has been given addition responsibility for monitoring Highways England's progress in delivering the investment and performance specified by Government. It was renamed the Office of Rail and Road on 1 April 2015.</p> <p>The Watchdog Transport Focus acquired new responsibilities for representing the interests of the users of the Strategic Road Network on 30 March 2015.</p>

¹ If a decision is required, or you are asking for the paper to be formally noted, please set this out in section 2

² If for information only, please make clear in section 1 **why** this information is being provided

³ ie **OFFICIAL/SENSITIVE:** plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / MANAGEMENT-STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

Progress in establishing Transport Focus's Road User Team:

Road user director – Guy Dangerfield, in post

Road User Policy Advisor – Phil Carey, in post

Road User Managers – recruitment currently under way

Road User work programme:

Planning the work Transport Focus will deliver for road users in the 2015/16 year is well advanced. Stakeholders will be invited to comment on our draft proposals during May.

Research update:

- Road user needs and experiences, qualitative research. Transport Focus's first road user research was published on 30 March. [Summary report link](#). [Full report link](#).
- Independent analytical review of road user satisfaction research. This is an independent review commissioned to inform development of a replacement for the National Road User Satisfaction Survey, currently carried out by Highways England. The final report is due in May.
- Motorised road users' priorities for improvement. This research is now 'in field' and will be published in July 2015.
- National Road User Satisfaction Survey (NRUSS) statistical analysis. This work will draw additional insight from the past three years of NRUSS results.
- Maps and Apps. This research looks at how easy it would be to use online static and interactive maps to indicate the routes road users' have taken, to assist in determining if their trip was on the SRN.
- Research Colloquium. Transport Focus is hosting a research meeting with Highways England and DfT to share learning about road user satisfaction.

Stakeholder liaison:

- Our Road User Panel, comprising representatives of key organisations representing the users of the SRN, will meet every two months
- The Chief Executive and Road User Director have an extensive programme to meet and understand the views of a wide range of stakeholders.

4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing

There are no significant implications to report.

5. Background information

Description	Web Link

6. Equalities screen

Sometimes, an equalities impact assessment (EIA) is required for a given report, proposal or project. To help decide whether an EIA is required, a screen must be undertaken based on the information provided above. The screen seeks answers to four questions which are used to determine impact on the protected characteristics – major, minor or none (default). Please choose the correct impact value and, if **major**, link it to an explanation below.

Gender	Age	Sexual orient'n	Disability	Marital status	Political belief	Religious belief	Racial group
1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None
4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None

Summary of **major** impacts

1	
2	
3	
4	

Conclusion (the board's consideration of this paper may result in a change of conclusion)

Based on the information above, and having regard to the guidance below, the sponsor and author of this paper agree that (✓)	
(a) A full equalities impact assessment is not required	✓
(b) A full equalities impact assessment is not required at this time but the impact values above suggest the matter should be kept under view during the lifetime of the project	
(c) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed during the lifetime of the project	
(d) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed immediately	
Please provide a brief explanation of why you have arrived at this conclusion	
<p><i>The proposal has little no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations and / or is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.</i></p>	