
Board minutes

Agenda item 4 (a)
Drafted 4.4.08

**Minutes of the London TravelWatch Board meeting
held on 11 March 2008 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1**

Contents

196	Chairman's introduction
197	Declarations of interest
198	Minutes
199	Matters Arising
200	Action taken
201	Information items
202	Transport for London Business Plan
203	Options for strengthening bus passenger representation
204	European Commission green paper: "Towards a new culture for urban mobility"
205	National Rail: performance report for quarter 2, 2007/08
206	Any other business
207	Resolution to move into confidential session

**Minutes of the London TravelWatch Board meeting
held on 11 March 2008 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1**

Present

Ron Brewer
Brian Cooke Chairman
Kevin Davis
Gail Engert
Daniel Francis
Roxanne Glaud
Libby Kemp
Teena Lashmore
David Leibling
Sarah Pond
Virginia Rounding
Andrew Theobald

Rufus Barnes Chief Executive
Carmel Cannon Senior Committee Administrator
John Cartledge Deputy Chief Executive
Janet Cooke Chief Executive designate
Mark Donoghue Committee Administrator
Suzanne Fry Rail Policy Assistant
Graham Larkbey Committee Clerk

Stephen Critchley Chief Finance Officer, Transport for London (TfL)
Daniel Rockett TfL

196 Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed members, guests and visitors to the meeting, and made the standard information announcements. Apologies for absence had been received from the Deputy Chair, Lorna Reith. David Leibling also tendered apologies as he would have to leave during the first part of the meeting.

The Chairman began by saying that the Chief Executive would be leaving London TravelWatch at the end of the month, after more than 25 years of representing the interests of London passengers. He had been a tremendous servant to the people that London TravelWatch and its predecessors represented. Massive progress and change had occurred in that time; throughout, the Chief Executive had worked assiduously, and the Chairman wished him all the best for the future. Members warmly endorsed these sentiments.

The Chief Executive thanked the Chairman, and replied that he had enjoyed the last 25+ years. There had indeed been massive changes, including at the office itself where over the years the Secretariat had grown from three people to 26. The biggest changes had occurred in the attitudes of the transport providers to London TravelWatch. From being seen as a "long stop", often being involved only after major decisions had been taken, London TravelWatch was now in a position where its comments and suggestions could exercise genuine influence. This was very important. He thanked the Chairman, Board

and staff for their support, and hoped they would be able to attend his farewell event on 19 March.

Since the last Board meeting the Chairman had attended the following :

20 February Meeting with Elaine Hall, Managing Director, First Capital Connect (FCC), to discuss various issues including the naming of a train after the Chief Executive.

Meeting with Tom Edwards, the new transport correspondent with BBC London. This had contributed to good media coverage of London TravelWatch's new report on access to health facilities.

Reception at City Hall (with the Chief Executive).

26 February Various television interviews.

27 February Visit to Norwich for the launch of National Express East Anglia. If those responsible had listened to London TravelWatch, they would not initially have chosen the widely-criticised name "one" Railway.

Meeting with First Great Western (FGW) and Passenger Focus to discuss implementation of Oyster pay as you go on FGW. This was on schedule for May 2008 – nine months ahead of most other train operating companies (TOCs).

Meeting with Richard Parry and Mike Brown of London Underground (LUL).

Guest of the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC) at the London Transport awards dinner, where a lifetime achievement award was presented to the Chief Executive.

28 February Meeting of stakeholder advisory board for the National Passenger Survey.

4 March "Building London's Transport" conference, at which the candidates for London Mayor outlined their plans.

5 March Meeting of SELTRANS working group.

Meeting of House of Commons Transport Committee to discuss the Rail white paper.

6 March Meeting with Tim O'Toole, Managing Director, London Underground.

7 March Breakfast meeting at Guildhall with about 35 top business representatives, senior transport managers and the Chief Executive, to discuss major transport construction schemes in London and the interim effects of the necessary associated works. There would inevitably be short-term pain for long-term gain. Some disruptive works were the result of poor decisions or specification in the past – the escalators at Bank were having to be replaced after only 15 years, whereas older and better designs had lasted for 60.

Various interviews re the London TravelWatch report on access to health facilities.

Herne Hill secure station award presentation.

10 March Access to Hospitals conference at City Hall. Engaging certain hospitals in this issue was still an uphill task. One representative had commented that hospitals effectively subsidised car parking heavily through providing the necessary land, and wondered if this money might be better spent on supporting public transport access. There was food for thought there, including for London TravelWatch's own Access to Hospitals task force.

The Chief Executive said that in addition to the above, he had attended a meeting with Tunde Olatunji of Passenger Focus to discuss Eurostar, and a Passenger Focus meeting with TOCs affected by the Network Rail project overruns at Christmas. It had been proposed by the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) that Network Rail would be fined £14m, but confidential discussions were now under way into the possibility of abating this and instead diverting that amount into providing passenger benefits.

The Chairman thanked Board member Libby Kemp for her hard work in trying to set up a meeting of business people in Ealing to discuss transport issues. Regrettably, the low level of response had caused this to be shelved, but it might be rearranged for the autumn.

197 Declarations of interest

There were no additional declarations of interest.

198 Minutes

The minutes of the Board meeting held on 29 January were agreed.

The following minutes were noted:

- a). Executive Group meeting 17 January 2008
- b). Executive Group meeting 29 January 2008

The Chairman added that as certain groups and bodies only met infrequently, their draft minutes would be placed before the Board for information and noting before they had been agreed formally, providing the relevant Chair agreed. Any subsequent significant changes would be advised as necessary. The status of the minutes involved would be made clear. Members signified agreement with this procedure.

199 Matters arising (paper LTW 164)

The Secretariat had been trying very hard to clear the outstanding items from previous meetings, and this would continue. Discussions with TfL on this were ongoing.

Referring to Annex A (minute 67 – action owner Chiltern Railways), a member said that she had met the station manager at Marylebone to discuss the positioning of the customer information (CIS) screens there. She and another member were continuing to press the issue of the West Ruislip waiting room's opening times.

Referring to minute 175 (action owner TfL), a member asked if the question of East London line replacement bus services could be taken up again. The Chairman replied that a number of changes had been made to these without prior consultation with London TravelWatch, which had expressed concern about them, and liaison on the matter had now been established. The Director, Research & Development, was in close touch with TfL about this.

Referring to item 2.15 (iBus), a member said he thought iBus was meant to offer more than just information about serious incidents or delays. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that this was true, but that replies to queries raised by members reported here only covered the specific issue raised. An item covering the full scope of iBus could be included on a future Board agenda.

200 Action taken (paper LTW 165)

Item 2.2 : A member commented that the consultation on route 603 had not been publicised.

Item 2.12 : No reply had yet been received to the letter sent to the minister regarding access to health facilities, and the issue needed to be kept under review. The Chairman replied that he would raise it at a meeting scheduled for 13 March.

Action: Chairman

Item 2.21 : A member asked if London TravelWatch had agreed to the proposed extension of penalty notices for disorder (or "on the spot" fines) for certain railway bye-law offences, as outlined. The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that it had.

The paper was received for information.

201 Information items

The following information items were noted:

- (a) Lambeth transport partnership forum (LTW 168)
- (b) Docklands Light Railway upgrades (LTW 169)
- (c) West Hampstead interchange feasibility study (LTW 170)
- (d) Hillingdon traffic management liaison meeting (LTW 171)
- (e) Harrow bus and highway liaison meeting (LTW 172)
- (f) Emirates Stadium liaison committee (LTW 173)
- (g) Casework report – February 2008 (LTW 174)
- (h) Greater London Forum for Older People : transport event (LTW 175)

Members made the following comments:

Item (c) : This should be kept on London TravelWatch's "live issues" list and needed to be discussed at some point. The Deputy Chief Executive replied that active discussions were ongoing on bringing the various sources of funding together. Some smaller scale improvements were planned by TfL (e.g. widening pavements) although the original major behind-the barriers interchange scheme had been abandoned. Gail Engert (Board liaison member for Camden) would shortly be attending an update meeting at TfL headquarters.

Item (f) : Two members had attended a liaison meeting at the Stadium. Re item 2.8, it was not clear what had happened to the Section 106 money originally earmarked for improvements to transport access. It was presumably sitting somewhere in a bank earning interest, but councils were required to ensure such monies were ring-fenced and should maintain a register so that their disbursement could be tracked. However the amount in this case - £7.6m – was very small, given the scale of the stadium, and it was a pity the local authority had agreed to it. Matches and the numbers attending them had adverse affects on other transport users and local residents. London TravelWatch was not happy about the overall situation but it was not clear what it could do.

Item (g): The Chief Executive gave updated casework figures. The monthly total of cases finalised had risen from 100 to 145, thanks to a large number of replies being received from providers. It was hoped to maintain this. A member commented that the number of new cases received year on year was going down. The Chairman explained that cases in January and February usually went up due to fares increases, but this had not been a major issue this year. Another member observed that the percentage of cases awaiting finalisation was less than half compared to last year. He praised the efforts of the casework team and hoped the level of performance could be maintained. The Chief Executive replied that this depended on the necessary staff being in place; annual leave and staff sick absence were major factors.

202 Transport for London Business Plan

The Chairman welcomed Stephen Critchley, Chief Finance Officer, TfL. Mr Critchley began by explaining that the 2008/9 Plan was a revision to the five-year plan set out in 2004. Its key objectives were as follows:

- Enhance transport infrastructure through the "£10bn" (actually £13/14bn) investment programme.
- Improve operational services.
- Utilise new technology for service delivery, e.g. Oyster, Journey Planner.
- Deliver significant improvements in road safety (early success here had resulted in higher targets being set).
- Establish measures for better management of demand for existing infrastructure, e.g. Congestion Charge western extension and the Travel Demand Management pilot, to encourage people to make "smarter travel" choices.
- Incorporate sustainability, accessibility and other Mayoral priorities into plans.
- Promote value for money and efficiency in spending (savings of £3m had been made as a result).

Mr Critchley went on to outline progress on the "key deliverables" in the October 2004 Business Plan:

London Underground :

Upgrades of Central, Waterloo & City, Jubilee and Victoria lines (interim) by 2009/10 : first phase Jubilee, Waterloo & City and Central lines all completed; remainder on target.

Step-free access (platform to street) provided at 25% of LUL stations by 2010 : on target, though the Metronet collapse had resulted in some stations being dropped and replaced by others.

Congestion relief schemes at Kings Cross, White City, Shepherds Bush (Central) and Covent Garden delivered by 2010 : on target. Kings Cross phase 2 now under way.

Piccadilly Line extension to Heathrow T5 (BAA funded) open in 2008 : completed, trial running successful, opening next week.

London Rail :

Docklands Light Railway (DLR) extensions to Woolwich Arsenal (2009) and Canning Town to Stratford International (2010); capacity upgrade to Bank-Lewisham route (2010) : on target.

East London line extension phase 1 (2010) : on target.

Surface Transport :

Bus network expansion with 100% accessible buses and in-bus CCTV: delivered. Now working on improving ramp availability.

“iBus” bus communications system : On target and being rolled out now. Differing views had been expressed about the on-bus announcements, mainly their volume, and some tweaking might be needed.

London-wide Low Emission Zone established from 2008 : stage 1 delivered.

Congestion Charge western extension established from February 2007 : delivered.

London Cycle Network (LCN+) complete by 2010 : on target except for a number of problem sections totalling 50km.

Road safety schemes to meet revised Mayoral targets to reduce numbers killed and seriously injured on London’s roads compared to 1994-8 levels : 40% target met early.

Corporate targets:

Oyster development : Pay as you go introduced across TfL network (including Overground) : being rolled out to National Rail stations (for completion in 2009).

Support for London borough council transport schemes : spend to date exceeds target of £150m per annum.

Mr Critchley then summarised the key changes made in the 2008/9 plan :

Bus services : additional bus services from October 2006 plan; target of 478 million bus km for 2009/10.

Overground/LUL stations transfer : enhanced staffing at all stations transferred from Silverlink in November 2007.

Travel Demand Management to encourage smarter travel choices : additional funding allocated for 2008/09 and 2009/10 to deliver targets.

Transport policing: safer transport teams to continue in 2009/10 (previously only funded until 2008/09).

Public realm : implementation of schemes to improve Victoria Embankment and eliminate Tottenham Hale gyratory system (subject to completion of necessary formalities).

Sustainability : support for Clinton climate change Initiative to improve environmental performance of the TfL buildings estate, and continued support for climate change fund.

The plan did not include the impacts of the Metronet collapse or the Government spending review 2007 funding settlement.

TfL had significantly improved the outcomes of the Business Plan since it was established in 2004. The following table is excerpted from his presentation :

<i>(millions except where noted)</i>	2004/05	2009/10
Bus operated km	454	478
Underground operated km	68.8	72.0
DLR operated km	3.2	5.0
Bus passenger journeys <i>(rebased from 2006/07)</i>	1,777	2,247
Underground passenger journeys	940	1,092
DLR passenger journeys	51	79
Roads – number killed or seriously injured London-wide	5,192	3,493
% of TLRN pedestrian crossings with disabled facilities	62%	80%
% of Underground stations with enhanced accessibility/safety features	<29%	72%

[Note : TLRN = Transport for London road network]

A number of additional outcomes had been included since 2004, and these are shown below together with change that had occurred since then :

<i>(millions except where noted)</i>	2004/05	2009/10
Bus excess wait time	1.3 min	1.2 min
LUL PPP “lost customer hours”	17.6	15.5
DLR on-time performance	96%	96%
Cycling journeys on TLRN <i>(index = 100)</i>	172	226
TLRN state of good repair <i>(% not in this state)</i>	12%	5.7%
BAME in senior management	6.6%	15%
Nitrous oxide emissions (tonnes)	7,828	7,012

[Note : PPP = public/private partnership, BAME = black and minority ethnic]

Finally, Mr Critchley summarised the impacts of the comprehensive spending review 2007 – in other words, “what next?”

TfL had negotiated a funding settlement with the Department for Transport (DfT) covering the period until 2017/18. This was the longest settlement period on record, but it meant there would be less opportunity to ask for more as time went on, and it would be a challenge to meet it. The key features were as follows:

- Updates 2004 settlement, except for provisions relating to Olympic projects.
- Gives TfL continued autonomy to deliver projects, including Crossrail and Underground PPP improvements. The transport grant was no longer split into separate amounts for TfL and LUL, so TfL could decide itself how best to disburse it.
- Sets out Government grant and borrowing capacity for the next 10 years.
- Includes funding package for Crossrail (scheduled to open in 2017).
- Provides specific funding to cover Metronet obligations.

TfL would develop the Business Plan for the whole period by the end of 2008, and would be able to give more detail then. It had still to work out what else it could do, and the Mayor was optimistic about the chances of securing more money at the next spending review.

The Chairman thanked Mr Critchley and invited questions and comments, as follows:

There were concerns that west London would lose out to east London and the Olympics.

TfL was quietly confident about the Olympics. Progress on the transport infrastructure was tracked every four weeks. Most of the projects were already in the Business Plan, though a few had received Olympic Development Agency funding e.g. DLR and North London line capacity enhancements. There might be some overspend, but all capital projects carried that risk. What was less clear was the likely running costs during the Games themselves, but this would not involve huge amounts. Therefore, projects elsewhere in London should not be affected.

What was happening on the A406 Bounds Green interchange scheme?

Mr Critchley apologised; this question had been asked at a previous meeting but the reply had gone astray. He would take it away and reply with an update. The scheme was currently going through the approval process; no land currently owned by TfL that might be needed for future enhancements would be disposed of.

Action: TfL

The figures given for the proportion of step-free stations appeared to be inconsistent.

Other enhancements were included in some refurbishment programmes, e.g. improved visibility aids for partially sighted passengers.

Which stations had been removed from the access programme due to the Metronet collapse, and which new stations added?

Mr Critchley would take this away and reply.

Action: TfL

What were the details of the Tottenham Hale gyratory elimination scheme?

Mr Critchley would take this away and reply.

Action: TfL

Regarding the final “difficult” 50km of the cycle network, what impact did these gaps have on the rest of the network? Was it in large segments or a mixture of long and short segments?

There were some locations where fitting in cycle provision was difficult. TfL needed to find cost-effective solutions which would get the balance right. Mr Critchley would find out how the 50km was made up and reply.

Action: TfL

Now that the transport grant did not comprise separate sums for TfL and LUL, was there a risk of one losing out to the other?

It was necessary to look at TfL as a whole and strike a balance. The fact that the sums had been merged showed the Government now had confidence in TfL to get it right, after its initial opposition to the Underground PPP.

What were the biggest risks to the Business Plan?

The Metronet collapse had created a major problem, and TfL was anxious to get it under control as soon as possible – hopefully early next financial year. LUL had some uncertainties, including Metronet, the delivery of works, and the periodic review of the Tube Lines contract whose price and terms were reviewed every 7.5 years. This might become more expensive than when the original PPP contracts were negotiated. The national economy was also more uncertain now, and a downturn could result in a decrease in passengers and fare income. However, at present TfL was still seeing growth in usage.

Councils were seeing cuts in their financial support from TfL.

TfL money for councils’ local implementation plans (LIPS) had in fact increased each year, though not always in line with inflation. Councils had received more than was originally pledged over the last five years, though Mr Critchley accepted they would always like more. TfL would need to look at future amounts. Individual councils’ amounts might vary – it depended on what schemes they submitted.

Phase 2 of the East London line extension appeared not to have been costed yet.

It would not be as expensive as phase 1; TfL was in discussions about this with the DfT. A member added for information that at the end of March “the largest crane in the world” would be installing the new bridge over Shoreditch High Street.

The holders of Freedom Pass equivalents from outside London could now use TfL services free, which must have an affect on revenue; did TfL receive compensation?

Reimbursement was governed by where the travel took place, and there was no net cost to TfL. London Councils had done well out of the Government grant arrangements for this. The down side was the potential increase in congestion resulting from more people using the system.

Returning to the issue of step-free access, passengers with luggage wishing to transfer between Waterloo and St Pancras International faced a hostile environment, especially at the St Pancras end where there was a short flight of steps and only one small lift (which had recently been out of order for nearly two weeks). More generally, station gateline staff could be more proactive by directing passengers with luggage to use side gates.

Kings Cross St Pancras Underground station would remain under pressure until phase 2 of its reconstruction programme (the new northern ticket hall) opened early in 2010. The Chairman added that the Board had already raised this with LUL; the situation would get even worse when Kent domestic services started using St Pancras International. This had been discussed at a recent high-level management meeting. London TravelWatch had insisted on two lifts being provided at London City Airport to ensure at least one was always available; this was very important at such stations. On the subject of gateline staff directing passengers with luggage to side gates, Mr Critchley imagined they were instructed to do this, but he would pass the comment on.

[The Deputy Chief Executive stated that the obstacle presented by the short flight of steps between the gateline and the ticket office in the "Tube" ticket hall at Kings Cross St Pancras had already been raised with London Underground. There were plans to modify it to make it easier to negotiate with wheeled luggage, e.g. by installing a ramp next to the wall, up which such items could be towed.]

When Morden station was refurbished, the toilets were not included, as they had been locked out of use previously, and the lifts were delayed by 18 months. Toilets were important at termini, and works needed to be coordinated so they were all carried out at once.

TfL and LUL did try to tie-in access improvements with the station refurbishment programme.

What was happening with the Cross-river tram scheme?

The plan included the development phase, but not implementation. TfL needed to consider whether it could do this post-2010.

Concluding the item, the Chairman said that the Board would like a detailed session with Mr Critchley and his colleagues to discuss their plans up to 2018 in more depth. Mr Critchley replied that TfL would first need to discuss these with whoever won the Mayoral election. The likely time for another meeting would be in the late autumn.

203 Options for strengthening bus passenger representation (paper LTW166)

The Chairman began by giving the background to the preparation of this report. The Government had announced that it was minded to set up a statutory body to represent bus passengers in England (outside London), and was now consulting on the options. London TravelWatch had an interest, as it would have to work with whatever type of body was set up, and the Chief Executive had put a lot of time and work into preparing the paper. Passenger Focus had discussed the matter at length. It would be some advantages for London TravelWatch if the body selected was Passenger Focus; it would avoid the need to deal with another separate organisation, and London TravelWatch already had close links.

Introducing the report, the Chief Executive said that paragraph 2.4.1 was key - this stated: "The argument for there to be a single bus and rail consumer organisation for England outside London is compelling". This reflected what had happened within London when the London Regional Passenger Committee was established in 1984. Paragraph 2.4.2 listed the various provisos that London TravelWatch would wish to see built in. The Government was keen to hear the views of an already-integrated transport body, so London TravelWatch had a real contribution to make. It had been suggested that the new body should deal with industry-level issues and not deal directly with individual passengers' complaints; the Chief Executive felt very strongly that this was unacceptable. The various volunteer passenger bodies around the country were keen to be involved. The paper sought to offer the best solution to a difficult problem.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive and invited members to comment, as follows:

Paragraph 2.3.6: The voluntary regional TravelWatches had suggested top-slicing local authority transport allocations at regional level to fund the new body. A member felt this would be most inadvisable; councils did not have enough money to do the necessary work as it was. The Chief Executive explained that the Government was concerned at what the new body might cost to set up and run; if it thought it would be too expensive, it might drop the idea altogether. Because bus operation and regulation outside London was not centralised, liaison with operators was much more difficult and potentially costly. It was important to get the Government to agree to setting up a statutory body – its role could be refined later, if experience proved the need for this. A single body would have more weight and bargaining power.

A member expressed reservations about Passenger Focus's ability to take the task on and to find time to devote to the minutiae of bus operations. The Traffic Commissioners had experience in this area, as did the Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) in the conurbations. The Chairman observed that it was not currently proposed that the new body would deal with minutiae, only strategic issues. The member replied that the two could not be divorced.

The Chief Executive pointed out that the PTEs procured services on behalf of their constituent local authorities. This was covered in paragraph 2.3.8. They could not also act as champions of bus users' interests. It had originally been suggested that the Traffic Commissioners could partially fill that role, but the Government had accepted the view of London TravelWatch and other respondents to its initial consultation on the Commissioners' role that this was not an appropriate function for a regulator and a separate body was required. A member pointed out that – unlike TfL - the PTEs only procured the relatively small percentage of routes not operated on a commercial footing in their respective areas.

The Chairman said that part of the aim of allocating the task to Passenger Focus would be to make it multi-modal in its outlook. The Department of Transport was also keen on the idea. The Chief Executive said that Passenger Focus realised that it could not do everything centrally, and that it would need local networks to pick up local issues. It should be given the power to make formal representations to the Traffic Commissioners.

The Board agreed the paper and the provisos set out in paragraph 2.4.2.

Introducing the paper, the Chairman said that TfL was very supportive of the line London TravelWatch was taking. London TravelWatch had been represented on the European Passengers Federation (EPF) from the outset. The EPF was holding its 2008 annual conference in London this weekend, and the Chairman, Chief Executive and Chief Executive designate would be attending. The Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for transport was also attending. Once the new Chief Executive took up post, he would be asking her to consider the role and approach that London TravelWatch should adopt towards the EPF and Europe, including the option of engaging a consultant.

A member felt that the "labelling" scheme suggested in paragraph 2.8.1 might be difficult to implement. Another member asked about the issue of common ticketing; the Chief Executive replied that this was covered at paragraphs 2.8.8, 2.8.11 and 2.8.25.

205 National Rail: performance report for quarter 2, 2007/08

The Chairman welcomed the Rail Policy Assistant, and thanked her for all the work she had put in on preparing the report, including chasing up operators for their contributions. Due to the timescales involved in collating and releasing data, the report was inevitably a little historical in nature (quarter 2 covered the period July-September 2007).

First Great Western (FGW) had shown a significant improvement during the period, and a sea-change had occurred there. Passenger benefits had also been secured. The DfT had now admitted that FGW had been in breach of its franchise obligations, and the whole saga bore out London TravelWatch's view that independent auditing of operators' performance was needed. Senior management at FirstGroup and Network Rail had engaged with the issues, and had been astonished and embarrassed at what had gone on at FGW. The Chairman believed there would now be no benefit in removing the franchise from FGW; some of the problems were deep-rooted, but First Group was best placed to sort them out.

The Chief Executive added that there was evidence that the DfT had specified elements of the franchise wrongly in the first place. There was a feeling within Government that DfT officials had let it down, and as a result the Secretary of State might want a more hands-on role in future. A member who liaised regularly with FGW added that it was now much more responsive and reacted more quickly to complaints. The Chairman agreed that FGW management was now much more on the ball. He had no regrets about the action London TravelWatch had taken to have FGW brought to heel, and a member added that these had clearly acted as a shot across the bows. The Chief Executive observed that when London Regional Transport removed tendered routes from certain bus operators a few years ago, all the others had taken notice. The action taken by the DfT now would concentrate other train operators' minds.

Commenting on the report generally, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that each provider supplied its own narrative commentary on its performance, and London TravelWatch took no editorial responsibility for these. He pointed to Virgin Trains' paragraph on fleet reliability as a classic of its type. London TravelWatch officers were actively investigating how best to meet the Board's wishes regarding the reporting of TfL's service performance, and a discussion with senior TfL personnel had taken place. The possibility of reducing the frequency of publication of the National Rail report in order to free up staff resources for this was being looked at, but this was not a simple task.

206 Any other business

The Chairman reported that London TravelWatch had initially been offered four places at the Passenger Focus conference on 24 April. These would be taken up by the new Chief Executive, a member of the Research and Development team, a member and himself. Additional places might become available nearer the time.

The agenda for the next Board meeting would include First Great Western's recent performance, an update on the rolling stock and timetabling issues arising from the first phase of the Thameslink project, and the London TravelWatch research programme.

207 Resolution to move into confidential session

The meeting moved into confidential session for the final item, in accordance with the provisions of section 15(2)(B) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded.

In the confidential session, the Board reviewed the presentations received in the course of the meeting.