


LONDONASSEMBLY

Door-to-door transport in London

Delivering a user-led service

Large print version



Transport Committee
April 2017

Holding the Mayor to
account and investigating
issues that matter to
Londoners

LONDONASSEMBLY

Transport Committee Members



Caroline Pidgeon
MBE AM (Chair)
Liberal Democrat



David Kurten AM
UK Independence
Party



Keith Prince AM
(Deputy Chair)
Conservative



Joanne McCartney
AM
Labour



Kemi Badenoch
AM
Conservative



Steve O'Connell
AM
Conservative



Tom Copley AM
Labour



Caroline Russell
AM
Green



Florence Eshalomi
AM
Labour



Navin Shah AM
Labour

The Transport Committee holds the Mayor and Transport for London to account for their work delivering the capital's transport network. The committee examines all aspects of the transport network and presses for improvements on behalf of Londoners.

Contact

Richard Berry, Scrutiny Manager

TransportCommittee@london.gov.uk

0207 983 4000

Follow us

@LondonAssembly

#AssemblyTransport

facebook.com/london.assembly

Contents

	Large print	Original text
Summary.....	9.....	7
Recommendations.....	12.....	9
1. Introduction	12.....	10
2. Integrating services.....	18.....	13
3. A user-led service.....	25.....	17
Appendix 1: TfL Social Needs Transport roadmap ...	36.....	24
Appendix 2: Views and information	38.....	26
References	40.....	27
Other formats and languages	42.....	29

Keith Prince AM

Rapporteur and Deputy Chair of the Transport Committee



As a Londoner, I take it for granted that I can get on the bus, tube, train or tram whenever I want. London's public transport network allows me to get to work, visit family, go to Church and watch football. But, for many Londoners with mobility issues, these journeys are not possible and they need a different kind of service. Door-to-door transport—Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call, community transport and NHS Patient Transport—gives less mobile Londoners access to public transport, and the opportunities to work and socialise that come with it.

However, as I have found out during the course of this investigation, these services are not meeting the needs of users. I have met and heard from many people who have found it difficult to book journeys, had their journey requests denied, had limits imposed on the length of their journeys, or had their vehicles arrive late or cancelled. Frankly, it's just not good enough.

"The lack of real progress is inexcusable"

The Transport Committee has been pushing Transport for London (TfL) to improve door-to-door services for several years now, focusing on how the various services need to be integrated to improve consistency and efficiency. And, while I am pleased that TfL has a long-term plan for integrating services, the lack of real progress is inexcusable. TfL is really dragging its feet – and it is the people who rely so much on these services who are bearing the brunt.

To deliver a truly user-led service, TfL has to integrate services and set up a single booking system to cover the different service providers. In time, integration will provide an opportunity to introduce personal budgets, which would allow users to take control over the journeys they make and who provides them. Funding for services would follow individuals' choices so the system could become more efficient, leaving more resources for the high quality frontline services that people need and want. TfL needs to think carefully about how this could work. A good start would be to introduce a pilot project in a London borough. If successful, this system could be rolled out across London.

Door-to-door transport remains London's Cinderella public transport option. We are still some distance from our vision for London's door-to-door services, in which people get the service they need, delivered in the most straightforward way, as efficiently as possible. The introduction of personal budgets is a logical final step which would provide flexibility and independence for users who want to be in control of their travel. I hope that TfL responds positively to this report – it needs to remember

that it must provide good quality, efficient, public transport for everyone in London.

Finally, I would like to thank all those who have contributed to this investigation, in particular Dial-a-Ride staff in Redbridge and members of the Richmond Transport Forum and Wandsworth Mobility Forum who met with us. Hearing about their experiences was especially valuable and really highlighted to me just how far we have to go. I would also like to thank scrutiny staff at City Hall who have supported me in this investigation.

Summary

Door-to-door transport services offer vital support for many Londoners with mobility constraints, who are less able to get about on other forms of transport. This makes them a small but essential part of London's transport system.

Transport for London (TfL) is a direct provider of one door-to-door service, Dial-a-Ride, and funds two other services, Taxicard and Capital Call. London boroughs also fund Taxicard, and commission a range of community transport services.

Until TfL is able to make all public transport fully accessible, it has an obligation to ensure effective and comprehensive door-to-door services are available to Londoners. Our vision for London's door-to-door services is one in which people get the service they need, delivered in the most straightforward way, as efficiently as possible. We are still some distance from achieving this.

Integrating services

In previous reports, we have called for the integration of door-to-door services. In practice this would mean that service users can make one phone call—or visit one app or website—to book the journey they need, from their chosen provider. This is a key way in which TfL and its partners can improve the quality and consistency of the user experience, and make services more efficient.

Despite a widespread consensus that integration should happen, progress towards this goal has been slow. TfL's 2015 action plan for integration contains the necessary measures, but is not being implemented with any sense of urgency. In this report, we ask for TfL to address this and report back to us with regular updates.

Personal budgets

Integrating services would provide a new opportunity to deliver a truly user-led door-to-door service, by introducing a reform that has already been implemented in other public services. Service users could be allocated a personal budget, for them to choose what door-to-door journeys they want to make and who will provide them.

Introducing personal budgets would give service users much greater control over the transport service they receive – just as able-bodied people are able to choose where, when and how they travel. As the funding for services would follow individuals' choices, the system could also become more efficient.

Implementing personal budgets would be a significant reform. It would be vital for TfL to study all options for the specific model to be used, and the possible impacts on service users and providers. Concerns have been expressed, for instance, that some frequent users of door-to-door services may face new limits on how many journeys they can take, and that bus-based services may become less viable if some people opt out of these services.

We recommend that TfL initiate a pilot project in a London borough to test how personal budgets would work in practice as part of an integrated door-to-door transport service.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

TfL should set out a timed plan for implementation of its roadmap towards integration of door-to-door services. In view of the slow progress since the Committee's last report, TfL should also provide written progress reports to the Committee every six months for the remainder of this Mayoral term. We ask that TfL write to the committee by the end of July 2017 setting out its response to this recommendation.

Recommendation 2

TfL should explore the feasibility of introducing a system of personal budgets to an integrated door-to-door service, with a timed action to do this added to the service integration plan. This work should be carried out with a view to introducing a pilot scheme in a London borough to test the concept. We ask that TfL write to the committee by the end of July 2017 setting out its response to this recommendation.

1. Introduction

Key points

- Door-to-door services are a vital resource for thousands of Londoners with limited mobility.
- Service users continue to encounter problems with availability, reliability and pricing.
- Our investigation has gathered evidence from a large number of users, providers and other stakeholders to assess the potential of personal budgets.

- 1.1 Door-to-door transport services are specialist services designed for people with mobility issues. They offer vital support for Londoners who are less able to get about on other forms of transport. This makes them a small but essential part of London's transport system. Although TfL has an ambition to make all public transport fully accessible, until it does so it has an obligation to ensure an effective and comprehensive door-to-door service.
- 1.2 Transport for London (TfL) is one of the key providers and funders of door-to-door services. It directly operates the Dial-a-Ride service, provides the majority of the funding for the Taxicard service, and funds and commissions the Capital Call service. London boroughs also have a significant role, commissioning and funding Taxicard and community transport. The wide range of service providers include licensed taxi and private hire operators, and a number of community transport providers.

Types of door-to-door service

Service ¹	Operator and commissioner	Approximate costs and funding	Membership and usage
Dial-a-Ride Minibus service, on which individuals book specific journeys and are then grouped based on time and location	TfL in-house operation	£35m annual cost Fully funded by TfL Journeys are free to users	48,000 members 1.3m journeys a year
Taxicard Service mainly delivered by black taxis, where individuals book a specific journey and receive a fare subsidy	Commissioned by London Councils Operated by CityFleet, with several taxi firms	£12m annual cost 81% funding from TfL & 19% funding from boroughs Users pay contribution to each journey (around £2.50)	66,000 members 1.3m journeys a year
Capital Call Supplementary service for Taxicard, using minicabs, in boroughs that traditionally have fewer black taxis	Commissioned by TfL Operated by Transport Co-ordination Centre, with minicab firms	£500,000 annual cost Fully funded by TfL Users pay contribution to each journey (£1.50)	2,000 members (closed to new members) 23,000 journeys a year
Community Transport Mainly minibus services with a mixture of individually booked journeys and regular services	Commissioned by boroughs 22 independent operators in London	Overall costs not aggregated	1.8m journeys a year

¹ Other door-to-door services include NHS Patient Transport and social services transport. TfL also funds a travel mentoring service for disabled people, with 12,000 accompanied journeys per year.

- 1.3 The Transport Committee has investigated door-to-door services several times in recent years (note 1). During these investigations, we received many reports from service users and their representatives about problems with services. For Dial-a-Ride, for instance, we have heard of journey requests being denied, poor reliability, limitations on journey length and groups being separated. For Taxicard, we have heard about a lack of disability awareness among drivers, and inconsistencies in pricing between boroughs. Users have also complained about a lack of coordination between services, and having to contact a range of different organisations to book journeys.

“Dial-a-Ride can be good but the system is now free. The main problem with it is that often you get refused trips at short notice or told you have to vary your times.”

Service user, Kingston upon Thames

Our investigation

- 1.4 This investigation was led by Keith Prince AM as a rapporteur for the Transport Committee. The particular focus has been on the potential introduction of personal budgets for door-to-door service users. This is a way of paying for services that has been introduced in other sectors, notably social care, and has been discussed as a possibility for door-to-door services for a number of years. We have set out to assess whether this reform could help

people with mobility problems exercise more control over their lives, or increase the quality and efficiency of services.

- 1.5 We have gathered evidence through a range of methods. Our call for views and information attracted 25 written submissions from Londoners, service providers and other organisations. We held meetings at City Hall with a range of stakeholders, and spoke to service users directly at local mobility forums.
- 1.6 In this report, we set out the conclusions of our investigation and make recommendations to the Mayor and TfL about how the potential of personal budgets in delivering an improved, user-led door-to-door transport service could be tested.

2. Integrating services

Key points

- Door-to-door services suffer from a lack of coordination, causing duplication and making life more difficult for service users.
- Previous attempts to integrate door-to-door services have failed, and progress implementing TfL's latest action plan has been slow.
- TfL and its partners need to prioritise integration as a necessary step towards an efficient, personalised door-to-door service.

- 2.1 It is a long-held ambition for London's door-to-door services to be integrated much more closely, rather than being run as separate operations. TfL reiterated the benefits for service users in its submission to our investigation:

“Bringing [door-to-door services] together is a challenging undertaking, although the customer benefits are worth having. Integration can help ensure better services for users, as it should mean users get the right kind of service delivered to them, according to their needs and the type of journey they are making. It should also help to make services more efficient by increasing service integration and reducing duplication.” (note 2)

- 2.2 London Councils, which commissions Taxicard on behalf of boroughs, highlighted the potential efficiency gains:

“Greater integration would minimise duplication of administrative procedures, thereby freeing up funding for journeys. It should provide better value for money, service quality and ensure that appropriate capacity was available.”(note 3)

- 2.3 Service integration is also considered by many stakeholders to be a pre-requisite for the introduction of personal budgets (note 4). We have heard that integration is required to enable a holistic assessment of a person's travel needs; to allow people to access a wide range of potential service providers via a single booking system; and to ensure common service standards across providers. The practicalities of implementing personal budgets are discussed further in the next chapter.

Delays in delivering a joined-up service

- 2.4 The key partners in door-to-door transport acknowledge that the current patchwork quilt of services does not serve Londoners well. A strategy for integration was published by London Councils in 2009, and a multi-agency project board involving TfL was established. However, there was no significant movement towards integration in the wake of this plan (note 5).
- 2.5 The Transport Committee published a report on door-to-door services in 2015, calling for tangible steps towards service integration (note 6). Among the specific changes we recommended were:
- consistent eligibility criteria for membership of door-to-door services
 - a single membership application process for all services
 - a single customer feedback system
 - customers being able to book journeys for all services in one place – that is, by phoning one call centre, or visiting one website
 - joint commissioning of services by TfL and boroughs
- 2.6 Following our report, TfL carried out the Social Needs Transport Review to examine door-to-door services and other support for people with mobility issues. This work led to the publication of a ‘roadmap’ toward integration of services, with key measures summarised below, and further detail in the Appendix (note 7). TfL gave an update on its progress in its submission to this investigation.

Based on this, the table below summarises our assessment of progress on each measure.

Progress with TfL's roadmap for door-to-door service integration	
Customer contact experience	
Short-term: Following joint tendering, move to a single customer complaints and feedback process, a single set of eligibility criteria and a single membership process for Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call, and, where applicable, the TfL Travel Mentoring service.	No progress reported by TfL
Medium-term: Work to introduce a single booking process for customers, ultimately moving to an integrated booking centre for Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call and Travel Mentoring.	No progress reported by TfL
Medium-term: Following the implementation of a single booking process, trials of a local, decentralised booking process could take place.	Measure would be dependent on the above
Long-term: Seek to expand the role of the integrated operation to secure more cooperation and coordination with other providers across London.	Measure would be dependent on the above

Transport services	
Short-term: Re-let current contractual arrangements for Dial-a-Ride's Multi-Occupancy Accessible Transport (MOAT) contracts with community transport providers, in a form that would incentivise contractors to invest in vehicles, drivers and training.	TfL has reviewed and expanded its MOAT contract and procurement is on track
Short-term: Diversify the use of the Dial-a-Ride fleet, contracting out to other service providers who also have a need for the fleet's specialist vehicles and trained drivers.	Dial-a-Ride has been separated into delivery and commissioning parts, although TfL has not reported diversification of fleet usage
Medium-term: In partnership with London Councils and boroughs, develop a new contracting framework for taxi and private hire providers to deliver services for Dial-a-Ride and Taxicard.	Agreement reached on joint procurement of taxi services for Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride

- 2.7 TfL's roadmap contains most of the measures we previously recommended. It defines actions as short, medium or long-term measures, although beyond this no specific timings for delivery were established.

"It would be good to integrate door-to-door services so you are able to find a mode of transport to get you to where you need to be, on time, without a long wait."

Service user, Southwark

- 2.8 While we welcome TfL accepting many of our recommendations, we have found that progress toward delivering this plan has been very slow. TfL has undertaken steps to deliver some of its pledges, namely to re-let Multi-Occupancy Accessible Transport contracts for Dial-a-Ride, and introduce an internal separation between the commissioning and provision of Dial-a-Ride.
- 2.9 However, there appears to have been only one significant step toward service integration to date, which is an agreement between TfL and London Councils to jointly procure taxi services for Taxicard and Dial-a-Ride (note 8). This measure may improve the efficiency of services by joining up a back-office function, although it will not directly affect the user experience.
- 2.10 Users of door-to-door services should be able to make one phone call—or visit one app or website—to arrange a journey. They should be able to access all available services from this one source, and receive the most appropriate service for their needs. This is the vision for door-to-door services that has been promised to Londoners, and not delivered.**
- 2.11 We are disappointed that little further progress has been made to integrate door-to-door services in London, after many years of discussions and with various plans having been drawn up. Moves towards delivering a more personalised service will be delayed if integration is not delivered. Although we note that TfL and its partners are committed to integration, clearly this agenda has not been given sufficient priority.**

Recommendation 1

TfL should set out a timed plan for implementation of its roadmap towards integration of door-to-door services. In view of the slow progress since the Committee's last report, TfL should also provide written progress reports to the Committee every six months for the remainder of this Mayoral term. We ask that TfL write to the committee by the end of July 2017 setting out its response to this recommendation.

3. A user-led service

Key points

- Personal budgets give service users a specific cash allocation to purchase services. They have been introduced in other public services, with different models available.
- Introducing personal budgets in door-to-door services would give control to service users over the journeys they make, and who provides them.
- Implementing this reform would require attention to issues such as different levels of demand among service users, and the viability of existing providers.
- A pilot programme could be established in a London borough to test this proposal and identify how it works in practice.

- 3.1 One option for rethinking how door-to-door services are delivered is to introduce personal budgets for service users. This would involve allocating a certain amount of money to each user or member, for them to purchase directly the journeys they wish to take and choose who will provide the journey. There has been a move towards ‘personalisation’ of other public services in recent years, with personal budgets notably used in social care, as discussed below.

Personal budgets in social care

A personal budget is a sum of money that is allocated to someone to cover the cost of social care services. The amount is determined by an assessment of individual needs.

Personal budgets have been available to adults in receipt of social and community care for a number of years. Since April 2015, following the Care Act, local authorities have been obliged to offer personal budgets and produce care plans for all adult service users.

Personal budgets can be delivered in three ways:

- Direct Payments – the money is given to the service user to commission care services from their chosen provider.
- Managed Arrangements – local authorities commission services to meet the outcomes in a care plan that is created with the service user.
- Individual Service Fund – a third party organisation manages the budget and services under instruction from the service user.

- 3.2 Personal budgets have previously been proposed for door-to-door services. The 2009 strategy published by London Councils recommended that personal budgets be introduced as part of an integrated service, although it also noted that a range of implementation challenges would need to be addressed. TfL told the committee in 2015 that personal budgets would be explored in the Social Needs Transport Review, but the topic was not included in the final report from the review (note 9).
- 3.3 Some elements of the personal budget approach are already a feature of door-to-door services. For Taxicard, members have a personal trip allocation – generally 104 trips per year, depending on the borough. For Capital Call, members have a personal budget of £200 per year.
- 3.4 As demonstrated by their implementation in social care, there is no single model of personal budgets. The system could work in a variety of different ways. Some of the different aspects that would need to be determined by commissioners would include:
- whether personal budgets would be mandatory for all members of door-to-door services, or if they would be free to opt out
 - whether service users would receive a direct cash allocation to spend on services, or a virtual budget for each individual held centrally by TfL or boroughs
 - the extent to which service users could access support to help them manage their personal budget, if required

- the range of providers that service users could engage – that is, whether they could spend the budget on any service, or only on approved providers
- whether users would need to make an out-of-pocket contribution to pay for journeys – presently they do on Taxicard and Capital Call, but not on Dial-a-Ride

“I get 52 Taxicard trips a year which is not enough. I spent on average £50 to £80 a month out of my pocket on door to door transport.”

Service user, Wandsworth

Potential benefits of personal budgets

3.5 Introducing personal budgets could have a range of benefits for door-to-door service users, and help make the system more efficient:

- Service users would have a greater sense of control over the services they receive – as able-bodied people are free to choose how to spend their money on public transport services, disabled people would be more able to exercise the same right in relation to door-to-door services.
- Service users would be free to take different types of journey. For instance, people can use their Taxicard to pay for two journeys per week, but only for journeys of a certain length. With a personal budget, they should be able to take a smaller number of longer journeys if this is their preference.

- Service users would be free to use different providers offering the most appropriate service for them. For instance if they need to travel in a vehicle accessible to a particular type of wheelchair, they could choose a service providing this. Users might also be able to use their budget to pay for other types of service, for instance a travel buddy to accompany them on public transport.
- Resources spent on door-to-door services would become better targeted on what service users need and want, as the money would follow the choices people make. For instance, TfL spends approximately £27 on each Dial-a-Ride journey, on average. If people did not need to use the fully-accessible minibus that Dial-a-Ride provides, these resources might be more efficiently used on other services.

3.6 Wandsworth Community Transport, a charitable organisation providing accessible services, emphasised the benefits of user choice in its submission:

“What is needed is a system with more choice – if you want to use up your yearly travel allowance on some long distance trips, why not! Maybe a daily short trip [in a minicab] might be the cheapest and most convenient solution for you. Or maybe Dial-a-Ride suits you best. Have a list of approved transport suppliers (which could include Community Transports and accessible cab companies) and give people a budget and let them choose what suits them best.” (note 10)

3.7 Similarly, the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA), which represents many drivers providing door-to-door

services, also expressed how personal budgets could increase flexibility for users:

“Personal travel budgets for door-to-door services would give users the freedom to choose a preferred supplier which suits their needs. Current use of centralised contractors has limited the flexibility of door-to-door transport services, as they are often unable to provide transport in a specific location, or at required times.” (note 11)

Implementing personal budgets

- 3.8 We have heard during this investigation that implementing a system of personal budgets for door-to-door services would involve a number of risks and challenges. For service users, it would be important that they are able to manage a personal budget, and that they do not face the risk of losing the services they need. For the door-to-door provider market, it would be important to encourage new providers without undermining the viability of existing specialist services some people rely on. Some of the challenges experienced in social care are summarised in the box on the next page.

Managing a personal budget

- 3.9 Using a personal budget may be challenging for some door-to-door service users. It would add extra responsibility for making financial decisions regarding their transport needs. Submissions we have received from London boroughs suggest that elderly users and those with learning disabilities may find it most difficult (note 12).

There would also be a need for a robust system to prevent fraudulent use of a personal budget.

- 3.10 As discussed above, users of Taxicard and Capital Call will be accustomed to a personal budget approach. Those who solely use Dial-a-Ride, which tends to be those with more profound disabilities, may not be as familiar. Some users may require support to manage their budget, either from carers or via TfL or boroughs. It is possible, as in social care, to introduce a model for personal budgets that allows people to access a personal cash allocation, but without having to hold this directly.

Demand for services

- 3.11 A system of personal budgets may also have to account for the fact that not all services users have the same level of need, or make the same demands on services. Some people may need to use door-to-door services for every journey they make, while others may use them only occasionally if other options are not available for a particular journey.
- 3.12 One potential risk highlighted by London Councils is that a personal budget could encourage higher usage, which would need to be funded. This may happen if, for instance, someone who currently uses services infrequently decides to take advantage of their full cash allocation. It may be argued, of course, that people in need should be encouraged to use a service designed for them. In any case, we have not seen direct evidence that there would be an increase in demand. Evidence from the Taxicard service, which gives people an annual trip allocation, is

that many members do not use their full allocations (note 13).

Challenges of personal budgets in social care

Personal budgets are intended to cut back-office costs, allowing more money to be spent on the frontline, and therefore improve outcomes for service users by giving them control over the care they receive.

A recent National Audit Office (NAO) study found that local authorities using personal budgets faced a number of challenges (note 15):

- Some service users did not benefit from personalisation of care as local authorities did not have the capacity to support them to manage their budgets and commission appropriate care services.
- Some local authorities could not afford to increase personal budgets above the cost of local authority commissioned services to allow service users their preferred but more expensive option.
- Some local authorities were not able to manage and support care markets to develop a diverse and sustainable range of providers, leading to rising costs or diminishing choice of service providers.

- 3.13 A key challenge would be to ensure people are receiving the right amount of personal budget to meet their needs. A concern is the possibility of some users facing reductions in the number of journeys they can take. For instance, TfL has highlighted the risk that those who need to use Dial-a-Ride frequently may find that their personal budget does

not cover the cost of all of the journeys they currently make:

“Establishing travel budgets for a particular service involves difficult judgements to determine the budget needed and to predict the impact on existing demand. For example, introducing a trip budget of one trip a week for Dial-a-Ride services could limit daily customers.” (note 14)

- 3.14 This issue may particularly affect those with more profound disabilities. There may be a number of ways in which this could be addressed. Service users might be assessed to identify their level of need and given an appropriate budget. Alternatively, there might be a system of redistributing unused allocations from infrequent users, perhaps on a monthly or quarterly basis.

Door-to-door market

- 3.15 One of the potential benefits of introducing personal budgets is the greater freedom for services users to choose their preferred providers, including those from the public, voluntary or private sectors. We have heard a greater range of providers and services would need to be available to ensure personal budgets enable increased choice (note 16). Some private hire operators appear to be seeking to expand their accessible services (note 17), although it is not yet clear if there would be sufficient capacity in local markets across London to enable greater choice everywhere.
- 3.16 A concern raised by a number of stakeholders is that greater personal choice may inadvertently lead to certain types of service becoming less viable (note 18). As set out

in a submission from the Community Transport Association:

“Caution needs to be taken to ensure a move towards personal budgets does not have a negative impact on the financial viability of communal transport. The financial structure of community transport in particular means it can provide services where it would be unprofitable for commercial services to do so. There is a risk that personal budgets could cause a disparate funding system that limits the travel options of some of London’s least mobile citizens.”

“One lesson which could be learned from social care is that sufficient funding has to be put in place to ensure that all those who need support receive it. Sufficient capacity has to be in place so that service users can actually find transport providers when they want to use them.”

Service user, Croydon

- 3.17 In particular, bus-based services such as Dial-a-Ride may be most affected if a large number of service users take advantage of their personal budget to opt for individual travel options, such as taxis and private hire vehicles, especially if these are cheaper. It is to be welcomed, of course, that people are more able to choose the option that is right for them. However, it is important that the viability of services that offer specialist support to those with more profound disabilities have a sufficient number of users and funding to remain viable. The social element of bus-based services is also welcomed by some users, and could be lost to some extent.

- 3.18** The potential value of personal budgets to door-to-door service users, in terms of user choice, flexibility and better targeting of resources, is such that the proposal clearly warrants more detailed consideration than TfL has previously given it. We agree with the position that the immediate priority for TfL and its partners is to deliver the promised integration of services. Introducing personal budgets should be explored as a key element of a new, integrated service.
- 3.19** Some concerns have been raised about different impacts on service users and providers. We take these seriously, but are of the view that none presents an insurmountable challenge. Reform is always difficult. There is no evidence to assume that personal budgets would necessarily lead to a loss of service for some users, or make some services unviable.
- 3.20** We believe this proposal would lend itself to being piloted in one borough, to assess the wider implementation challenges and to identify how the system will work in practice. If successful, it could be rolled out across London.

Recommendation 2

TfL should explore the feasibility of introducing a system of personal budgets to an integrated door-to-door service, with a timed action to do this added to the service integration plan. This work should be carried out with a view to introducing a pilot scheme in a London borough to test the concept. We ask that TfL write to the committee by the end of July 2017 setting out its response to this recommendation.

Appendix 1: TfL Social Needs Transport roadmap

Customer contact experience

Short-term

Following joint tendering, move to a single customer complaints and feedback process, a single set of eligibility criteria and a single membership process for Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call, and, where applicable, the TfL Travel Mentoring service. This will result in a service that is much simpler for customers to use and understand and one that is cheaper to administer.

Medium-term

Work to introduce a single booking process for customers. Initially this could mean a single phone number, with calls connected through to the relevant call centre. The fundamental step will be to move to an integrated booking centre providing an integrated service for users of Dial-a-Ride, Taxicard, Capital Call and Travel Mentoring, providing a single booking point for all services.

Following these steps, trials of a local, decentralised booking process (as requested by a number of stakeholders, who believe this would lead to more effective booking and scheduling and a more personalised customer service) could take place.

Long-term

Seek to expand the role of the integrated operation to secure more cooperation and coordination with other providers across London, with the aim of commissioning provision from the most appropriate and cost-effective providers.

Transport services

Short-term

TfL will re-let its current contractual arrangements for Dial-a-Ride's Multi-Occupancy Accessible Transport (MOAT) contracts, currently in place with six community transport providers, in a form that would incentivise contractors to invest in the vehicles, drivers and training. This will provide ongoing support for the community transport sector.

TfL will start to diversify the use of the Dial-a-Ride fleet, contracting out to other service providers who also have a need for the fleet's specialist vehicles and trained drivers. This would improve the overall efficiency of the fleet and start to integrate the services TfL provides with those in the education and health sectors.

Medium-term

The taxi and private hire industry already provides significant transport services to both Dial-a-Ride and Taxicard. In partnership with London Councils and boroughs, TfL will develop a new contracting framework, letting a series of contracts to meet the requirements on the service. The new contracts will include enhanced standards of customer service including enhanced training requirements.

Appendix 2: Views and information

Meetings

Keith Prince AM and other committee members undertook the following activities during the investigation:

- Visit to a meeting of the Richmond Transport Forum
- Visit to a meeting of the Wandsworth Mobility Forum
- Informal meeting with representatives of Community Transport Association
- Informal meeting with representatives of London Councils
- Informal meeting with representatives of Transport for London
- Informal meeting with representatives of Transport for All

Submissions

In addition to six submissions from individual Londoners, the committee received written submissions from the following organisations:

- CityFleet Business
- Community Transport Association
- Croydon Mobility Forum
- Ealing Community Transport (Confidential)
- Gett
- HCT Group
- Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

- London Borough of Camden
- London Borough of Southwark
- London Councils
- Thomas Pocklington Trust
- Transport for London
- Uber
- Wandsworth Community Transport

References

Note 1: London Assembly, [Letter from Transport Committee to the Mayor on Dial-a-Ride performance](#), March 2009; [Door-to-door transport services](#), June 2010; [Improving door-to-door transport in London: Next steps](#), January 2015

Note 2: Written submission from Transport for London, January 2017. Written submissions are available to download via: <https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/london-assembly/london-assembly-publications?order=DESC>

Note 3: Written submission from London Councils, January 2017

Note 4: Written submissions from Transport for London; London Councils; Transport for All; Croydon Mobility Forum, January 2017

Note 5: London Councils / eo consulting, [A Future Door to Door Strategy for London](#), September 2009

Note 6: London Assembly, [Improving door-to-door transport in London: Next steps](#), January 2015

Note 7: Written submission from Transport for London, January 2017

Note 8: Informal meetings with London Councils, 21 December 2016; Transport for London, 12 January 2017

Note 9: Transport for London response to Transport Committee report on door-to-door services, April 2015

Note 10: Written submission from Manuel Button, Managing Director of Wandsworth Community Transport, January 2017

Note 11: Written submission from Licensed Taxi Drivers Association, January 2017

Note 12: Written submissions from London Borough of Southwark, December 2016; London Borough of Camden, January 2017

Note 13: Written submission from London Councils, January 2017

Note 14: Written submission from Transport for London, January 2017

Note 15: National Audit Office, [Personalised commissioning in adult social care, Department of Health and local authorities](#), March 2016.

Note 16: Meeting of Richmond Transport Forum, 16 January 2017

Note 17: Written submission from Uber, January 2017

Note 18: Written submissions from Croydon Mobility Forum; London Borough of Camden; Community Transport Association, January 2017

Other formats and languages

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Chinese

如您需要这份文件的简介的翻译本，
请电话联系或按上面所提供的邮寄地址或
Email 与我们联系。

Vietnamese

Nếu ông (bà) muốn nội dung văn bản này được dịch sang tiếng Việt, xin vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi bằng điện thoại, thư hoặc thư điện tử theo địa chỉ ở trên.

Greek

Εάν επιθυμείτε περίληψη αυτού του κειμένου στην γλώσσα σας, παρακαλώ καλέστε τον αριθμό ή επικοινωνήστε μαζί μας στην ανωτέρω ταχυδρομική ή την ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση.

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinize çevrilmiş bir özetini okumak isterseniz, lütfen yukarıdaki telefon numarasını arayın, veya posta ya da e-posta adresi aracılığıyla bizimle temasa geçin.

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਸੰਖੇਪ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਲੈਣਾ ਚਾਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਉਪਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਡਾਕ ਜਾਂ ਈਮੇਲ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Hindi

यदि आपको इस दस्तावेज़ का सारांश अपनी भाषा में चाहिए तो उपर दिये हुए नंबर पर फोन करें या उपर दिये गये डाक पते या ई मेल पते पर हम से संपर्क करें।

Bengali

আপনি যদি এই দলিলের একটি সারাংশ নিজের ভাষায় পেতে চান, তাহলে দয়া করে ফো করবেন অথবা উল্লেখিত ডাক ঠিকানায় বা ই-মেইল ঠিকানায় আমাদের সাথে যোগাযোগ করবেন।

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ کرم نمبر پر فون کریں یا مذکورہ بالا ڈاک کے پتے یا ای میل پتے پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Arabic

الحصول على ملخص لهذا المستند بلغتك،
فراجع الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو الاتصال على
العنوان البريدي العادي أو عنوان البريدي
الالكتروني أعلاه.

Gujarati

જો તમારે આ દસ્તાવેજનો સાર તમારી ભાષામાં
જોઈતો હોય તો ઉપર આપેલ નંબર પર ફોન કરો
અથવા ઉપર આપેલ ટપાલ અથવા ઇ-મેઇલ સરનામા
પર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.



Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

More London

London SE1 2AA

Enquiries 020 7983 4100

Minicom 020 7983 4458

www.london.gov.uk