

LTW REVIEW – IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

	Issues to be addressed in implementation	Action
<p>Proposal 1</p> <p>We propose that London TravelWatch should not remain as a separately constituted organisation and its functions and duties in relation to the representation of the capital’s public transport users be vested in the elected London Assembly. We further propose that discussions to this end, and any necessary legislative changes, are taken forward with the relevant government departments during the autumn. As an interim measure, it is proposed not to reappoint the six positions on the board which will become vacant in December 2010.</p>	<p>Implementation of this proposal would require a change to primary legislation and the Assembly has adopted the proposal as a policy position. the case for the inclusion of</p> <p>London TravelWatch has indicated its opposition to this proposal and the Parliamentary process of legislative change, if introduced, would enable the merits to be debated and for consultation to take place with the relevant parties.</p> <p>If change is effected, the Committee should seek to ensure that passengers of all transport modes in the capital have a clear right of appeal to a separate body when unhappy with the response of the operator. It would also consider mechanisms for separating the appeals function from the scrutiny work of the Assembly.</p> <p>The Committee could also examine different models of representation, learning lessons from elsewhere where relevant, and ensure that positions adopted on behalf of passengers have a robust evidence base.</p>	<p>The Chair of the Assembly has written to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government requesting the inclusion of the necessary changes in forthcoming legislation.</p> <p>Presentation of options to Transport Committee in due course.</p>

	Issues to be addressed in implementation	Action
<p>Proposal 2</p> <p>We propose that the staff of London TravelWatch be re-located to City Hall as soon as is practical, and by the latest April 2011, and that negotiations should be started with the current landlord with a view to realising savings in accommodation costs from the earliest possible date.</p>	<p>The GLA Act provides that the Assembly may, in consultation with the Secretary of State, make arrangements for London TravelWatch to be provided with accommodation.</p> <p>The provision of accommodation at City Hall is the responsibility of the Mayor.</p> <p>Depending on the response to this request, clarification of the number of staff to be relocated and the availability of relevant space, the Transport Committee would therefore take this proposal forward.</p>	<p>The Chair of the Assembly has written to the Mayor regarding the availability of space within City Hall for staff of London TravelWatch..</p> <p>Further pursue discussions with the Mayor.</p> <p>Open discussion with DfT, LTW and the landlord of LTW's existing premises.</p>
<p>Proposal 3</p> <p>We propose that steps to absorb London TravelWatch's back office functions within the GLA should be taken forward. A report should be submitted to the Transport Committee setting out progress with these proposals by December 2010.</p>	<p>Whilst not entirely dependent upon relocation of staff to City Hall the provision of back office support would be easier with co-location. Ahead of any decision on co-location discussions will take place with the GLA Head of Paid Service and relevant Directors and LTW senior management on the absorption of back office functions.</p>	<p>Discussion with Directors of relevant service areas and HR, and with LTW senior management and report to Transport Committee January 2011.</p>

	Issues to be addressed in implementation	Action
<p>Proposal 4</p> <p>We propose that officers explore the potential for contracting Passenger Focus to fulfil the functions of London TravelWatch in relation to rail passengers in the capital.</p> <p>They should report back to the Transport Committee with the legal and financial implications of these arrangements by March 2011.</p>	<p>This proposal would eliminate the duplication of resources allocated to the two bodies to represent passengers of the Train Operating Companies serving the London rail area.</p> <p>Implementation of this proposal might involve contracting Passenger Focus to provide specific services to deliver some of the functions of London TravelWatch relating to overground rail, e.g. dealing with appeals cases, carry out research and liaise with the relevant Train Operating Companies on specific issues.</p> <p>Passenger Focus is under review as part of the central government review of Non-Departmental Public Bodies. At the moment it is still not clear what functions, Passenger Focus will have responsibility for delivering in the future and therefore what scope there may be for London-based passenger representative services to be procured from it. It would therefore be for the Transport Committee to decide, in the light of any changes to the remit or status of Passenger Focus, to decide what services could be practically procured in a way that would deliver value for money and ensure effective passenger representation for users of overground rail services in the capital. Similarly, it may want to consider the level of resource appropriate to support various functions, if they are retained in-house at London TravelWatch, in the light of decisions about passenger</p>	<p>Discussion continuing with DfT and Passenger Focus, but to take account of the Government's proposals for reform of PF, once full details known.</p>

	Issues to be addressed in implementation	Action
	<p>representation at a national level.</p> <p>The Transport Committee will seek to ensure that, regardless of whether functions are commissioned from Passenger Focus or retained in-house, there is appropriate expertise and knowledge to support representation of passengers of overground rail services.</p>	<p>Presentation of options to Transport Committee when the implications of the Government's proposals for PF are known.</p>
<p>Proposal 5</p> <p>We propose that London TravelWatch stops responding to borough consultations relating to streets with immediate effect.</p> <p>Proposal 6</p> <p>We propose that, with immediate effect, London TravelWatch cease responding to large-scale transport consultations to which the Assembly is planning to respond.</p> <p>Proposal 7</p> <p>We propose that London TravelWatch ceases committing resource to production and publication of its performance monitoring reports with immediate effect.</p> <p>Proposal 8</p> <p>We propose that London TravelWatch asks Transport for London to remove its contact details from publicity on buses by the end of 2010. It should ask Transport for London only to provide these details when a complainant</p>	<p>Proposals 5 – 8 concern certain activities currently carried out by London TravelWatch staff. The report argues that these activities are not value for money and should not be continued. It also sets out indicative savings the working group believes would be realised by stopping this work.</p> <p>Without legislative change, it is for the London TravelWatch board to instruct its staff to implement these proposals and to achieve any consequential savings. The Assembly does have powers of direction and guidance over London TravelWatch under section 251 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended).</p> <p>The Transport Committee may therefore want to consult London TravelWatch on these specific proposals and, if it considers appropriate, negotiate alternative proposals that would realise similar savings and the outcomes set out in the working</p>	<p>Discussion with LTW and report to Transport Committee in January 2011.</p>

	Issues to be addressed in implementation	Action
has expressed dissatisfaction with the outcome and wants to appeal. The Board should take further immediate measures to redirect and deter inquiries which are not related to appeals.	group's report.	