

<b>Board Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>22/09//2020</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>14.00-15.30</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Video Conference (Zoom)</b>
----------------------	-------------	--------------------	-------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------------------

Time	Item	Subject	Leading	Purpose	Paper
<b>A Public Affairs</b>					
14.00	1	Chair's opening remarks; apologies and introductions; declarations of conflicts of interest.	Isabel liu	Information	
		<b>Transport across the north: immediate and longer term priorities to build better journeys</b>			
	2	Introduction	David Sidebottom		
14.05	3	Alex Hornby, Chief Executive Officer, Transdev Blazefield			
14.15	4	Anna-Jane Hunter, Director, North of England Rail, Network Rail			
14.25	5	Richard Marshall, Regional Director, Yorkshire and the North East, Highways England			
14.35	6	Barry White, Chief executive, Transport for the North			
14.45	7	Q&A and discussion			
<b>B Corporate affairs (for information only or discussion by exception)</b>					
15.15	1	Workplan October 2020-March 2021	David Sidebottom	Approval	✓
	2	Board meeting minutes: July 2020	Isabel Liu	Approval	✓
	3	<u>Committee meeting minutes:</u>			
	3.1	Audit and Risk Assurance Committee	Isabel Liu	Information	✓
	3.2	Campaigns Steering Group	Rob Wilson	Information	✓
	4	<u>Reports from subsidiaries:</u>			
	4.1	Transport Focus Wales Limited	David Sidebottom	Information	✓
	4.2	Transport Focus Scotland Limited	David Sidebottom	Information	✓
	5	<a href="#">Tailored Review</a>	Jon Carter	Information	
15.30		Close			

## **Workplan October 2020 – March 2021**

### **Summary**

The final draft of the Workplan for the next six months, October 2020 to March 2021 is attached.

Publication via our website is planned for next week.

The draft is intended to reflect:

- The major opportunities and risks identified by the Board
- the need for a relatively short, flexible workplan to allow us to easily shift resources as work priorities change – matching change in outside world with the virus and travel patterns
- a principles-based approach, as recently discussed and agreed
- Discussions with DfT teams in the context of the Comprehensive Spending Review

**The Board is asked to endorse and approve the workplan.**

Anthony Smith  
September 2020

## Transport Focus workplan: October 2020-March 2021

### 1. Introduction

Transport and the way people think about making journeys has changed beyond recognition in recent months. Altered lifestyles, such as more remote working and less business travel, will bring long term change to both travel patterns and attitudes to transport. Attracting people back to transport networks, especially public transport, to help boost and level up the economy, decarbonise transport and build in more inclusivity, will create great challenges.

Transport Focus and our partner organisation, London TravelWatch, are uniquely placed to represent transport users throughout their door-to-door journeys. We offer unique, innovative, independent and trusted insight into attitudes, experiences and requirements. This will be vital as governments and the transport industry make difficult, complex decisions with scarce resources in the coming months and years with a strong pressure to grow the economy.

We will work with the transport industry and governments to:

- Identify, and help implement, what is required to build confidence among users and potential users, to support a strong return to public transport.
- Advocate for the consumer by protecting the public transport user and road user interests and defending them against unwelcome changes.
- Ensure the user voice – and that of the lapsed and potential future user - is central as transport is built back. This involves taking advantage of the changes brought about by the pandemic to deliver systems that are personalised, inclusive and responsive to local needs.

Through the Covid-19 crisis Transport Focus has made a considerable difference for transport users such as:

- We secured rail refunds and better information for passengers.
- We set up the now well-respected and heavily used weekly multi-modal omnibus survey of attitudes and experiences to travel. This has enabled us to press for improvements and ensure the needs of transport users are paramount in the delivery of services.
- Our new online rail, bus and road user 'communities' give us an unparalleled opportunity to understand user attitudes and needs within the broader context of Covid-19. These have been used to inform the decisions of transport bodies.

Along with our achievements, Transport Focus's proven independent pan-GB mixture of world class insight and consumer advocacy means we are uniquely positioned to help governments, devolved transport authorities and the industry deliver strategic improvements. Such improvements are needed to support transformational economic growth, boost jobs and make a greater contribution to the world economy. We translate insight into action.

In these uncertain times we have adapted to new and changing circumstances but always with the user at the heart of what we do. For example, we necessarily stopped our face to face insight of our flagship surveys such as the National Rail Passenger Survey, but have gathered users' views and experiences in new and innovative ways. Over the months ahead, we will continue to adapt to different challenges that emerge whether connected to changing travel patterns, Covid-19 or Brexit. We will also publish reports produced in advance of Covid-19 which are still relevant (see Appendix).

Our overall theme for the next six months is to help governments and the transport industry build - or rebuild - user or non-user confidence in travelling whether in thinking about or realising travel plans. We have ambitions to do more by applying our approach to new areas where we can be useful. Here we set out our plans, which will have to be flexible to cope with events, for the next six months.

## **2. Restarting travel and the economy: safe, sustainable and inclusive transport**

### **2.1 Identifying and rebuilding transport user confidence**

We will

- continue our highly successful and useful weekly omnibus survey of public attitudes to travel, covering all modes including road use, subject to adequate funding
- continue our online communities of rail, bus and road users
- continue to use our standing Transport User Panel to explore user issues in more depth
- at the same time, work towards restarting to measure satisfaction with rail, bus and tram journeys. In the shorter term, our new 'Barometer' could gather insight on user and non-user confidence and experience providing fast feedback.

### **2.2 Breaking down barriers to public transport**

Our insight on Covid-19 showed what people want to give them confidence to get back onto public transport. Using this insight we will work with the transport industry

to break down barriers to travel and build back services in a way that meets user needs.

- We will start preparation for new work based around our previous, successful ‘Give Bus a Go’ work in the West Midlands. This aims to break down barriers to bus use, increase confidence in choosing the bus again and help boost industry revenues.
- We will start a new workstream aimed to identify the current barriers to rail use, help break them down and restore passenger confidence, as well as boost industry revenues. Rail fares and retailing reform is likely to feature heavily in this.

### 2.3 Rail reform

The Covid-19 crisis has accelerated a process of reform already underway. As Government control over the railways has increased, and major changes will be made to the structure, funding, specification and operations of the railway, it is important that the passenger voice is heard in these decisions being made on their behalf. Big changes are looming in fares structures - the consumer voice must be clearly heard in these decisions.

### 2.4 Making a difference for passengers

We will make a difference for rail, bus, coach and tram passengers by:

- Continuing to advocate for transport users at a city/region level as tough decisions on long-term public transport priorities are made across major city regions. This will be achieved through our roles on strategic bodies including chair of the West Midlands Bus Alliance, co-chair of the Bristol City Transport Board; representing bus passengers on the Liverpool City Region Bus Alliance, the West Yorkshire Bus Partnership and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority bus partnership; representing transport users on the Mayor for Greater Manchester’s Transport board, Transport for the North’s Partnership Board and Transport for Wales Advisory Panel. We will get involved in other devolved transport authority areas where appropriate
- Ensuring the passenger voice is heard in discussions on any future bus strategy across Great Britain and on the way bus services are funded and controlled in those nations
- Updating and publishing guidance on the Covid-19 Bus Services Support Grant to help provide confidence for bus users and identify industry best practices
- Building on existing work checking the clarity of information provided on bus company and local transport authority websites. Explore potential to do similar for tram and coach operators
- Developing new ways of conducting the Bus Passenger Survey for 2021 – whether it be the gathering of data or the liaison and follow up with the operators and authorities

- Continuing to represent passengers on Network Rail’s supervisory boards across England and Wales, input to the TransPennine Route Upgrade Board and work with Network Rail on the reopening of passenger services on the Northumberland line re-opening project. We will work with Transport for Wales to provide consumer led insight to wider transport needs in South East Wales.
- Boosting the rail user voice. Some train companies fund additional consumer representation on behalf of their passengers. Through this Transport Focus will carry out extra work on behalf of those using Govia Thameslink Railway, Great Western Railway, Greater Anglia, Northern, South Western Railway, TransPennine Express, West Midlands Trains, Transport for Wales and Network Rail Wales
- Continuing our role in representing the passenger on licence conditions and policies such as Accessible Transport Policies, National Rail Conditions of Travel, ticket office opening hours, complaints handling procedures and Penalty Fare schemes
- Continuing to work with the Department for Transport on rail contracts, including checking and reporting on information provided to passengers on train company websites
- Continuing to push for improvements on: Delay Repay compensation, passenger information and, in association with London TravelWatch, on complaint handling and escalation procedures including the performance of the Rail Ombudsman.

### 3. A reliable road network

Britain relies on its roads. Our role of representing road users has never been more important as Highways England spends large sums of money on improving the network. Efficient roadworks and rapid clear up following accidents remain crucial for the user. A strong focus by Highways England on the basics like surface quality, signage and information benefits the road user.

#### 3.1 Making a difference for road users

We will make a difference for road users by:

- Measuring and reporting consumer opinion, as required by the second Road Investment Strategy. We will:
  - Restart the Strategic Roads User Survey (SRUS) as soon as possible. SRUS was suspended in March due to Covid-19.
  - Launch our new Strategic Roads Logistics & Coach Survey - measuring satisfaction with Highways England’s roads among businesses in these sectors.
  - Complete development of our new survey into the needs of cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians using Highways England’s roads.

- Ensuring road users' priorities are at the heart of the third Road Investment Strategy 2025-30 (RIS3), we will:
  - Deliver major new insight looking at road user priorities for improvement to Highways England's roads through RIS3.
  - Work with Highways England, DfT and the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) to ensure the yardsticks used in RIS3 properly measure what matters to users.
- Holding Highways England to account on behalf of consumers:
  - We'll review Highways England's actions in light of Transport Focus's recommendations. Where we can we'll acknowledge progress and push them to go further where necessary. The key areas include:
    - Roadworks management and other disruption, including managing the welfare of those trapped in traffic queues arising from disruption
    - Smart motorways including all-lane running
    - Road surface quality.

### 3.2 Campaigning on behalf of road users

- We'll launch phase two of *Sort My Sign*, pressing Highways England to focus on the basics that affect safety and journey experience. *Sort My Sign* will:
  - encourage road users to report things that need to be fixed
  - press Highways England to make changes where policy and process falls short of meeting users' needs.
- We'll plan a new campaign for launching in 2021. It's potential areas of focus include smart motorways, road surface quality and roadside facilities.

### 3.3 Allocation of road space

The allocation of road space between pedestrians, two-wheeled transport, buses, cars and vans/trucks is becoming a more vexed issue. What are the consumer issues that should underpin these decisions? Alongside London Travel Watch, we will identify funding partners to explore these issues further.

## 4. Understanding air passengers

We will adapt the successful approach of our omnibus survey and user communities to better understand how people are currently experiencing and perceiving air travel.

## 5. Inclusive transport

While all of our work benefits all transport users, the needs of disabled users requires additional focus. We have a programme of Covid-related activities and will be speaking to motorway service operators, bus and train companies about reassurance around Covid-19 safety measures and barriers to travel.

We will continue to comment on train company Accessible Travel Policies and consultations on exemptions from accessibility regulations for trains, stations and rail replacement vehicles. We will also continue to support our Accessibility Forum but will be trialling a new digital format for hearing from transport operators and users.

## **6. Effective user advocacy throughout Great Britain**

Much of this workplan applies to England, Scotland and Wales. There are however differences in statutory remit between the home nations - the constraints of which, with the creation of our subsidiary companies, we have taken steps to overcome.

We will, however, in addition to all the work outlined above which is relevant to Scottish and Welsh transport users also:

### **6.1 Scotland**

- Continue to represent passengers on Scotland's Rail Recovery Task Force
- Continue to work with Scotland's Regional Transport Partnerships on developing Regional Transport Strategies
- Continue to work with Transport Scotland on the delivery of the second National Transport Strategy
- Engage with Transport Scotland on the phased approach to the Strategic Transport Projects Review (2) and changing travel behaviours
- Engage with local government on the Transport (Scotland) Act regarding governance models for bus provision

### **6.2 Wales**

- Continue to engage with Welsh Government, ministers and Senedd members to represent transport user issues and provide input to policy formulation from our research
- Continue to work with Welsh Government and Transport for Wales to provide input to the development of Wales Transport Strategy
- Work with Transport for Wales to assist with understanding of transport user needs and priorities during Valleys transformation rail engineering, developing travel options around Newport, wider integrated transport and passenger-centric measurement
- Continue working with Transport for Wales Rail Services to ensure clarity of passenger communications during disruption, timetable changes and programme of rolling stock refurbishment
- Continue to work with Network Rail Wales Route on Putting Passengers First, to give depth to understanding passenger views, through our research and Data Hub, feeding into work programmes and priorities

- Continue to work with Network Rail System Operator to feed passenger priorities into longer term planning for developing Wales and Borders network.

## **7. A well run and governed, effective organisation that is seen and heard by transport users and decision makers**

Transport Focus needs a diverse, geographically representative Board that can help set its strategy, challenge and govern this new, larger, more wide-ranging organisation. One or more new Board members will be recruited to replace Isabel Liu who steps down in December 2020. We'll also continue our programme of public board meetings, including broadcasting these events to allow greater participation.

Our communications reach, including a greatly enhanced social media presence, has been significant in the first six months of 2020-21 so we'll continue to run our 24/7 press office. We will also launch our rebuilt website to improve access to our work by transport users and stakeholders.

The delivery of this plan relies on our staff who have demonstrated their effectiveness and resilience in the first part of the year. We'll ensure our policies and systems continue to provide flexibility to support smarter working, including in our plans for relocating the London office, as we return to a new normal.

**September 2020**

## Appendix – pre Covid 19 reports awaiting publication

We have a number reports produced before Covid-19 which will be published. Elements of these reports continue to be relevant to how we travel now:

- All-lane running smart motorways: road users' experiences and attitudes
- Monitoring satisfaction with the roadworks on the M4 between Heathrow and Reading – phase two
- 'Project future' best practice guides
- Research looking at the potential for park and ride for longer-distance journeys (say, Oxford to London) to release capacity on Highways England's roads.
- Additional insight into user satisfaction through in-depth analysis of SRUS data
- Results of the pre-launch wave of our Strategic Roads Logistics & Coach Survey
- Information provision around the King's Cross blockades
- Bus passenger (and non-user) priorities for improvement
- What future users would want from High Speed 2
- Rail passengers' experience of delays and claiming compensation
- NRPS pilot mini surveys
- MerseyRail community report and videos
- Lost property on rail – this will be published by Department for Transport
- GWR timetable change
- GWR sustainability
- Modelling the impact of bus lanes
- Traveline website review

Transport Focus Board Meeting (public session)	
Date:	21 July 2020
Times:	10.38-12.00
Location	Video Conference

## **Attended**

### **Board members:**

Jeff Halliwell	JH	Chair
Philip Mendelsohn	PM	Board member for Scotland
Theo de Pencier	TdP	Board member
Isabel Liu	IL	Board member
Kate Denham	KD	Board member
Arthur Leathley	AL	Board member
Keith Richards	KR	Board member
Rob Wilson	RW	Board member

### **Management in attendance:**

Anthony Smith	AS	Chief executive
David Sidebottom	DS	Director
Mike Hewitson	MH	Head of policy
Guy Dangerfield	GD	Head of strategy
Jon Carter	JC	Head of board and governance
Ian Wright	IW	Head of innovation and partnerships
Louise Coward	LC	Head of insight
Michelle Jackson	MJ	Manager, board and governance operations

### **Other attendees:**

Graham Vidler	GV	Chief Executive, Confederation of Passenger Transport
Glyn Williams	GW	Head of Integrated Public Transport, Cornwall Council
Jane Cole	JCI	Managing Director, Blackpool Transport
Jonathan Bray	JB	Director, Urban Transport Group

### **Apologies:**

William Powell	WP	Board member for Wales
----------------	----	------------------------

**Members of the public:** Several members of the public attended

## Part A: Public Affairs

### 1.0 Chairman's opening remarks; apologies and introductions

JH welcomed the participants to the meeting of the Transport Focus Board. JH explained that this was the second meeting that had been held virtually. Apologies were noted from WP, the member for Wales, who was recovering from COVID-19.

JH stated that the Board meeting was public, and that he would be happy to take questions from members of the Board and members of the public who were watching at the end of each section. JH stated that the future of bus services would be the main topic of discussion during the meeting, particularly in the context of COVID-19.

JH asked the Board members whether there were any conflicts of interest to declare. No conflicts of interest were declared.

### 2.0 The Future of Bus Services: Coping with coronavirus and beyond

#### 2.1 Introduction

- DS stated that the UK government had given a significant boost of £3.5 billion to the bus industry. He noted that the current situation provided an opportunity to highlight that buses provide an important link for many individuals for travelling to work, education, and vital appointments.
- During the lockdown, the bus industry had reduced services and had adapted its timetable to provide services for key workers. The bus industry had demonstrated agility and flexibility in responding to the pandemic.
- DS noted that it would be important to consider the needs of bus passengers in the future, as well as how to encourage passengers to use public transport again. He added that this came with short, medium, and long term aims.
- At this meeting, GV would provide an overview with regard to the bus operators, JCI would provide a perspective from Blackpool, GW would consider rural public transport issues, and JB would provide a perspective from large combined urban authorities across the North and Midlands. DS observed that GW had carried out a significant amount of work on the transport structure in Cornwall, and on the challenges in linking bus and rail services.

•

#### 2.2 Graham Vidler, Chief Executive, Confederation of Passenger Transport

- GV stated that he would be providing an overview of bus operations since the lockdown, how the network was operating today, and the short and long-term priorities required to restore the industry to the levels of usage prior to the pandemic. While the presented

figures related to England outside of London, trends had been very similar in London, Scotland, England and Wales.

- The industry had responded quickly to the pandemic and had reduced levels of service between March and July. Services had been reduced to 47% of pre-pandemic levels. The frequency of services had been reduced, and weekday services had been reduced to the level of Sunday services, with earlier starts and later finishes.
- During the first week in June, the service had been increased to 68% of pre-pandemic levels. Today, the service was between 80 and 85% of pre-pandemic levels. The business had worked with central and local government to implement the new social distancing guidelines, and the new policy with regard to the mandatory use of face coverings.
- During the lockdown period, passenger numbers had been reduced to 10 to 11% of pre-pandemic levels, but there had since been some recovery. Passenger numbers were now at 32% of pre-pandemic levels. This had led to a serious reduction in revenue.
- The government had chosen to buy business services through the COVID-19 scheme and had provided grants which had enabled services to run. Bus capacity on each bus was between 80-85% of pre-pandemic levels and normal seating capacity had been reduced to 45%.
- There was a greater capacity on the network compared to demand, and fewer than one in one thousand buses were operating at full capacity. Compliance with social distancing and wearing face masks had been high, although there had been a few 'hot spots' around the country.
- The short-term priority, for the remainder of 2020 and early 2021, was to help the sector flourish. The government funding approach had enabled central government to choose the volume of services, and enabled local authorities to direct services where they were most needed, without making a profit or loss.
- Car traffic had recovered more quickly than public transport. At the beginning of July, car use had been at 80% of pre-pandemic levels. There was an opportunity to make bus transport a priority. This had been done in Scotland, where ministers have provided £10 million funding for bus transport.
- The short-term goal was for the government to encourage the general public to use public transport, and provide reassurance that it was safe. Transport Focus research showed that there was a high level of anxiety among the public about using public transport, though 80% of bus passengers had stated that they had felt safe on their most recent bus trip.
- There were challenges in the national bus strategy, as it was difficult to determine how bus travel would change as the country emerged from the pandemic. Overall travel in the country was likely to be reduced due to fewer commuters, and fewer people visiting the high street. As a result, more funding would be required from the government to increase the level of passengers on the network to pre-pandemic levels.
- During the pandemic, there had been some examples of cases where passengers had contacted the local operator and the local authority asking for more flexibility in bus timetables. Passengers had asked for timetables to better meet their needs, particularly

key workers. The industry needed to be agile and flexible to respond to passenger demand.

- The funding for the bus network should be reviewed to ensure it was more aligned to central government outcomes. Central government would have to specify the nature and scale of bus services that it wanted to deliver and provide funding for this.

## 2.3 Jane Cole, Managing Director, Blackpool Transport

- JCI reported that the tramway had reopened on 19 July. Blackpool was the only operator in the UK that ran a bus *and* a tram service. The municipal operator was a limited company, with a turnover of £24 million. The shareholder was Blackpool council, and any profit would be paid back to the council. At the height of the season, Blackpool Transport employed 650 individuals.
- In 2014, Blackpool Transport had received a five-year transformation loan from the council to decarbonise the fleet. The average age for the fleet was now less than two and a half years old.
- The proposed extension to the tram, which had been scheduled for 2021, had been put on hold. The aim had been to develop an integrated transport system for the coastal towns serving 300,000 individuals, which had a visitor level of 18 million annually.
- The tramway had been closed on 23 March, with the aim that the bus service would replace it. At the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, services had been arranged around the needs of key workers. Customers insights on bus timetables and what times the services should run had been sought using the website and app. This had helped the business to maximise the number of passengers travelling on buses. Several communication channels had been used, including the app, social media, and radio, to ensure that services met the needs of customers. All NHS workers had been given free travel until the beginning of July.
- A corporate ticket strategy had been developed to try and retain long-term customers who brought season tickets. £50,000 had been spent on PPE for customers and staff, and double-screen protection had been installed on buses. There had been no cases of COVID-19 in the workforce.
- A marketing campaign had been developed to enforce social distancing around bus stops, to ensure that there was compliance and good behaviour from people before and when on buses. The fare structure had been revised. There was now a flat fare on the trams, and zonal fares had been implemented in the town. Customer feedback on this had been positive. The aim was to increase the number of younger people using the bus and the tram by extending the youth ticket to those aged 22.
- There had been investment in contactless, and new machines capable of accepting contactless payment had been introduced. The business had been able to predict when and where more services were needed, and increase output to ensure all passengers could travel on the busses. 3,000 people used the tram on the 19 July, which was a Sunday, and 4,000 on the 20 July, which was a Monday.

- The business had developed several initiatives, including returning lost property directly to the individuals' houses, and had helped individuals to give away gift and food parcels. Employees had received gifts from customers.
- Employee relations had been improved by introducing flexible working, regular Q&A sessions, support with mental health, and local social prescriptions. As a result, industrial action had been avoided. The business had managed to reduce cost by £0.25 million without any staff redundancies. Drivers had accepted flexible working arrangements.
- The business had lobbied the government for funding of £23 million for the tramway, and was hoping to receive some funding given that Scotland had provided £9 million funding for its trams.
- A new fare structure was due to be implemented on 9 August. The business was still running at a loss as it had taken out significant loans before COVID-19, but these could be repaid. The business had received a letter of comfort from Blackpool Council, and a business plan had been developed stating that the loan would be repaid, with the aim of paying a dividend by year five.
- The economy in Blackpool had suffered due to the reduction in coach travel and reduced hotel occupancy, and a recovery plan had been developed. Car travel in Blackpool had successfully recovered. The business was lobbying for capital projects, and had applied for £25 million for an electric bus scheme. Investment was needed for a feasibility study for tram and bus hubs.

JH congratulated JC and her team at being able to adapt at short notice to the challenges that they had faced.

## **2.4 Jonathan Bray, Director, Urban Transport Group**

- JB noted his report would focus on three areas: the current situation, the future, and what was necessary to achieve future objectives.
- There had been a growth in car use in city centres and urban areas, and this presented a risk for public transport, particularly due to the reduction in commuting.
- There had been a decline in bus use. There had been challenges around determining how many bus passengers would return to using the buses, how quickly they would return, and what type of services would encourage passengers to return.
- The deregulated bus model was in crisis. The bus network had made decisions on a wartime basis, with a significant amount of public funding. There had not been much competition, and the existing model was not working. The short-term funding was due to expire on 4 August, and no information had been provided about any subsequent deals.
- Local transport authorities were working on an emergency basis, and had been asked to pay for concessionary trips. There had been insufficient trips to cover the cost of the bus services, which was unsustainable. Bus companies wanted to increase fares, but had not done so.
- It was unlikely that levels of government funding would be maintained. The government would likely implement another deal, but an exit strategy would be needed in the Autumn. If additional funding was withdrawn, and income did not increase to pre-pandemic levels,

there would be devastating consequences for the networks. This would undermine some of the government's objectives including improvement in air quality, reduction in jobs, and decarbonisation. The services were currently at off-peak and Sunday level capacity to allow for social distancing.

- There was a risk that as customers returned, only core services would be provided, and the onus would be on local authorities to fill the gaps. Fares could continue to increase if income was reduced in some areas.
- There was a consensus that a green economic recovery from COVID-19 would be good for public transport and for buses. The government was keen to see investment in active travel, and £5 million of funding had been provided for this.
- There was now better data on the capacity of bus services. City centre leaders had been considering ways in which to reduce car use and encouraging commuter travel by active travel. JB believed buses should be part of any solution.
- Looking to the future, JB reported that a different model was needed for bus services. A higher subsidy would be required for bus services to ensure good network coverage. This combined with greener, electric buses could be an attractive proposition for customers, and would be in line with the way in which the city centres were changing. The first draft of the vision for the future had been developed by the transport and bus authorities. This would be essential to help cities get through the current crisis.

## **2.5 Glyn Williams, Head of Integrated Public Transport, Cornwall Council**

- The challenges for rural areas were distinct from those in urban areas. Prior to COVID-19, there had been a 14% growth in bus use year on year in Cornwall, due to investment. There had been investment to integrate bus and rail travel which was carried out between 2000-2004. There had been a £36 million investment in rail to improve the tracks and signalling. In 2014, £60 million public funding had been provided in Cornwall, and funding of £12-13 million had been provided by the bus operators.
- There had been a retendering process for services, and the council had committed £20 million a year for public transport. The tender letter had been submitted in December and was due to be introduced in April. Approximately 70% of people in Cornwall were dependent on cars, but there was a substantial proportion of people who could not afford a car.
- Through the beginning of the recovery, there had been a focus on school transport, and on whether there would be sufficient resources to support the return of schools in September.
- A balance needed to be struck between the green environment programme and running the new fleet. Passengers might be reluctant to use buses due to the government's previous messaging. Improvements had been made in the working relationship between health colleagues and the operators.
- Nationalisation of rural services was an option to sustain buses as a valid transport option, though there was some doubt as to whether the level of passengers would return to pre-COVID-19 levels, particularly if more people were working from home.

JH thanked GW and all the other speakers for providing a comprehensive and multifaceted overview of the situation.

## 2.6 Q&A

- JH noted that some strong words had been used to describe the current situation including references to nationalisation and wartime conditions. JH wanted to consider how Transport Focus could help the efforts that had been made by Board members and their organisations. JCI stated that focusing on the bus services outside London was important; she added that obtaining and utilising more up-to-date data to inform decision making, and having time to implement decisions would be helpful.
- It was suggested that the passenger surveys should highlight the extra costs associated with driving, including car park charges, to increase support for bus use. It was noted that passenger satisfaction had increased, but passengers did not think that bus services provided value for money. GW stated that there would be a new contract, and noted that the DfT had been positive about the security of funding. KD stated that a distinction should be made between the needs of cities like Blackpool and London. She asked for views on the impact of the move towards contactless payment on different communities
- GV stated that across the country, 93% of bus journeys could be paid by contactless. He observed that during the pandemic, there had been a significant increase in the use of contactless payment, and there had been a 90% increase in transactions outside London, and across England. he thought that this would be sustained, but that there would always need to be an option for passengers who wanted to pay with cash.
- GW stated that funding had been provided for contactless machines, and there had been a 30 to 35% switch to contactless payment. He noted that drivers preferred contactless payment. GW observed that some people in Cornwall did not have bank accounts, so payment in cash should always be an option.
- PM noted that there had been a push to encourage the government to continue the model of funding to increase bus usage, to reach the green targets. JB observed that there were challenges in the public transport sector due to the short-term approach taken by the government, and the different funding models in different parts of the country. He thought a long-term approach was required. JB noted that the rationale behind franchising was that extra funding was not required. He thought that if funding was increased using the franchise model, there would be a positive outcome.
- GV stated that the next stage for the bus network was an exit strategy which reduced the need for emergency funding. There was also a need to ensure that passenger numbers increased to pre-pandemic levels. Removal of all social distancing on buses, so that buses could accommodate more passengers, would be a positive message. A future national bus strategy would create an agreement with the network, on the future of the bus network and how it would be funded and managed. Income could be increased without moving to a franchise model. This would be discussed in September under the auspices of the national bus strategy.

- GW observed that there had been some positives from COVID-19, as more people had started cycling and walking, leading to cleaner air. He felt the DfT should take a long-term strategic view to increase bus usage and reduce car usage. If the government was serious about supporting rural networks, renationalisation should be considered in certain areas.
- AL thought there might be a return to only funding core services by either the local operator or the local council. TdP stated that the provision of better data showed that passengers were looking for more information and flexibility in services. He asked for views on the ability of the bus industry to respond to these challenges.
- GV did not think it was inevitable that bus networks would need to reduce core services. He explained that it was incumbent on the bus operators to be flexible and respond to passenger priorities. He stated that with better data, it had been possible to see which bus routes had been busier, and adapt and quickly respond to this. This was a positive change for passengers.
- A member of the public, who was a tram driver in London, asked why trams had been treated differently from other modes of transport with regards to social distancing. JCI stated that when the Tramway had resumed service on 19 July, there had been more space for customers to move around. Capacity on a tram could be doubled compared to buses. She noted that tram drivers had been provided with face coverings and felt secure in their cabs.
- A member of the public asked why he was not able to use his bus pass to avoid busy periods when travelling. JB explained that the bus pass restrictions had been lifted during lockdown to enable vulnerable shoppers to shop in their allocated hours. He added that this had been changed to encourage older people to avoid public transport during rush hour, as it was more congested and constituted a risk.
- JB believed that the issue of flexible and concessionary fares would be reviewed. He noted that currently, there were high fares for a small number of regular users. He observed that flat, cheaper fares would increase the number of young people using public transport. GV noted that the peak hours in Liverpool were currently between 10.00 and 12.00, which differed from pre-pandemic peak hours. GV thought this situation was temporary, and that when the school term started, the pre-pandemic peak pattern would return.
- JH thanked all the speakers.. He added that Transport Focus would continue to provide any support it could, including engagement with the government to the many issues raised today, including that of funding.

## Part B: Corporate Affairs

### 1.0 Interim Workplan update

- AS reported there had been continued strong external performance. There would now be a refocus on the change in the government message about using public transport.

- Research would be conducted to determine the public's perception of safety and their need for reassurance. Useful insight had been gained from the Omnibus survey and by use of the Transport User panel. The results of the Strategic Road Users survey had been published, and there would be a continued focus on road users.
- There had been a good media presence on transport users. The work plan was on track and had be recast for the second six months of the year.

## 2.0 Board meeting minutes: March 2020

One or two clarifications were made on the minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2020; the minutes were then **agreed** as an accurate record of that meeting.

## 3.0 Corporate Governance

### 3.1 Transport Focus Wales Ltd – Parent Guarantee

- NH explained that Board approval was sought to provide a parent guarantee to cover the Transport Focus Wales Ltd balance sheet as at 31 March. There would subsequently be no need for an audit of the subsidiary under small business legislation. The guarantee had been seen and approved by the Audit Committee. The financial statements of Transport Focus Wales had also been reviewed by its Board. The guarantee was **approved** by the Board.

### 3.2 Terms of reference

- JC noted that the Board had discussed and agreed the arrangements for NED appointments to subsidiary boards at its meeting in February 2020. These arrangements had been incorporated into the ARARC terms of reference. Subsequently, a wider review of governance arrangements for subsidiary undertakings had taken place, with further amendments made to the terms of reference. IL noted that the Committee, at its most recent meeting, had determined itself content with the updated terms of reference but had decided to rename itself Audit and Risk Assurance Committee. The Board **approved** the terms of reference, subject to the change in name.
- The Board considered and, with one or two minor amendments, **approved** the updated terms of reference for the Campaigns Steering Group.

## 4.0 Updates from subsidiaries:

### 4.1 Transport Focus Wales Limited

- The Board noted the ongoing work in Wales, and that options were being considered for conducting further research on the current COVID-19 situation and the recovery of public transport. Discussions were ongoing with the bus industry and public authorities in Wales.

### 4.2 Transport Focus Scotland Limited

- The Omnibus research had been shared with and well received by stakeholders in Scotland, and was expected to help shape the recovery of public transport and ensure the views of users were heard.

## 5.0 To receive and endorse draft Version 2 minutes of meetings:

### 5.1 Statistics Governance Group (June 2020)

- TdP noted strong contributions from all the members of the team who had attended the Group's most recent meeting but at which time there had been no response from the DVLA regarding an alternative methodology of completing SRUS. A response had however since been received and a paper had been circulated. There were ongoing concerns in this respect.
- It had been helpful for the Group to get an update on the move towards the push to web, in which alternative ways to run the tracker surveys were being explored, avoiding face-to-face interviews.
- LC added that there had been positive feedback from the bus, taxi and rail teams at the DfT. Progress has been made on the materials to be tested. The Behavioural Insights Team would be involved. Both a traditional letter and other, more creative ways of communicating would be explored. Progress has been made on the questionnaire, which would be circulated for individuals to review. A small-scale pilot was due to take place, with a mail-out of around 6,000. A decision was likely to be made in early September to determine if the survey could be expanded or tweaked, or whether the multi-modal approach would be used.
- JH noted that the launch of bus event at Aston Villa ground had been postponed; DS explained that an extension until September had been obtained, but it was not clear what the situation would be after that.
- The Board **noted** the minutes of the Statistics Governance Group.

## 5.2 Audit, Risk Assurance and Remuneration Committee (July 2020 verbal update)

IL provided a verbal update on the previous week's Audit and Risk Assurance Committee meeting (ARAC).

- The external audit by the NAO had been delayed, as they require physical examination of records.
- Good progress had been made by NH and HP on developing the narrative around the numbers for the Annual Report and Accounts. This would be shared with the Board over the summer.
- The internal audit work by GIAA had now been completed for the last financial year, and an overall 'moderate' opinion had been provided. This was no means as bad as it sounded, but only the risk management audit had returned a 'substantial' conclusion, so the 'basket' had thus been calculated. There had been good progress on the internal audit programme for the new financial year.
- Non-executive members of the audit committee had conducted a self-assessment, and would be reporting to the full Board to highlight any areas for development in due course.
- The Board **noted** the minutes of this meeting would be tabled for formal noting at the Board meeting in September.

## 6.0 For approval by the Board

### 6.1 Project 101- Omnibus Travel Survey

- LC reported that the survey had been a significant success in the first 12 weeks. The results would be reviewed on a weekly basis to ensure that the appropriate questions had been asked, in view of frequent changes in the rules.
- There had been a good response to the weekly publication of the Omnibus survey. The results had provided information which was being shared with stakeholders. Funding would be required to continue the work for a further six weeks. Going forward, it was possible the survey would not be required, or would be conducted at reduced frequency. The survey was due to continue for another six weeks until the end of August.
- PM observed that according to the overview section in the relevant meeting paper on Omnibus, a budget had not been developed for stakeholder management, but funding had been included for stakeholder involvement. NH confirmed that the budget for stakeholder management had been included in the overall budget campaign and project.
- The proposal was **approved** by the Board.

## 7.0 For noting by the Board

Items previously approved out of meeting:

7.1 BRD1920-005 - BPS Autumn 2019

7.2 BRD1920-006 - Strategic Roads User Survey 2020-2021

7.3 BRD1920-007 - M4 project

The items were **noted** by the Board.

JH observed that this was PM's last Board meeting. JH noted that there would be an opportunity to say goodbye to PM at the strategic workshop due to take place in the last week of July. The Board expressed it's thanks to PM for his service.

## 8.0 Private session

### **8.1 Resolution to move into private session (webcast to be terminated once resolution is approved)**

*Private session resolution*

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: Philip Mendelsohn

**Seconded** by: Theo de Pencier

The Chair **countersigned** the resolution.

The public were excluded from the discussion for the remainder of the meeting.

# Minutes

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting:

---

Jeff Halliwell  
Chair, Board member, Transport Focus

---

Date



Audit, Risk Assurance and Remuneration Committee	Date	14/07/2020	Time	10.30-13.00	Venue	Zoom
--	------	------------	------	-------------	-------	------

**Committee Members**

Isabel Liu	IL	Board member, chair
Arthur Leathley	AL	Board member for London
Kate Denham	KD	Board member

**Executive in attendance**

Anthony Smith	AS	Chief executive & accounting officer
Nigel Holden	NH	Corporate services director
Michelle Jackson	MJ	Manager, board and governance

Siobhan O'Hagan

SO

operations

PA to ceo and chair

**Guests**

Aaron Condron	AC
Martin Burgess	MB

AC

Head of internal audit, GIAA

MB

Engagement director, NAO

**Apologies**

Jon Carter

JC

Head of board and governance

**Time Item Subject****A Standing items****1 Chair's opening remarks; apologies and introductions**

Apologies had been received from JC; AL would join the meeting later.

**2 Minutes from previous meetings: April 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 21 April 2020 were agreed and the chair was authorised to sign them.

**3 Action matrix**

No comments were made on the ARARC action matrix.

**B Finance and statutory reporting****1 NAO Guidance for audit and risk committees during Covid-19**

It was confirmed that everyone had read this guidance, no comments had been received.

**2 Draft Annual Report and Accounts 2019-2020**The annual accounts were based on Management accounts up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and will be going to NAO for Audit in September.

There are a small number of edits still to be made but largely it is complete. MB confirmed NH will send across accounts to NAO who will work on these over the summer, the deadline for this is September 2020. The text will be circulated to board members for comment over the summer. KD commented on the excellent list of Transport Focus wins and suggested that these be made to stand out more in the report. It was also noted that a separate document showing only the wins would be useful.

**ACTION: HP to separate out the wins into a different document as KD suggested.****ACTION: IL has made edits to wording of Annual report and will send them to HP to update and circulate.**

### 3 YTD finance report

The report includes data up to and including June 2020. A key issue discussed was the spend on Project future and, in particular, the Omnibus survey, and where this funding will come from. NRPS is unlikely to go ahead in Autumn, and therefore this budget could be used elsewhere; the Department have been sighted on this. The other uncertainty is the additional income that was forecast for the year, if our tracker surveys do not continue as planned, for example the NRPS boosts planned for the Autumn wave. Q1 was positive with additional income derived from 2019/20, but that will not continue for the rest of the year. The upcoming Comprehensive Spending Review was also discussed. The amber projects on the record of projects, and all third-party funded projects, were discussed in respect of their current funding status.

KD enquired over the increased risks from working from home, and whether certain control steps such as financial approval being skipped due to the pandemic. NH assured the Committee that the controls were still operating fully – as previously, we rely on email confirmation for approvals and Corporate Services are ensuring everything is signed-off as usual. Both Andrew Rowen and MJ work hard to ensure there is a fully compliant audit trail and accountability for all project approvals. AS, as the accounting officer, added he was content with the systems in operation during the pandemic.

IL stressed the need to scrutinise those projects which come under the ‘project future’ umbrella, to ensure we are aware of all expenditure. MJ noted feedback from the Board Effectiveness Survey which noted how it can occasionally feel as if the Board are asked for approval for projects which have already begun; the Committee **agreed** this needs to be kept under review.

### 4 Parent Guarantee

NH explained that to avoid having a separate audit for Transport Focus Wales Limited, he had arranged a parent guarantee. This has been approved by the DfT. ARARC were asked to confirm their approval before it is submitted to the full Board. This proposal was **endorsed**.

AS noted the excellent work on both subsidiaries but wondered whether a review of the staff resource needed to run them would be helpful, both in terms of accounting and the secretarial function, for Nigel and Jon in particular. IL noted that set-up arrangements would have been resource hungry, but it was up to the individuals concerned to consider the value of the time spent on actually running the companies, and raise any concerns with AS directly. In the meantime, an internal review into the set-up of the subsidiaries and what the ARARC responsibilities are as well as risks, costs and benefits would be useful. AC noted that GIAA have a planned internal audit review of the subsidiaries, which will cover staff resource and value for money. KD recommended reading the charity commission report into [RNIB and its subsidiaries](#).

**ACTION:** JC to report on resource implications of subsidiary undertakings

AL noted that although London TravelWatch is not a subsidiary of Transport Focus, there are similar implications in terms of direct costs and operational liabilities within the terms of the Collaboration Agreement. JC and AC were expected to discuss the terms of reference of this planned audit soon.

## C Business performance management and internal audit

### 1 Business Plan: mid-year review, resourcing and next steps

MJ confirmed the interim Workplan for October 2020-March 2021 is being developed and is likely to go the September Members Event for approval. The work undertaken by JC on resourcing of the Interim Workplan (April – September 2020), which ensures deliverability, was **noted**. This will be henceforth be a quarterly exercise to assess time recording validity. This had been seen and approved by Management Team. The Workplan principles included have been approved by the Board. The next Interim Workplan, underpinned by this resource report and by the principles, will be discussed at a Board Strategic Planning meeting at the end of July.

AL queried how resource heavy this activity of time recording review was, MJ ensured that the more project managers were doing it the better and more accurate the time recording has become.

### 2 Project management reports

These reports were **noted**.

### 3 Internal audit progress report

AC explained this report is the overall summary at a high level, the 2019/20 programme is complete, and GIAA have completed their overall annual report and opinion. They have also started scoping the 20/21 programme and noted that most of their customers were in the process of altering their internal audit plans due to the pandemic.

IL suggested we move the subsidiary operations audit after the LTW audit, and to move the rail review audit due to uncertainty over the outcomes of the review. How this will effect our sponsored posts was briefly discussed.

AC confirmed the LTW audit will take place between now and the end of September. AS suggested sooner rather than later would be better as there will be budgetary pressure in the Autumn.

**ACTION: AC to make agreed changes to the internal audit plan. It was agreed the order should be : (1) LTW, (2) subsidiary operations, (3) rail review.**

#### 4 **Internal audit reports**

##### 4.1 **Campaigns management**

This report has been circulated to the Board. We've also seen the management response. There were no further comments from the Audit Committee. JC would add the agreed actions to the rolling internal audit action log (RIAAL).

#### 5 **Rolling internal audit action log**

The log was **noted**.

#### 6 **Annual Audit Report & Opinion 2019-2020**

AC noted this report summarised work from 2019/20, the opinion being “moderate” overall. A key positive point was the risk management framework operating effectively, and the corporate quality tests on payroll were operating effectively. In order to improve the result to ‘substantial’ we would need to receive more substantial audit opinions. MJ noted that the response to our audits need to be kept proportionate to the size and capability of the organisation.

#### 7 **Internal Audit Charter**

The GIAA are subject to a quality assessment by the Institute of Internal Auditors, to make sure they meet the public sector standard. This charter was submitted for approval, as a document sets out how the GIAA works. The Committee **agreed** to the charter (subject to the Committee's acronym being corrected).

### **D Risk**

#### 1 **Strategic risks and opportunities**

MJ, JC and AS have recently reviewed the impact assessments and mitigating measures of the board-identified opportunities and risks. This document will be submitted to Board Strategic Planning meeting at the end of July and MT this week.

KD asked how we use this as a tool and mechanism to spur challenge and if there was a read across to other work, such as campaigns and projects. MJ noted the current risk oversight processes we have in place. It was suggested it may be beneficial to have these included as part of the Board meeting agenda so they remain at the forefront of members minds.

## 2 Q1 Information risk report (includes SIRO's annual letter to Accounting Officer)

The Committee noted that the data map and risk assessment has been updated by JC in response to the Default and Design Review, which was a successful and useful review. MJ noted that the various IAOs did great job of thinking about their team's information assets, which was now fully reflected in the data map.. LTW are now handling all casework including freedom of information and GDPR rights requests. MJ had met with Susan James from LTW to discuss the process for FOI requests. As part of website refresh MJ said we hoped to begin regular publishing of our FOI request responses, which should decrease future FOI requests as the information will have already been made available. JC's annual letter to the Accounting Officer was **noted** as a sound statement of the information risk situation at year-end.

## 3 Team risks: Corporate Services Team

The risks identified in this register were presented by NH. It was noted that the equality and diversity risk had been on the agenda for some time. No risks have changed significantly. IL questioned our current WFH situation and whether we were exposed to more risks in terms of cyber security, data Security and phishing emails. NH reassured that the measures in place are strong. There is a cyber security risk if staff are on an unsecure network or if someone is using a machine outside of our network. In terms of phishing emails we have strong filters but we could remind staff to take precautions.

## E Governance and scrutiny

### 1 Annual review: whistleblowing policy

This policy was noted.

### 2 Annual review: terms of reference

These terms of reference had been updated by JC to include the subsidiary undertakings and, in particular, a process for the appointment of outside appointments to the subsidiary's Board. It was agreed that henceforth the name of the committee will be simplified to Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC).

## F Staffing and remuneration

### 1 Staff forum update

The Staff Forum had scheduled an extra meeting in July due to the pandemic and the new working from home arrangements. Linda McCord is also on the Internal Virus Response Team as a manager and as a staff representative. They are well sighted of what is happening across the organisation. The Forum are assisting with the continued communications with staff. The Employee Assistance

Programme providing various telephone support for staff is being set up in August. It was noted that employees may need encouragement and guidance to use this, in particular word of mouth recommendations.

IL commended the recent Staff Attitude Survey results. Everyone has responded well to the sudden changes and working without face to face contact. The Forum have been more active on Connect, which has helped provide cultural support to staff.

## 2 **Absence and diversity report**

NH presented this quarterly report. There are one or two issues at the moment, given all staff are working from home. One issue identified through the Staff Attitude Survey was how continued working from home was affecting people in the longer term. Help has been commissioned from freelancer Anwen Page to analyse the results of the SAS and identify key themes. These will then be discussed in small group sessions to be run by the Staff Forum later in the summer.

NH noted that diversity and inclusion would be a key piece of work helping to create an action plan for the organisation. We are talking to outside diversity and inclusion advisors on how they could help.

KD mentioned that the employee assistance helpline sometimes isn't seen as an option by staff until things are desperate or as a last resort, so the communication to staff on how to use this service should be clear on how approachable it is as a service for everyday frustrations.

## 3 **Staff development update**

The virus response has created opportunities for staff to do different tasks which has been interesting. The Lunch and Learns are doing well and continuing.

## 4 **Pay remit update**

The guidance from the Government was discussed. This proposal was for a 2% increase for all staff from January 2020. This was within budget for the year and is affordable. IL enquired about contracts for staff paid by third-party and whether they had termination notice periods. NH confirmed they have notice periods as long as 6 months and we would have to pay redundancy for those posts. IL also noted the current national environment of financial and economic uncertainty, and to take this into account when making this decision. The Committee **approved** this proposal.

**G Board members only for this session****1 ARARC self-assessment**

The chair and Board members went into private session to discuss this assessment.

**There being no further business, the meeting closed at 12.20pm**

**Next scheduled meeting: 20 October 2020**

**Summary of actions:**

HP	Amend AR&A taking into account edits submitted by IL (Aug-20)
HP	Separate out the Wins into a different document as KD suggested (Sept-20)
JC	Report on resource implications of subsidiary undertakings (Oct 20)
AC	Make agreed changes to the internal audit plan. It was agreed the order should be : (1) LTW, (2) subsidiary operations, (3) rail review (Sep 20) AC would discuss terms of reference with JC and MJ.

Signed as a true and accurate record of the meeting:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Isabel Liu, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Campaigns Steering Group

### Minutes of the first meeting of the Group

Friday 11 September 2020 1000-1200

#### Attended

Rob Wilson (RW) (Chair)  
Laura Osborne (LO)  
Anthony Smith (AS)  
Louise Collins (LCn)  
Mike Hewitson (MH)  
Ian Wright (IW)  
Guy Dangerfield (GD)  
Linda McCord (LM)  
Hannah Dawson (HD)  
Jon Carter (JC)  
Sara Nelson (SN)

#### Apologies

Theo de Pencier (TdeP)  
Michelle Jackson (MJ)

Item	Subject	Action reference (if any)
1	<b>Welcome and introductions; opening comments</b> RW welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Group. He hoped the meeting could be largely a stock take of where we were at present. Apologies had been received from TdeP and MJ.	
2	<b>How did we get here?</b> AS noted the range of planning work across Transport Focus, in the context of the Spending Review and the workplan being finalised, both of which would be subject to Board discussion later in the month.  JC talked through the internal audit report, published in April 2020, which had raised issues in respect of roles and responsibilities, objectives, planning, monitoring and Board level oversight.  The key outcomes of the audit were the creation of the Group, time planning and analysis as it related to campaigns, and the campaign briefing document or workbook, which it was hoped would serve as a coherent planning and management tool during the lifecycle of future campaigns.  In respect of the Group, and its terms of reference, it was noted that its role was an assurance one, not a campaign approval one, which was an issue for management team and the Board.	

The penultimate bullet under 2.1.1 of the terms of reference, which referred to stakeholder content with our campaigning approach, was raised as an issue. The meeting **agreed** this was largely incompatible with our independent role and should be removed. Any residual reputational risk as it affected stakeholders was covered elsewhere in the terms of reference.

It was also **agreed** that in respect of paragraph 4.2.4, in respect of London TravelWatch, Emma Gibson should be included on the list of those attending. A Communications Team representative should also be included.

JC would seek Board endorsement to these changes.

**CSG 2021-001**  
JC / Oct 20

### **3 Exactly where is here?**

LC referred to the first year's review of campaigning, which had been warmly welcomed by the Board, and Management Team's response, and was entirely separate from the internal audit report.

There were four key areas of learning. These included the need for clear objectives at the outset; robust selection criteria; resourcing and, in particular, cross team working, and time planning, budgeting and value for money; and the impact of external events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

Much of our success was due to agility and flexibility, and whilst additional scrutiny was welcome, it should not affect our ability to respond creatively to opportunities. RW agreed completely; the 'committee' nature of the Group should not be allowed to become a barrier to progress and flexibility – it should have an enabling role, as well as having an eye to outcomes. The Group **agreed**.

## **4 Current campaigns overview**

### **4.1 Make Delay Pay**

MH introduced the end of year report for this campaign. Its objectives were largely about impact, through increased demand for delay compensation, although given the pandemic situation it will be hard to measure.

It could be argued that more impact will be achieved from the influencing nature of the campaign, among key stakeholders; ORR's recent consultation on fares reform was evidence of this.

RW agreed but noted the highly creative nature of the campaign and the significant reputational outcome. There remained the question of the longevity of the campaign, and whether it was worth pursuing, given the enduring nature of the pandemic.

MH thought a 'holding pattern' was the best outcome, using hard data and research results as available, in context. He also believed that retailing issues - rather than wholesale fares reform - would be a better focus, piggybacking on existing retailing opportunities, where we stood a much greater chance of delivering a passenger dividend.

Other views were expressed, but the general feeling was that the campaign should be placed on hold, rather than closed, given it is a matter with which DfT is much engaged.

With reference to the project future options set out later on the agenda, it was agreed that any ticket retailing work could emerge from there.

LO referred to her experience at Which? where multiple campaigns were run simultaneously. Clarity was required on what was running and what was not, based on a formal campaign evaluation of the type we had produced at Transport Focus.

The Group **agreed:**

- (1) Make Delay Pay as a campaign would be placed on hold for the foreseeable future, with any potential outcomes used on a standalone basis;
- (2) Given the need for a rail related campaign during the pandemic, a retailing based campaign would be developed from within project future, with clear objectives and planned resources, based on a simplified campaign workbook;

CSG 2021-002  
MH / LC / Nov 20

(3) Project future would be declassified as a campaign, and the term henceforth used to describe an umbrella programme of pandemic related work, some other elements of which may also be developed as campaigns or mini-campaigns:

(4) an at-a-glance simple summary table of all campaigns with their current (planned, active, on-hold, closed) status included.

CSG 2021-003  
LC / Dec 20

#### 4.2 **Sort my Sign**

GD referred to the primary campaign objective - better information for road users – on which Transport Focus could make a clear difference. We had plenty of evidence road users were irritated by poor signage. Unfortunately, the campaign was launched only a few weeks before lockdown, but its potential was clear given the volume of visits to the website. Once agreement on the core aspects of the campaign had been reached with HE, it had become acknowledged by them as a key consumer focussed task for Transport Focus. The campaign was ongoing. New bursts of social media were planned in November and January. An interim report was also planned. The final task will be driving policy changes at HE.

The potential use of local media, including local TV coverage was discussed, based on the emerging profile of those likely to register a signage issue. The key target was those under 30 years of age, hence the use of Messenger as part of the social media strategy. The Group agreed this was an ongoing campaign, and asked for a workbook to be developed, once simplified.

CSG 2021-004  
GD / LC / Dec 20

#### 4.3 **Give Bus a Go**

LM introduced the campaign, which had as a clear objective the need to break down barriers to bus travel. Transport Focus had worked initially with local stakeholders in the west midlands, where bus travel was poorly perceived. It had been very successful in terms of profile, - the metro mayor Andy Street had been very engaged – but less successful in terms of boosting the volume of travel. A second phase, based on changed routes and services (which would have been highly measurable) was planned, but the pandemic intervened.

Other areas of the country appear to be interested in a campaign with a new emphasis on boosting travel post lockdown, and maybe not just related to bus. Our 'head out to help out' theme could be an option here. There remains a need to be careful about over encouraging public travel, especially in areas which have since gone into further lockdown.

The Group believed this to have been an excellent campaign, and agreed it was (probably) not now just about bus travel. So what next?

The Group were briefed on an idea – still being developed by the project future team – for a multimodal type of campaign that could be run in conjunction with metro area mayors or authorities.

The Group **agreed** the GBAG campaign could be morphed into something from within the project future stable, and looked forward to seeing the results of the discussions in due course.

#### 4.4 **Project Future**

IW briefed the Group on the current status of the various project future workstreams, noting the communications evaluation, a really important aspect of it. The flexible, agile approach has worked well, especially in promoting cross team / LTW working. Flexible ticketing is a good example of what has emerged from this approach.

Reassurance and information provision remain an important workstream, informing other work, especially in helping to break down barriers to travel.

It was noted that some retail system problems (in particular fully functioning T-12 availability) were not expected to be fixed until January 2022.

An event of some kind was being planned for later in the year.

The Group discussed other aspects of travel, in particular that of reassurance, and reducing the barriers to travel. Good data was available via the Omnibus survey but there remained a gulf between perception and reality. The ‘head out to help out’ theme could be important in this respect. There was a feeling that the rail industry, in particular, is not doing enough in terms of masks, distancing, and policing, although the evidence is still somewhat ambiguous. It was also noted that the barriers to travel are complicated; there appear to be lots of reasons for not travelling – exposure, cost, empty offices, for example.

More active travel management was clearly required. But with the economy on the floor we had a role in rebuilding confidence. There was evidence of a significant minority not prepared to travel; ‘cleanliness’ was a recurring theme.

As agreed above, project future would be declassified as a campaign, and the term henceforth used to describe an umbrella programme of pandemic related work, some other elements of which may also be developed as campaigns or mini-campaigns, each with their own identity so it is clear what their objectives are, how hard they are likely to be, what resources are required, what outcomes are we seeking and by when, and how we will know when to close.

**5 Current issues, processes and oversight**

It was agreed that the campaigns workbook was a good start but given it had been designed alongside the development of project future, it needed simplifying for other campaigns, which should all have something similar. LO had access to some useful documentation in this respect which she would share with LC and JC.

CSG 2021-005  
JC / LC / Oct 20

**6 Looking ahead**

The draft agenda designed for future meetings did not appear to reflect the discussion at this meeting. Whilst it should make provision for governance issue, it needed to be a helping tool, not a burden. The Group needed to think again.

CSG 2021-006  
JC / LC / Dec 20

**7 Any other business**

RW noted a fantastic first year of campaigning and congratulated the team on what they had achieved. Part of the role of CSG is to ensure this continues. There being no other business the meeting concluded at 1135hrs.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday 10 December 2020**, 1030-1200

Signed as an accurate record of the meeting

---

Rob Wilson, Chair

---

Date

**TRANSPORT FOCUS WALES LIMITED**

Fleetbank House, Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JX  
Telephone 0300 123 0855

**BUSINESS MEETING NOTES**

Date: Monday 27 July 2020  
Location: VIDEO CONFERENCE CALL ONLY  
Time: 1130-1230  
Classification: **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**Attended**

Jeff Halliwell	JH	Director, Chair
Cllr William Powell	WP	Director
David Sidebottom	DS	Director
Nigel Holden	NH	Director
Jon Carter	JC	Secretary
David Beer	DB	Senior Manager Wales, Transport Focus
Michelle Roles	MR	Stakeholder Manager Wales, Transport Focus
Apologies		
Anthony Smith	AS	Chief Executive, Transport Focus
<i>Copy to</i>		
Louise Collins	LC	Senior Stakeholder Manager, Transport Focus
Michelle Jackson	MJ	Manager, board and governance operations

Item	Subject	Action reference (if any)
1	<b>Chair's opening remarks</b> JH welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.1	<b>Notes from previous meeting.</b> The notes of the meeting held on 13 May 2020 were agreed.	
2.2	<b><u>Action points for updating</u></b> <b>Action points were discussed within item 4.</b>	

### **3 Reports**

#### **3.1 Operational report**

MR introduced her report. She mentioned in particular the supply of information, especially via the websites, for passengers. The reassurance work as part of project future had been important in this respect, which applied equally to bus users as well as to rail. She is continuing to work with NR closely with regard to engineering work.

#### **3.2 Strategic issues report**

DB introduced his report. Feedback in respect of our Omnibus work had been universally good, given its tracker nature. The work on the user panel had also been much appreciated. Presentations to the RSB had also been well received – issues such as flexible season tickets were good practice that can be shared elsewhere. The Senedd had been closely briefed on our work, and this had helped their scrutiny of TfW planning. A report was expected soon.

Regarding work with the WG, legislation had been published on Friday, but without the now normal requirement for three-layer face coverings, although related advice makes this clearer. Given the potential for confusion, DB had raised this as an issue – clarity of information remains crucial for passengers.

In respect of NR, timetable planning was still an issue, given the re-gauging required for new rolling stock. 'Tight but achievable' is the current message.

WP had recent experience of services on the Newport – Abergavenny route, and had noted the absence of onboard crew. Was this safety related? DB advised that this was a matter of policy – there was a need to maintain two meters distance between crew and passengers and this remained largely impossible to achieve. There were also issues in respect of opening doors between carriages, which had affected calling patterns on some services and stations. Mitigating measures had been put in place which were flagged on the NRE website. On board catering had also been suspended; it was as yet unclear if and when it would return.

DS noted the recent BBC coverage of the face coverings issue, and the lack of clarity, especially regarding exemptions. The WG messaging really needed to be clearer for all passengers, whether covered by an exemption or not, and any supporting documentation passengers needed to carry with them.

### **3.3 Wales Board Member update**

WP provided an update on activities since the last meeting, although these had of necessity been light.

Mohamed Ashkar - Conservative MS for South Wales East; member of the Economy & Transport Committee had died in June; Laura-Anne Jones MS has succeeded him as the Conservative representative for South Wales East & is well placed to succeed him on the Senedd Transport Committee. The Conservative Group in the Welsh Parliament has been reshuffled, but Russell George MS has retained his position as Economy & Transport Committee Chair.

He had been impressed with the high degree of compliance with the COVID-19 measures, and how generally staff had been very helpful. The Abergavenny station café was scheduled to reopen on 3 August – DB / MR noted that other facilities across the network were also likely to reopen soon.

## **4 Other issues**

### **4.1 Future engagement / issues: Discussion paper on future work**

DB introduced his paper, which provided options on future work in Wales in the context of emerging from the COVID-19 lockdown, the Wales Transport Strategy and Bus Services Bill, and elections to the Senedd in May 2021. A sum of around £20,000 was now available for further work in Wales.

Themes in the draft transport strategy – equality, sustainable choices and economic recovery in particular – are being looked at although this is very much work in progress. Two versions of the strategy had now been reviewed and commented on. The TfW Advisory Panel was also keen to input into the strategy and this could be an area for collaboration.

Further insight work in Wales should be sufficiently robust to enable cuts geographically and demographically.

A boost to the Omnibus survey was a possible option, although not a preferred one. Discussions in respect of the new website were ongoing, with a dynamic, showcasing function for Wales (and Scotland) proposed. The community based approach to passenger feedback was also work in progress.

JH wondered what the 'hot buttons'? WP mentioned the M4 corridor issues (not technically out of remit via TFW) plus a key issues document for passengers ahead of the Senedd elections next year. Rail performance and sustainability of bus services were also issues that could potentially be addressed. Further devolution of transport powers – as had been recently discussed – might be problematic.

A briefing or manifesto for passengers for future policy makers ahead of the elections was agreed as a good idea to which some funds could be committed.

DS noted that a fully fledged Wales transport user community was unlikely to be realised soon. An online event early in the autumn might be more sensible.

It was clear that a 'product' to provide the necessary impact was now required, and some further thinking was essential. A September event based on the emerging transport strategy was considered sensible, but it should be focused on something specific and not too high-level. In this respect, evidence collection which could input to the M4 debate would be particularly useful. (As also discussed in the subsequent Board strategy discussion, our tracker and other work suggests that public transport usage is likely to remain depressed for some time, with or without a second Covid wave this winter. This will put additional pressure on the M4, surrounding roads, air quality, and the regional economy.)

It was agreed we should reconvene in about a month's time to firm up any proposal. DS noted that other events were planned in Wales through delivery partners we had worked with previously who could be approached.

**TWL 2021-005  
JC / DS Aug 20**

Any community based project would be useful before the elections, helping to drive the evidence base.

The Wales based Board event in January 2021 was discussed. It remained totally unclear whether this could be a 'real' event. There were certainly issues that could inform the meeting and be used to select speakers – one of these was the south Wales metro. An online event might be more inclusive but a bilingual approach would be required. This would be perfectly possible, although may cost a bit more than normal. It would be good opportunity for the launch of any 'passenger manifesto'.

The meeting agreed to plan on this basis, leveraging the resources and expertise of the Communications Team.

**5 Management accounts year to date**

NH presented the management accounts to the end of June 2020, which showed a net operating surplus of around £10,000. The expenditure profile had been updated to provide an additional £20,000 for user insight and related activities. Travel and related activities was shown to be virtually nil in the first quarter. In a good position. Not all the available funds needed to be committed in the current year.

**6 Financial forecast 2020-21**

DB noted there was some provisions in the forecast which could be used for other activities.

**7 Any other business**

There being no other business the meeting concluded at 1230 hrs.

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 7 October 2020 1000-1130 by video conference call only.**

**TRANSPORT FOCUS WALES LIMITED**

Fleetbank House, Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JX  
Telephone 0300 123 0855

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Date: Monday 27 July 2020  
Location: VIDEO CALL ONLY  
Time: 1230-1300  
Classification: **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**Attended**

Jeff Halliwell	JH	Director, Chair
Cllr William Powell	WP	Director
Jon Carter	JC	Secretary
David Sidebottom	DS	Director
Nigel Holden	NH	Director
David Beer	DB	Senior Manager Wales, Transport Focus
Michelle Roles	MR	Stakeholder Manager Wales, Transport Focus
<u>Apologies</u>		
Anthony Smith	AS	Chief Executive, Transport Focus
<i>Copy to</i>		
Louise Collins	LC	Senior Stakeholder Manager, Transport Focus
Michelle Jackson	MJ	Management Assistant to CEO and Chair

Item	Subject	Action reference (if any)
1	<b>Chair's opening remarks</b> JH welcomed everyone to the meeting. No conflicts of interest were declared.	
2	<b>Minutes of previous meeting</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 08 January 2020 were <b>approved</b> and the Chair was authorised to sign them.	
3	<b><u>Operations, business and financial</u></b>	
3.1	Progress on operations, business and financial performance as discussed at the previous business meeting was <b>noted</b> .	

#### **4 Corporate Governance**

##### **4.1 Report from the secretary in respect of corporate governance**

The Board **noted** the filing of the annual confirmation statement at Companies House (06 July 2020) and that the updated Articles of Association were accepted at Companies House on 20 July 2020.

##### **4.2 Paper from the corporate services director in respect of audit exemption**

The Board **noted** the exemption from audit as set out in the paper based on the parent company guarantee agreed at the July 2020 meeting of the Transport Focus Board.

##### **4.3 Financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2020**

The Board **approved** the financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2020 and **authorised** the Chair to sign them on its behalf. It was noted that the accounts for Transport Focus Wales Limited would be consolidated into Transport Focus Group accounts.

#### **5 Any other business**

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 1240 hrs.

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 7 October 2020 1000-1130 by video conference call only.**

Signed as an accurate record of the meeting

---

Jeff Halliwell, Chair

---

Date



## TRANSPORT FOCUS SCOTLAND LIMITED

Fleetbank House, Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JX

Telephone 0300 123 0855

### BUSINESS MEETING NOTES

Date: Wednesday 09 September 2020  
Location: Video Conference Call Only (see Zoom Link in Calendar)  
Time: 1330-1430  
**Classification: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

#### Attended

Jeff Halliwell	JH	Director, and Chair, Transport Focus
Trisha McAuley OBE	TM	Director, and Transport Focus Board Member for Scotland
Jon Carter	JC	Secretary
David Sidebottom	DS	Director, and Director, Transport Focus
Anthony Smith	AS	Chief Executive, Transport Focus
Robert Samson	DB	Senior Manager Scotland, Transport Focus
<u>Apologies</u>		
Nigel Holden	NH	Director, and Corporate Services Director, Transport Focus

Item	Subject	Action reference (if any)
1	<b>Chair's opening remarks</b> JH welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular TM to her first meeting, and explained the format of the meetings we had developed over time. The subsidiary company, although not yet trading, provided a focus on Scottish issues not generally otherwise available.	
2	<b>Notes from previous meeting (June 2020)</b> The notes from the meeting held on Wednesday 17 June 2020 were agreed.	
3	<b>Outstanding actions not covered below</b> There were no outstanding actions.	
4	<b>Updates</b>	
4.1	<b>Business updates</b>	
(a)	<b>Follow up to our submission to Cabinet Secretary of February 2020 in light of Comprehensive Spending Review</b>	

RS reported that little progress had been made on the paper to the Cabinet Secretary given the current pandemic. In respect of the CSR, block grants would be allocated to the Welsh and Scottish Governments via the Barnett formula, and there was little point in bidding for additional funds at present. But discussions with the Minister and officials should resume before too long; an opportunity would present itself as part of TM's induction. RS had requested dates. There was certainly an opportunity to do more on buses, since the SG were interested in our research in England. AS added that a Scottish 'version' of our CSR submission and / or the workplan for the second half of the year would be helpful in this respect, especially given the recent publication of the SG's programme for government. This should be produced in advance of any meeting with the Cabinet Secretary. It was agreed that JH should also attend this meeting if possible. There should be an emphasis on *added value*.

**TFS 2021-016**  
DS/RS Nov 20

**(b) Proposed November Board meeting**

It was agreed that as TM could not make the November date, we would reschedule this board meeting for February 2021.

**(c) Current issues and work across modes in Scotland**

**Stonehaven derailment – creation of task forces**

The paper from Network Rail was noted. RS had expressed condolences to the rail industry in Scotland. The meeting noted the importance of learning the lessons from the accident. AS reported that he had a meeting the day before with Andrew Haines, CEO of Network Rail; it was clear that managing the consequences of such accidents was the priority. There was currently disruption between Glasgow and Edinburgh due to poor weather conditions (a canal had burst its banks) affecting the railway infrastructure.

**NRPS and ScotRail issues**

RS updated on the NRPS in Scotland, given there was to be no autumn wave. NRPS was though regarded as a bit 'clunky' and a meeting had been arranged to discuss the various, complex issues in November. AS noted that discussions with RDG, DfT and NR in respect of an always on, digital survey were going well and would be helpful in this respect. It was hoped agreement could be found at the 'summit' in mid-October. RS would liaise with Louise Coward in advance of preliminary discussions with stakeholders

**TFS 2021-017**  
RS / Oct 20

### **Stakeholder consultation on rolling stock**

The meeting noted the consultation on future rolling stock, and RS's response. The issue was subject to some uncertainty given the potential end of the Abellio contract, the outcomes of the rail review and the end of emergency franchise measures. The possibility of an OLR arrangement could not be discounted, as it was being considered by the SG. TM noted that Transport Focus should be included in these discussions from the consumer and governance perspective; the meeting agreed.

### **Bus issues**

RS noted that ridership remained low, given the pandemic, and that maintaining service levels was still a struggle. We should keep the SG officials and local authorities in the loop in respect of useful intelligence from elsewhere.

As an aside, RS mentioned that ScotRail were considering our 'head out to help out' line, which was considered fine provided the intellectual ownership was acknowledged.

JH reiterated that the partnership model we had developed in the West Midlands and the Liverpool City region was ready and waiting to be deployed in Scotland, and we must continue to push it with SG officials and local authorities.

#### **4.2 Scotland board member's update (if any)**

TM had enjoyed a wide ranging and very useful series of introductory discussions with Transport Focus colleagues in August, for which she thanked those responsible.

#### **5 Any Other business**

JH mentioned a potential read across with the DfT's 'low travel neighbourhoods' initiative to Scotland, and that given the restrictions on remit it was something that could be channelled via TFSL. DS would investigate further as the project developed.

The meeting also briefly considered the impact of the pandemic on lifeline CalMac ferry services, and Transport Focus's historic remit.

There being no other business the meeting concluded at 1427 hrs

**TFS 2021-018**  
DS / Nov 20

Date of next meeting: **Wednesday 4 November 2020, 1000-1130**



**TRANSPORT FOCUS SCOTLAND LTD**

Fleetbank House, Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JX  
Telephone 0300 123 0855

**BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Date: Wednesday 09 September 2020  
Location: Video Conference Call Only  
Time: 1430-1500  
**Classification: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

**Attended**

Jeff Halliwell		JH	Director and Chair, Transport Focus
Trisha McAuley OBE		TM	Director and Transport Focus Board member for Scotland
David Sidebottom		DS	Director, and Director, Transport Focus
Robert Samson		RS	Senior Stakeholder Manager Scotland, Transport Focus
Jon Carter		JC	Company Secretary
Anthony Smith		AS	Chief executive, Transport Focus
<u>Apologies</u>			
Nigel Holden		NH	Director, and Corporate Services Director, Transport Focus

Item	Subject	Action reference (if any)
1	<b>Chair's opening remarks</b> JH welcomed everyone to the meeting. As a non trading entity there were no financials to review or discuss.	
2	<b>Minutes of the Board meeting of 3 February 2020</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2020 were <b>agreed</b> and the Chair was authorised to sign them.	
3	<b><u>Operations and business</u></b> The Board <b>noted</b> progress on operations and other business as discussed at the previous business meeting.	

**4 Corporate Governance**

The Board **noted** the corporate governance report from the Secretary, and the updated Articles of Association as approved by the Board of Transport Focus.

The meeting formally endorsed TM's appointment as a director, and noted her registration as a person with significant control.

TM noted the provision in the articles for an appointment of a further non-executive director. JH explained that this was indeed now an option if it was considered a good idea. It was one that could be explored with the Cabinet Secretary at a suitable point.

**5 Any other business**

There being no other business the meeting concluded at 1444 hrs.

**Date of next meeting:** to be confirmed