



EQUALITIES & ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE FORUM

**Conference Room 3, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ
Friday 27th January 2016 – 10:00am**

AGENDA

- 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. MINUTES**
 - (a) Equalities Forum of 24th October 2016
- 3. EQUALITY OUTCOMES 2017 – 2021 PROGRESS REPORT – Report by Emily Whitters**
- 4. SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON GENDER REPRESENTATION ON PUBLIC BOARDS (SCOTLAND) BILL – Report by Emily Whitters**
- 5. BOARD DIVERSITY SUCCESSION PLAN / BOARD OBSERVERS – Report by Emily Whitters / George Eckton**
- 6. NATIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2 PRE-CONSULTATION – Report by George Eckton**
- 7. RESPONSIBLE PARKING CONSULTATION – Verbal update by George Eckton**
- 8. SESTRAN MODEL 3 UPDATE – Report by George Eckton**
- 9. SESTRAN PROJECTS UPDATE – Report by Lisa Freeman**
- 10. BUSINESS PLAN 2017/18 – Verbal update by George Eckton**

20th January 2017.

Telephone: 0131 524 5150 or E-mail: reception@sestran.gov.uk

Agendas and papers for all SEStran meetings can be accessed on www.sestran.gov.uk

EQUALITIES FORUM

MONDAY 24 OCTOBER 2016

CONFERENCE ROOMS 7 & 8, VICTORIA QUAY

Present

Lisa Freeman (Chair)	SEStran
(LF)	
John Ballantine (JB)	SATA
Nikki Boath (NB)	SEStran
Karen Brown (KB)	NHS Lothian
Angela Chambers (AC)	SEStran
Mark Craske (MC)	NHS Forth Valley
George Curley (GC)	NHS Lothian
George Eckton (GE)	SEStran
Mike Harrison (MH)	Midlothian Access Panel
John Moore (JM)	LCTS
Gordon Mungall (GM)	West Lothian Access Committee
Moira Mungall (MM)	Disability West Lothian
Emily Whitters (EW)	SEStran
Dennis Wilson (DW)	Edinburgh Access Panel

Apologies

Cllr Lesley Hinds	City of Edinburgh Council
Sophie Bridger	Stonewall
Lesley Crozier	Mid/East Lothian Council
Jane Findlay	Fife Council
Toni Giugliano	Age Scotland
John Jack	Non Cllr Member
Stuart Lockhart	One-Ticket Ltd
Alan Rees	SATA
Catriona Scally	West Lothian Access Committee
Tim Steiner	JMP

Ref	Actions	
1	Introduction	
	LF welcomed everyone and conducted round the table introductions. Apologies were noted as above.	
2	Matters Arising from Minutes of Previous Meeting	
	<u>Thistle Card Update including App Development</u> GM agreed to get symbols from Catriona Scally to support the primary disability sticker.	Gordon Mungall
	GM to send a contact list from other Access Panel Networks for feedback on app.	Gordon Mungall

	<p><u>Waverley/Haymarket/Edinburgh Gateway</u> LF has spoken to Network Rail regarding the taxi rank at Waverley Station and a business plan is underway. Network Rail will be holding a meeting with City of Edinburgh Council.</p> <p>There were no further matters arising from the previous meeting.</p>	
3	Passenger Transport Authorities	
	GE outlined the paper and a general discussion took place.	
4	Review of SEStran Liaison Structures	
	<p>GE gave a verbal report regarding Forums structures and suggested that potentially some of the current Forums could be integrated. GE highlighted that the Equalities Forum is valuable and invited comments from the Forum members. A general discussion took place and it was highlighted by members that the Forum has been diluted. LF reported that SEStran has done a recruitment drive to invite other organisations with protected characteristics to attend the Equalities Forum. JM suggested contacting the TSIs directly.</p>	Lisa Freeman
5	Equality Outcomes	
	<p>GE presented a paper on Equality Outcomes. GE recommended that the focus should be on delivering a smaller number of Equality Outcomes for period 2017-2021. GE advised a consultation paper will be sent out at the beginning of 2017 and the Equalities Forum will have an opportunity to review these comments following the consultation at the next meeting before publishing in March 2017. JB questioned the proposed new format and highlighted it is important to look at more than just data. GE agreed with the comments but advised that a baseline needs to be set. The general consensus was that the new format needs to be tried.</p>	
6.	Board Diversity/Succession Plan	
	<p>EW presented a paper and outlined the contents. EW invited feedback on the paper from the Forum. A general discussion took place and it was suggested that appointing a service user with protected characteristics to the Board could be beneficial.</p> <p>GM communicated that he would be willing to attend the Partnership Board as an Observer and highlighted that this is a good opportunity for Personal Development. GM suggested an alternate could be introduced also.</p>	Gordon Mungall
7.	Thistle App	
	<p>LF presented a report. LF thanked SATA for the Award. LF brought to the attention of the Forum that the app is now available for testing and would welcome comments on the development of the app by the end of November. The app will also be sent to Operators for comments. KB advised that this will be put on the NHS Intranet.</p> <p>LF requested assistance with obtaining learning disability symbols.</p>	Karen Brown

8.	Accessible Travel Framework	
	LF presented a paper and highlighted that SEStran and its Forums have an ever increasing relevance to the delivery of the Outcomes. LF also highlighted that the Thistle card is acknowledged within the paper. MH said that the RTPs have a strong part to play in the Framework.	
9.	NTS2 Consultation	
	LF gave a verbal update. LF communicated that Transport Scotland had been in contact stating that Transport Scotland are committed to a collaborative review and this is currently being planned. Stakeholder events are likely to start early 2017. RTPs will be represented in the new NTS Stakeholder Advisory Group.	
10.	Update on RTS	
	LF gave a verbal update. LF highlighted that a Refresh has been done and the scoping exercise is currently being undertaken.	
11.	Emerging Transport Bill (Responsible Parking)	
	GE delivered the paper. A consultation paper is imminent and it was agreed that GE will bring this paper to next Equalities Forum meeting for further discussion.	
12.	RSA Inclusive Growth Commission	
	GE presented the paper. GE pointed out that SEStran will be responding before Christmas and therefore the timescale for comments is mid December.	
13.	Access to Healthcare	
	GE gave a verbal update. GE reported that a discussion had taken place with John Jack to merge the Access to Healthcare and Equalities Forum and GE highlighted that this merger could be beneficial for both Forums. GE also reported that John Jack is willing to chair the future joint Forum. GE also advised that the main action from the last Access to Healthcare Forum, namely the strategic plan, could be taken forward. GE invited comments from the Forum. A general discussion took place.	
14.	AOCB	
	<p><u>Waverley Station – Taxis</u> DW raised a concern regarding taxi accessibility at Waverley Station. GE offered to speak to Network Rail and DFT regarding access and will report back to the Forum.</p> <p><u>Comments forwarded from Forum Members unable to attend the meeting</u></p> <p><u>Tim Steiner, JMP</u> There are some clear synergies between access to healthcare and equalities (notably that people who are more deprived tend to have greater need to access healthcare services and yet fewer modal choices about how to do so). But the access to healthcare agenda should also include a range of environmental considerations (manifesting themselves through travel plans, parking strategies,</p>	George Eckton

	<p>etc), and it would be a shame if the integration meant that this second element became overlooked.</p> <p><u>John Macdonald, CTA</u> I have read through the papers including the Equality Outcomes. My main comment is that as SEStran develop new outcomes that steps are taken to give people who share a protected characteristic the opportunity to contribute to the process. I would be very happy to be involved with this in the coming months and years.</p> <p><u>Lesley Crozier, Mid/East Lothian Council</u> I have looked over the agenda papers and would comment that the Forum should note that all nine existing protected characteristics should be represented – there are times when marriage and civil partnership and pregnancy and maternity are missing from the list/(s). I would also ask the Forum to note that the tenth protected characteristic (not yet enacted) of socio-economic deprivation is likely to be enacted in 2017, and so I will be including an outcome/(s) which will cover this for East and Midlothian Councils for the period 2017 – 2021. I am more than happy to discuss these matters further if this would be useful.</p>	
15.	Next of Meeting	
	The date of the next meeting is to be confirmed.	

SEStran Equality Outcomes 2017 – 2021 Progress Report

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 SEStran is a listed public body under the Equality Act 2010 and the Equality Act 2012 (Scotland) Specific Duties Regulations, and as such we have a duty to publish a set of Equality Outcomes covering the period April 2017 – 2021 to enable us to better perform the equality duty.

2. OUTCOMES 2013 – 2017

2.1 SEStran published a first set of Equality Outcomes in March 2013 and progress against these was published in March 2015. The EHRC guidance outlines a need to review progress against and continuing relevance of the public bodies previous set of outcomes before developing a new set of outcomes. This review was carried out in late autumn of last year and can be seen at appendix 1. A clear result of this review was the need to focus on clearer outcomes, rather than actions/outputs.

2.2 A number of the outcomes are based on the existing Regional Transport Strategy, developed in 2006/07 when SEStran had a considerable capital budget. In the course of subsequent years, this funding was removed from SEStran's control, reducing the capability of SEStran to directly influence delivery of many of the outcomes.

3. OUTCOMES 2017 – 2021

3.1 SEStran employees met several times over the autumn months to discuss the process of reviewing the set of outcomes and developing new outcomes. From these meetings a project plan and participation statement was developed to better enable the involvement of individuals and groups representing those with protected characteristics under the Equality Act to know how and when they can engage in shaping SEStran's Equality Outcomes. The participation statement was subsequently endorsed by the Equalities Forum on the 24th October and is included at appendix 2 for information.

3.2 As SEStran, currently has a very specific remit to produce a Regional Transport Strategy, alongside our duties as an employer, two outcomes were developed on the following 2 strategic issues:

- An equitable, diverse and representative organisation
- A safe, accessible and equitable regional transport network.

3.3 SEStran officers recognise that the two areas of focus above do not cover all that we aspire to do on equality, but they focus on our main functions and duties. We recognise that there are important issues in terms of equality, but these are within the duties of other public bodies. Clearly, if SEStran was in

the future to receive further powers, functions and resources e.g. a move to a Model 3 RTP, we would seek to develop further relevant outcomes.

- 3.4** At the Partnership Board meeting of the 2nd December, the Board approved a 4 – 6 week consultation period on the Outcomes. This was issued on 15th December and closed on the 17th January. The consultation documents can be seen at appendix 3.
- 3.5** Three responses were received and in the main outlined broad support or agreed on both Outcomes. The key requests were that there was more detail provided on certain actions and the specific greater inclusion of learning disability groups and local groups. The Equalities forum has an open membership but officers will seek to engage these groups to raise awareness of the Forum. There was also a specific request to address information gaps for certain groups who couldn't access Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) and a request for non-technical provision of data. SEStran would welcome members input on how to progress this.

4. EVIDENCE BASE

- 4.1** SEStran are in the process of compiling relevant equality evidence to support our Equality Outcomes. This evidence has mostly been sourced from the Scottish Government Equality Evidence web resource as well as census data. SEStran aim to develop their equality evidence further and the draft evidence base can be seen in appendix 4.

5. MAINSTREAMING REPORT

- 5.1** SEStran has a duty to publish a Mainstreaming report by April 2017 alongside our renewed equality outcomes for 2017-2021 and a general report on progress. Within the report we must publish the progress we have made to make the general equality duty integral to the exercise of our functions, an annual breakdown of information gathered on employees and how it's been used to further the equality duty. On the receipt of information from a Scottish Government survey we also have a responsibility to publish the gender composition of the SEStran board and a Board Diversity Succession Plan.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1** The forum are asked to:
- Comment upon the final development of the Equality Outcomes
 - Consider ways in which SEStran could progress the provision of non technical RTPI data.

Emily Whitters
Business Support Officer
20th January 2017

List of Appendices

1. Review of 2013 – 2017 Outcomes
2. Participation statement
3. 2017 – 2021 Outcomes Consultation
4. Draft Evidence Base
5. Draft structure for Mainstreaming Report

3. Appendix 1

PROGRESS WITH 2013-2017 OUTCOMES

Proposed Outcome	Action	2013 – 2017 Progress
To provide a forum for consultation on SEStran policy	Provide an Equalities Forum	The SEStran Equalities Forum has been running successfully since 2009.
An equality audit procedure for proposed initiatives and projects	Develop and implement a procedure.	This outcome has not been taken forward.
A monitoring process that specifically identifies equality issues.	Identify equality issues and relative monitoring requirements.	Equalities monitoring has been reported in the annual report which is presented to the SEStran Board.
Monitor and report progress on equality issues	Include a report on progress in our Annual Report	As above, progress has been reported in our annual report.
All documents produced by SEStran to be accessible to all aspects of the community	Provide a translation/Braille facility for any published documents as necessary. Provide large text/speech facilities for documents on the web site.	These are available on request.
Improved accessibility for those dependent on public transport	RTS Policy 3 – Encouragement will be given to the improvement of all aspects of bus services (services, vehicle quality, fares, infrastructure, bus rapid transit, and integration) as a means of reducing congestion and enhancing accessibility.	SEStran have consulted on accessibility issues such as accessibility at Waverley and Haymarket stations and lobbied on behalf of the Equalities forum. Development of RTPI.

Improved public transport affordability	RTS Policy 6 – SEStran will support intervention or seek to intervene where affordability is recognised by the Partnership as a barrier to the use of public transport.	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.
Improved public transport accessibility for deprived and rural communities	RTS Policy 18 – SEStran will seek to ensure that communities with poor access to employment by PT and low car ownership / high deprivation will be the subject of targeted measures to address this.	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.
Improved accessibility for those with no access to a car	RTS Policy 19 – Where improvements in accessibility are found to be require, the RTS will seek, in the first instance, to deliver these by enhancing conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.
Equal opportunities audit of all interventions	RTS Policy 25 – All interventions will be subject to an equal opportunities audit to ensure that they promote equal opportunities in accordance with the law.	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.
Improved access to PT for those with mobility problems.	RTS Policy 26 – SEStran will seek to ensure that people who have difficulties in using conventional public transport due to	SEStran developed the Thistle Card to assist elderly and disabled people in using public transport. This has been very

	disability will be the subject of targeted measures to address this.	successful.
Improved access to health facilities by PT.	RTS Policy 27 – SEStran and its constituent authorities will work in partnership with Health Boards and the Scottish Ambulance Service to improve access to health services and to reduce congestion caused by travel to these services.	Facilitated the Access to Healthcare forum.
Facilitation of independent travel by children.	RTS Policy 34 - There will be a presumption in favour of schemes that lead to greater physical activity, and that facilitate independent travel especially by children.	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.
Enhanced security particularly for women who are discouraged from using public transport by personal security concerns.	RTS Policy 35 – There will be a presumption in favour of schemes that enhance personal security, especially for pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport users.	Provided funding for lighting on cycle paths to increase safety.
Quality audit of all interventions to ensure needs of all aspects of the community are addressed.	RTS Policy 40 – All projects and interventions will be subject to a quality audit to ensure they maximise opportunities to meet all RTS objectives.	This outcome was not developed.
Ensure equalities issues are considered in project justification/ prioritisation	Include equalities section in project prioritisation/justification pro forma.	Following a change to RTP funding this no longer became a deliverable outcome.

		If SEStran had the funding to initiate our own projects we would ensure that equalities issues were embedded in project justification.
Ensure equalities progress is reported to the board annually	Included in annual progress report on equalities	Equalities Progress is reported annually through the RTS Monitoring report.
Ensure equalities issues are integral to our future planning	Include section on equalities in the annual business plan	Equalities issues have been included in the annual business plan.
SEStran's communications encourage equalities	Audit SEStran publications to ensure equal access by all	SEStran communications are openly available for all, in a range of formats and languages.
Promote access to SEStran for all sectors of the community	Participate in events designed to promote equal opportunities	Officers have participated at various events such as Edinburgh Mela, SATA events.
Ensure that in SEStran communications to all aspects of society are treated equally	Audit SEStran publications to ensure that the image portrayed gives equal emphasis to men and women, includes images of ethnic minorities and includes images of people with disabilities	New website is in development and will be audited to ensure that a diverse range of media is presented.

Outcomes and the Public Sector Equality Duty:

Participation Statement

Introduction

Under the Equality Act 2010 and the Equality Act 2012 (Scotland) Specific Duties, SEStran has a duty to publish a set of Equalities Outcomes covering the period April 2017- March 2021, which it considers will enable it to better perform the equality duty.

The General Equality Duty

The general equality duty requires public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

The Equality Act 2012 (Scotland) Specific Duties

The specific duties are designed to help public authorities in their performance of the general duty:

- To publish a set of equalities outcomes which it considers will enable the authority to better perform the equality duty. It must publish a fresh set of equality outcomes within four years of publishing its previous set.
- In preparing this set of equalities outcomes, the authority must take reasonable steps to involve people who share a relevant protected characteristic and any person which appears to the authority to represent the interests of those people.
- The authority must consider relevant evidence relating to people who share a relevant characteristic.
- If an authority's set of outcomes does not seek to further the needs of the general equality duty in relation to every relevant protected characteristic, it must publish its reasons for proceeding in this way.
- An authority must publish a report on the progress made to achieve its equality outcomes every two years.

Participation Commitment

SEStran are committed to engaging with individuals and groups with protected characteristics to enable us to develop a set of Equalities Outcomes which are fit for purpose and further the elimination of discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations. To achieve this we will undertake the following:

October 2016 – SEStran Equalities Forum

Invite current members, and also extend invites to a wider range of persons or groups with protected characteristics to:

- Participate in reviewing the current set of equalities outcomes in terms of progress and relevance and recommend which outcomes should be continued to March 2017.
- Provide input into drafting a new set of outcomes for the period April 2017 – March 2021.
- Provide opportunity for those invited but unable to attend the Forum to put their views forward.

December 2016 – SEStran Partnership Board

Seek approval from the SEStran Partnership Board to engage in a 4-6 week consultation on the draft set of new equalities outcomes.

December 2016 – Mid-January 2017 – Equalities Outcomes Consultation

We will undertake a consultation exercise which will be sent to all equalities groups within the SEStran region. We will also ask our 8 partner authorities to promote the initiative within their council areas. We may host or attend an event as part of the exercise, if appropriate.

January – Early February 2017 – Consideration of Consultation Responses

We will consider the consultation responses and draft a set of outcomes based on the findings.

Early – Mid-February 2017 – Equalities Forum

Publish the Consultation Report and air actions to seek to address comments.

March 2017 – SEStran Partnership Board

Seek approval from the SEStran Partnership Board to implement the set of Equalities Outcomes for the period April 2017 – March 2021.

March 2017 – Publication

Publish the Equalities Outcomes for 2017-2021.

Further information

Further information can be obtained by contacting:

George Eckton, Partnership Director
 Email: George.eckton@sestran.gov.uk
 Tel: 0131 524 5512

Angela Chambers, Business Manager
 Email: angela.chambers@sestran.gov.uk
 Tel: 0131 524 5154

Address: SEStran, Area 3D (Bridge), Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ

Links

Link to Equality and Human Rights Guidance

https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/2._equality_outcomes_-_formatted.pdf

Link to SEStran Equalities Outcomes 2015

[http://www.sestran.gov.uk/uploads/draft_equalities_outcome_report_update_ac_jan_2015_a8_appendix_4_\(2\).doc](http://www.sestran.gov.uk/uploads/draft_equalities_outcome_report_update_ac_jan_2015_a8_appendix_4_(2).doc)

Link to SEStran Website and papers

www.sestran.gov.uk

3. Appendix 3

SEStran Equality Outcomes 2017 - 2021

SEStran as a listed public body under the Equality Act 2010 and the Equality Act 2012 (Scotland) Specific Duties Regulations, has a requirement to publish a set of Equality Outcomes, covering the period April 2017 – March 2021, which it considers will enable it to better perform the equality duty.

A requirement of publishing a set of Equality Outcomes is the need to take steps to involve people who share a relevant protected characteristic and any person who appears to represent the interest of those people. To this end the Equality Outcomes were developed with input from the SEStran Equality Forum in October 2016 and subsequently the Partnership Board agreed to have a consultation period on the Outcomes.

The responses to this consultation will be considered and taken back to the Equalities Forum again in early 2017 for a final review. The draft set of Equalities Outcomes will be taken to the Partnership Board in March for approval and will then be published. A copy of the report taken to the Partnership Board outlining SEStran's duties and actions under the Equality Act is available.

SEStran have developed two new outcomes:

- An Equitable, Diverse and Representative Organisation
- A Safe, Accessible and Equitable Regional Transport Network

They can be viewed in full in the attached Equalities Outcomes summary and set out the course of action SEStran will take to achieve the two proposed outcomes.

Responding to the consultation

We are inviting responses to this consultation by 17th January 2017.

The consultation questions are listed below and should be answered in conjunction with the equalities outcomes summary document. Please send your response to emily.whitters@sestran.gov.uk

If you would like any of the consultation materials available in an alternative format please contact emily.whitters@sestran.gov.uk

All respondents should be aware that SEStran is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and would therefore have to consider any request made to it under the Act for information relating to responses made to this consultation exercise.

Next steps in the process

Following the closing date, all responses will be analysed and considered along with any other available evidence to help us and taken in to consideration in further development of our Equality Outcomes.

Comments and Complaints

If you have any comments about how this consultation exercise has been conducted, please contact emily.whitters@sestran.gov.uk.

Consultation Questions

1. What is your name?
2. Do you represent an individual or an organisation? If you represent an organisation please include the name of it.
3. Do you agree with the proposed objective of an equitable, diverse and representative organisation? (Outcome 1)
4. Do you agree with the proposed actions to achieve an equitable, diverse and representative organisation? (Outcome 1)
5. Any further comments on Outcome 1?
6. Do you agree with the proposed objective of a safe, accessible and equitable regional transport network? (Outcome 2)
7. Do you agree with the proposed actions to achieve a safe, accessible and equitable regional transport network? (Outcome 2)
8. Any further comments on Outcome 2?
9. Additional Comments
10. Do you consent to your response being published?

SESTRAN EQUALITY OUTCOME 1

An Equitable, Diverse and Representative Organisation

SEStran is committed to creating a culture in which diversity and equality of opportunity are promoted actively, discrimination is eliminated and good relations are fostered amongst all staff, members and stakeholders.

SEStran seeks to increase the diversity in the nature of its members who they represent and the workforce of the organisation. We recognise that we need to evaluate both the current monitoring of the diversity of our workforce and governance, and are committed to activity and plans to achieve these outcomes over the next 4 years. Currently, we don't have up-to-date and ongoing staff monitoring data processes and it is proposed to address these as part of a wider staff and board survey.

SEStran's commitment to improving the diversity of our workforce is constrained by the wider public sector financial situation at present, which means increasing diversity solely through recruitment will be limited and we are also constrained by the current legislative context at time of issuing these outcomes around governance diversity. However, we will seek to take all possible steps to enhance opportunities within the current policy and parliamentary legislation context over the next 4 years. SEStran has committed to undertake positive action with Equate Scotland over the summer of 2017 to address the wider under-representations in gender terms with the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) sector but also recognises our wider public duties to the wider workforce of Scotland.

This will build on the existing commitment made by the SEStran Partnership board in Summer 2016 to set up a Board Diversity Working Group to address issues of under-representation as far as possible, committing to producing a Board Diversity Succession Plan. While SEStran will seek to influence the advancement of equality of representation on our Board, there is a legislative recognition that over two-thirds of our Board are elected members appointed by constituent councils. Therefore this will depend to a large extent on the diversity of members appointed by constituent councils and the impacts of the proposed Gender Balance Bill for Parliament in 2016/17 on the requirement for public bodies such as SEStran to seek to improve the diversity of its Board through the appointment of non-councillor members by April 2018.

Equality Outcome	An Equitable, Diverse and Representative Organisation
Activity/Plans	Employee information should be collected with an 80% response rate across all characteristics by 2019 and 100% response rate by 2021. Undertake awareness raising of SEStran as an

	<p>employer and use positive action as appropriate to address underrepresentation within certain areas.</p> <p>Develop a plan for moving towards a more representative workforce and Board by 2021.</p> <p>Seek to influence primary legislation and regulations on Board governance by 2018.</p> <p>Work with our stakeholders to ensure that a wide range of applicants are encouraged to apply for non-councillor member appointments using a variety of mechanisms, including application support and other positive action initiatives.</p> <p>Monitor and review our promotion, training and progression opportunities to ensure they are fair and transparent for workforce and board members.</p> <p>Work with staff networks to ensure that staff are able to work in a supportive and inclusive environment where they feel safe and respected through the delivery of relevant policies and procedures.</p>
Measuring Progress	<p>Employee data, disaggregated by protected characteristic.</p> <p>Annual employee survey responses provided by staff across protected characteristics on an annual basis.</p> <p>Regular survey of diversity of Board members in line with 2016 Equality Act regulations.</p> <p>Calculate a non-statutory analysis of SEStran's gender pay gap</p> <p>Qualitative feedback mechanisms on staff experience and training and development policy monitoring.</p>
Public Sector Equality Duty	<p>Eliminate discrimination</p> <p>Advance Equality of Opportunity</p> <p>Foster good relations</p>
Protected Characteristics	<p>Age</p> <p>Disability</p> <p>Gender Reassignment</p> <p>Race</p> <p>Religion or Belief</p> <p>Sex</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Marriage & Civil Partnership</p> <p>Pregnancy & Maternity</p>

SESTRAN EQUALITY OUTCOME 2

A Safe, Accessible and Equitable Regional Transport Network

SEStran is committed to producing and delivering a strategy that seeks to make transport easier to use for all by promoting measures to further improve the safety, accessibility and equity of the transport network across the South-East of Scotland.

The journeys which take place across the transport network within the region, start in the planning/decision stage of an individual citizen or business choosing which method of transport to utilise for their travel. These types of journeys should be fully accessible to all, and particularly those who share a protected characteristic. There is evidence that shows that issues such as lack of support, comfort and safety when travelling or lack of availability of suitable forms of transport may mean that some users with protected characteristics are unable to make these journeys.

A contributing factor to this is that transport users can sometimes be unaware of the level of accessible travel information provided or where to find it.

In 2011, SEStran launched the Thistle Assistance Card to make it easier for older and disabled people to use public transport. The initial idea was raised by the SEStran Equality Forum following the demise of the nationally funded assistance card by Enable Scotland. Forum Members believed that the card was essential for helping people with all types of disability to access and use public transport. Since its launch SEStran has distributed around 45,000 cards and the design has been adopted by other Regional Transport Partnerships making it a nationally recognised card.

Safety and security can also be a concern for young and older people, women and certain BAME people, more so than other groups. There can be a fear of crime particularly when travelling alone on certain modes/routes of transport, particularly in terms of antisocial behaviour or sexual harassment of women on public transport and/or hate crime towards other groups. This can affect the frequency of travel for these groups and curtail their mobility. There is also the difference in road safety outcomes especially for children/young people or older people in terms of greater likelihood for negative outcomes in road use. There are a number of protected characteristics shared by those who experience or are most vulnerable to serious incidents on roads.

Equality Outcome	Safe, Accessible and Equitable Regional Transport Network
Activity/Plans	Continue to roll out Real Time Passenger Information system to increase users confidence of using the bus at

	<p>certain times.</p> <p>Undertake a full Equality Impact Assessment for the renewal of the Regional Transport Strategy during 2017-2021</p> <p>Undertake awareness raising of the various accessible services and information available within the SEStran area, continue to work with partners around the further development of the Thistle Card scheme.</p> <p>Continue and extend engagement to groups with or representing groups who have/share a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Seek to influence national strategy and policy of key partners on the issue of safety, accessibility and equity for all users of transport during 2017-2021.</p> <p>Work with our stakeholders to ensure that equality advances through the work of a range of partners within the SEStran area and act as an advocate for equality issues across all transport modes.</p> <p>Monitor and review existing equality actions to see if further advances promoting opportunity can be undertaken through further developments of existing projects.</p>
Measuring Progress	<p>Conduct passenger surveys on bus networks to analyse perceptions of accessibility, safety and security.</p> <p>Qualitative feedback from protected characteristics groups via the SESTRAN Equality Forum.</p> <p>User satisfaction surveys and general feedback on the delivery of projects such as the Thistle Card and App.</p>
Public Sector Equality Duty	<p>Eliminate discrimination</p> <p>Advance Equality of Opportunity</p> <p>Foster good relations</p>
Protected Characteristics	<p>Age</p> <p>Disability</p> <p>Gender Reassignment</p> <p>Race</p> <p>Religion or Belief</p> <p>Sex</p> <p>Sexual Orientation</p> <p>Marriage and Civil Partnership</p> <p>Pregnancy and Maternity</p>

SEStran Equality Outcomes 2017 – 2021 – Draft Evidence

The 2011 census showed that Scotland has an estimated population of 5,295,403 people, the highest ever population with a rise of 4.6% since 2001¹. The SEStran region comprises the local authority areas of City of Edinburgh, Fife, Falkirk, Clackmannanshire, Scottish Borders, East Lothian, Midlothian and West Lothian. The total estimated population of the SEStran area is 1,521,148 people. While the population of Scotland is projected to grow further², and both East Lothian and City of Edinburgh have been subject to large population increases from 2005 – 2015, by 11.1% and 11% respectively³.

Age

While the population of Scotland is growing, it is also an aging population with an increase of 17% in the number of people aged 75 and over and 18% in the 60-74 age group⁴. In the SEStran area 16.1% of the population is aged 65 years and older, 66.6% is aged between 16 – 64 years old and 17.3% is under 16 years old.

The Scottish Health Survey published most recently in 2015, shows that as people age they are less likely to describe their health as “very good” or “good”⁵. A number of health problems have been identified that may affect elderly people’s ability to use varying transport options, which could also come under the disability protected characteristic such as:

- Limited mobility
- Visual impairments
- Hearing conditions

Young people?

Disability

Within the SEStran area, 29.3% of the population is affected by a long term health condition or disability which impacts on their daily activities. The Scottish Government has collated data that states that adults with a disability or long-term illness were more likely to use a local bus service than those with no disability or long-term illness. In 2015, 50.4% of adults who had a long term health condition or

¹ <http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/ods-web/area.html>

² <http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/ods-web/area.html>

³ <http://www.scotlandscensus.gov.uk/ods-web/area.html>

⁴ <https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/files/statistics/high-level-summary/j11198/j1119802.htm>

⁵ <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Health/scottish-health-survey>

disability had used a bus service in the previous month compared to 49.3% of adults who had no long term health condition or disability⁶.

- 1.6% of the adult population has a long-standing illness, health problem or disability that meant they find using a car difficult to manage on their own.
- 4.7% of the adult population had a long-standing illness, health problem or disability that meant they find using a bus difficult to manage on their own.
- 3.6% of the adult population had a long-standing illness, health problem or disability that meant they find using a train difficult to manage on their own.⁷

The bus industry has in recent years become far more accessible with 94% of buses being accessible or having a low floor in 2014/15, up from 33% in 2004/5.

Race

The proportion of black and ethnic minority people living in the SEStran area is 4.02%, with a higher proportion in the City of Edinburgh of 8.3%. Indian, Pakistani and Chinese households were most likely to have access to a car. African households were least likely to have access to a car. At the time of the 2011 census, three quarters of households in Scotland had access to a car or van. The proportion was over 80% for Pakistani and White: Other British households and lowest (47%) for African households. Pakistani households were most likely to have access to three or more cars; 20% of Pakistani households had three or more cars, compared to a Scottish average of 9%.

Religion or Belief

In the 2011 census, 56.3% of the Scottish population reporting currently having a religion. 36.7% of the Scottish population reporting having no religion. Within the SEStran area 49.9% of people reported having a religion and 43.2% reporting having no religion. Sikhs had the highest car access with the majority (52%) having access to two or more cars or vans. Hindus had the lowest car access, with over two fifths (42%) living in households with no access to a car or van.

Sex

In 2011 the gender balance across Scotland was recorded as 51.5% female and 48.5% male. The gender balance across the SEStran area was broadly the same.

As stated in the Transport and Travel in Scotland study 2015, women are more likely to use public transport than men. 49% of women had used the bus in the last month compared to only 42% of men. 13% of women used the bus everyday

⁶ <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/People/Equality/Equalities/TransportTravel>

⁷ Transport Scotland, Transport & Travel in Scotland 2011

compared to 11% of men. 8% of men and 31% of women had used the train within the past month.

Sexual Orientation

The Scottish Household Survey introduced a question on sexual orientation in 2011 as one of their core questions. In 2015 98.1% of respondents identified themselves as heterosexual, 0.8% as gay/lesbian, 0.2% as bisexual and 0.2% as other.⁸

Gender Reassignment

There is currently no formal monitoring to collect information on gender identity through the census or Scottish Household Survey. Officers are to carry out more research and engage with groups such as Stonewall Scotland and the Scottish Transgender Alliance.

Pregnancy & Maternity

There is limited available quantitative evidence on use of transport with regard to those on maternity leave, or those caring for children. Within the SEStran area, Lothian Buses are a major provider of bus travel. As of December 2011, buses with buggy space make up around 40% of the Lothian Bus fleet⁹.

⁸ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00506173.pdf>

⁹ https://lothianbuses.co.uk/assets/files/Accessibility_Review.pdf

3. Appendix 5

Draft Structure of Mainstreaming Report

Foreword / corporate commitment

About SEStran – Role & Function

Legal Context

How we seek to Mainstream equality

- How we assess impact on equality
- How our relevant policies e.g. public procurement, HR address equality
- Examples of Equality Work
 - Thistle Card & App
 - Equate Scotland Placement
 - Equalities Forum
 - Board Diversity Working Group
 - Review of Policies – introduction of flexible time

Employee Data

Statement on Equal Pay & Gender Pay Gap

Equality Outcomes

Performance Reporting

Identification of Responsible Officers

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1** The Scottish Government published a consultation on the draft Gender Representation on Public Boards (Scotland) Bill on the 5th January 2017. The consultation closes on the 17th March. This was made as a key commitment in the Scottish Government's Programme for Government 2016-17.¹
- 1.2** Using new competence transferred to the Scottish Parliament through the Scotland Act 2016, the Bill will require positive action to be taken to: redress gender imbalances on public sector Boards. The purpose of the consultation is to seek views on the practical application of the Bill's provisions and to offer consultees an opportunity to offer views on how the Bill might be strengthened.
- 1.3** The Scottish Government have set out a clear objective to progress to having gender balanced public boards. As laid out in the consultation paper, women make up 35% of members of the Scottish Parliament, 29% of members of the House of Commons, 24% of local government councillors in Scotland and 26.1% of FTSE 100 boards. However, there have been advances made. In 2015, for the first time, Scottish Ministers appointed more women than men to regulated public boards at 53.6%, helping to bring the overall percentage of women to a historic high of 42%.
- 1.4** Scottish Government make a recognition that candidates will still have to demonstrate the relevant qualifications, skills, knowledge and experience that the Board requires.

2. CONSULTATION OVERVIEW

- 2.1** The Gender Representation Objective of the Bill is that a public board has:
 - (a) 50% of non-executive members who are female or who identify as female, and
 - (b) 50% of non-executive members who are male or who identify as male.

Where there is an odd number of non-executive members, the requirement for 50/50 applies as if the board had one fewer non-executive member. No action is required in relation to executive members and there are also certain other members of boards excluded by virtue of being elected to the board.

- 2.2** There is also a tie-breaker provision included within the bill. Where there are two or more equally qualified candidates for an appointment, the appointing person must appoint a candidate of the under-represented sex unless there are exceptional circumstances which tip the balance in favour of another candidate.

¹ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0051/00512727.pdf>

- 2.3** Further, the Bill places a duty on all appointing persons and listed public authorities to take steps, as appropriate, to encourage persons of the under-represented gender to apply to become a member of a public body.
- 2.4** There are a total of 11 questions asked in the consultation, although there is no requirement to answer all questions. A list of these questions is included in appendix 1.
- 2.5** Two of the questions seek views on the impact of the draft Bill on equality groups, and the business and financial impacts. Responses to these questions will support the development of an Equality Impact Assessment and a Business Regulatory Impact Assessment.

3. INCLUSION IN THE BILL

- 3.1** The consultation paper states that only bodies that are “Scottish public authorities with mixed functions or no reserved functions” are covered by the Bill. The Bill does not therefore cover private companies or voluntary organisations. Listed bodies are included at Schedule 1.²
- 3.2** Regional Transport Partnerships are not currently included in the Schedule. SEStran have had correspondence with the Scottish Government Equality Unit and they have advised that it was not an intentional omission and they would be happy to receive representations from SEStran and other RTPs as to why we should be included within the provisions of the Bill.
- 3.3** While SEStran are not currently included in the Bill, we would still wish to demonstrate our commitment to the principles laid out in the draft Bill, and would therefore consider signing the Scottish Government 5050 by 2020 pledge. This is a voluntary commitment for organisations to work towards gender balance on their boards by 2020.³

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1** The forum are asked to:
1. Comment on the consultation on the Draft Gender Representation on Public Boards (Scotland) Bill
 2. Consider what input they would like to make to SEStran’s response to the consultation.
 3. Recommend and support SEStran in signing up to the 5050 by 2020 pledge.

Emily Whitters
Business Support Officer
20th January 2017

Appendix 1 – Consultation Questions

² <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0051/00512727.pdf> pg. 16

³ <http://onescotland.org/equality-themes/5050-by-2020/>

4. Appendix 1

Scottish Government Consultation on the Draft Gender Representation on Public Boards (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Questions

1. What, if any, comments would you make in relation to section 1 [Gender representation objective] of the draft Bill?
2. What, if any, comments would you make in relation to section 2 [Key definitions] of the draft Bill?
3. What, if any, comments would you make in relation to section 3 [Duty when appointing non-executive members] of the draft Bill?
4. What, if any, comments would you make in section 4 [Consideration of candidates] of the draft Bill?
5. What, if any, comments would you make in relation section 5 [Encouragement of applications] of the draft Bill?
6. What if any, comments would you make in relation to Schedule 2 (introduced by section 7) [Application of Act to Certain Listed Authorities] of the draft Bill?
7. What, if any, comments would you make in relation to Schedule 1 (introduced by section 2) [Listed Authorities] of the draft Bill?
8. The draft Bill does not specify any requirement for reporting. Do you have any comments on reporting arrangements under the legislation, including timescales, location and content of reports?
9. Do you have any comments on the draft Bill, not already expressed in response to previous questions, including on how the Bill could be strengthened to deliver Minister's stated objective of gender balanced public boards?
10. To help with the development of our Equality Impact Assessment, please provide any comments on the impact of the draft Bill on people who share certain protected characteristics: age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, race and religion or belief; or any further information you think is relevant.
11. To help with the development of our Business Regulatory Impact Assessment, please provide any comments on the costs and benefits of the draft Bill, or any further information you think is relevant.

Board Diversity Succession Plan Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Equalities Forum at their last meeting in October 2016, received an update on the progress with the Board Diversity Succession Plan. Under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2016¹, listed public bodies are required to produce a Board Diversity Succession Plan to be published within an equalities mainstreaming report. The SEStran Board has agreed certain actions to increase Board Diversity and also noted the future provision of current Board Diversity information prior to April 2017 by Scottish Ministers, who by the same regulations are required to provide public bodies with survey information on board diversity.

2. DIVERSITY SUCCESSION PLAN FOR SESTRAN

2.1 The SEStran Board agreed the draft Board Diversity Succession Plan at their December meeting. A copy of the draft is attached and this will be submitted as part of the finalised Equality Outcomes 2017-2021 in April 2017.

2.2 At present, the 2016 Regulations and specifically Regulation 6A require Scottish Ministers to gather information on the relevant protected characteristics of board members of a listed authority, and to provide this information to the listed authority in question. At present, SEStran has not received this information, other than an update in November 2016 and at time of writing we don't think the survey has been issued to Board members. SEStran, subsequent to the survey, have until 30 April 2016 to include in their mainstreaming report details of:

- the number of men and of women who have been board members of the authority during the period covered by the report;
- how the information provided about the relevant protected characteristics of its board members has been used so far; and
- how the authority proposes to use the information provided in the future to promote greater diversity of board membership.

2.3 At the Board meeting held on the 23rd September 2016, it was agreed to appoint observers to the Board. The aim of this is to provide wider opportunities to suitable representatives to gain experience of attending meetings with the intention that they are able to then go on and gain a seat on a Board. The Equalities Forum at their last meeting agreed to nominate Gordon Mungall to the observer opportunity, as a recognition of initial positive action on this issue. It is also suggested that SEStran continue discussions with Changing the Chemistry in regards to appointing an observer. Once the results of the Board survey have been received, it is suggested a further report is brought back to the Equalities & HealthCare forum with a view to contacting other similar organisations to progress areas of board under-representation.

¹ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497889.pdf>

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 As outlined above, the following points would form the basis of the SEStran Board Diversity Succession Plan:

- Communicate with constituent local authorities that we would encourage them to appoint Board members in line with the Equality Act duties for Public Bodies
- Appoint observers to the Board to provide development opportunities
- Appoint a diverse range of Non-Councillor Board members in 2018

3.2 Through these actions SEStran hope to promote inclusion and to fulfil our duties under the Equality Act and associated regulations. SEStran recognises that a more diverse Board would be beneficial to the organisation and are fully committed to developing a successful Diversity Succession Plan.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Forum members are invited to:

1. Comment on the proposals for the Board Diversity Succession Plan;
2. Note the update provided on the survey of Board members; and
3. Comment upon the proposed Board Observer role description document.

Emily Whitters
Business Support Officer
20th January 2017

George Eckton
Partnership Director

Appendix 1 – Draft Board Diversity Report

Appendix 2 – Draft Board Observer role description

SEStran Board Diversity Succession Plan

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

Under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2016 listed public bodies are required to produce a Board Diversity Succession Plan in April 2017. This document aims to outline the current make-up of the SEStran Partnership Board and to outline ways in which SEStran will commit to making progress on improving the diversity of our Board. SEStran recognises that increasing diversity on the Board will encourage new and innovative thinking and maximise use of talent, leading to better decision making and governance.

The Scottish Government and a number of other parties at the Scottish Parliament have a commitment to greater diversity and equality of representation on public boards. The 2015 “On Board” guidance issued to Board Members of Public Bodies in Scotland recognises this commitment to redressing the current imbalance of representation with gender parity outlined as a particular area of focus. The guidance outlines that Public Boards themselves should give consideration to establishing a committee to consider matters such as planning for succession and Board performance as this should lead to more diversity at Board level. The guidance outlines a clear aim of 50:50 gender balance by 2020.

The “On Board” publication outlines an expectation that all public bodies will champion diversity and mainstream equal opportunities in their work. Public Boards are also challenged to give specific consideration to the impact on equality of opportunity when developing policies and making decisions. Having greater diversity of representation on the Board when making decisions is one clear mechanism for driving greater value in this regard and there is a growing level of evidence that “groupthink” or having a non-diverse Board can be a risk to an organisation and that having a more diverse Board can lead to more nuanced discussions and more informed decisions.

It is recognised by Scottish Government that a Board made up of people who are “visibly diverse” will not necessarily be immune to “Groupthink”. Visible diversity is simply an indicator but no guarantee that the Board’s members have the diversity of skills, knowledge, experience and perspectives needed to make it effective. However, the Scottish Government acknowledge that there is currently an insufficient visible and invisible diversity on the Boards of Scotland’s public bodies, which can be evidenced in relation to factors ranging from gender to black and minority ethnic (BME) status, employment sectors and income.

BOARD MAKEUP

SEStran has 20 Board members drawn from constituent local authorities and 9 non-Councillor members. The number of Councillor Members has been allocated on the basis of relative population within the partnership area. Non-Councillor Members are appointed to the Board based on Scottish Government guidance on membership for RTPs which states that the following principles should govern the selection and appointment of members, albeit the Gender Balance on Public Boards may alter these requirements:

- Transparency
- Appointment on merit
- Achieving a balance among the Non-Councillor membership

The current diversity of the Partnership Board has been surveyed by Scottish Government and data will be relayed back to SEStran on a confidential basis in December 2016. SEStran will publish the current Gender Balance of the Partnership Board.

COUNCILLOR MEMBERS

As stated above, the majority of the SEStran Partnership Board is made up of Councillor Members from constituent local authorities. They are appointed solely by local authorities, a process over which SEStran has no input. To address this, the SEStran Chair will write to the constituent local authorities ahead of the May 2017 elections to advise them of the Board's diversity in 2016/17 and ask them to assist SEStran in achieving our objectives of improving the Partnership Board diversity. However, SEStran recognises that election is a democratic process which is undertaken by each local authority's committee services department.

NON-COUNCILLOR MEMBERS

The current term for SEStran Non-Councillor Members finishes in April 2018. Under the Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) guidance for membership, produced by the Scottish Government, RTP's appoint their own Non-Councillor Members. SEStran aim to produce a gender balance for non-executive appointments on the Board, in line with the final requirements of Scottish Government Gender Balance on Public Boards Bill, and will consult with a range of equalities organisations to ensure that the application process is not exclusionary. SEStran will aim to publicise Non-Councillor Board vacancies through a wide range of sources including equality organisations and social media to encourage a wide range of good candidates with a diverse range of skills and experience. The RTP membership guidance states that non-councillor members should bring a range of benefits to the work of the RTP such as:

- Experience and knowledge from working at board/strategic level in business, the public sector and the voluntary sector
- Regional rather than local perspective

- Political and media awareness
- Transport knowledge
- Financial awareness
- Communication skills

Further, the guidance states that “lay members” will bring a different perspective to the Board.

OBSERVERS

The RTP guidance on membership states that RTP’s can appoint observers, who as advisers can make a valuable contribution. This provision would allow SEStran to involve people on the Board who were not appointed as Non-Councillor Members but who would have useful input to make. The SEStran Board agreed in September 2016 to appoint 4-5 observers to the Board. These observers would not have a vote on the Board and would not be expected to participate in all discussions or all meetings. Officers have progressed this and will now appoint Observers from Changing the Chemistry and the SEStran Equalities Forum.

SEStran anticipate appointing these observers in early 2017. The aim of this is to provide wider opportunities to suitable representatives to gain experience of attending meetings with the intention that they are able to then go on and gain a seat on a Board. The appointment of observers will also benefit the work of the SEStran Partnership Board by engaging with those who may have new ideas and who may bring an alternative viewpoint to the Board. SEStran will work with a range of equality organisations to publicise and appoint these observers.

CONCLUSION

SEStran therefore aim to work towards a more diverse Board through the following actions:

- Communicate with constituent local authorities to encourage them to appoint a greater diversity of Board members
- Appoint a diverse range of Non-Councillor Board members in 2018
- Continue to offer Board Observer opportunities in partnership with Groups who represent those with Protected Characteristics such as Changing the Chemistry

SESTRAN BOARD OBSERVER – Role Description

This is not an appointment, it is a developmental opportunity and positive action that SEStran are seeking to take as part of their Public Sector Equality Duties to promote opportunity and increased diversity of representation in the governance of public bodies.

The Role

The Role of a Board Observer is someone who attends SEStran Board meetings but is not an official member of the Partnership Board. The statutory regulations which provide the detail on membership of Regional Transport Partnerships set out the role of observers.²

SEStran aims to provide an environment where observers feel comfortable in listening, in their own time asking questions, and ultimately providing counsel and advice from their own perspective. Observers are not expected to vote on anything, albeit the Board decisions are predominantly based on consensus decisions and voting is rare. We would hope as well as providing a learning opportunity to the Observer, we can benefit as much from their influence and experience when they feel in their development journey they are ready to contribute. We hope we can benefit from you being able to, in time:

- bring different points of view to a discussion; and/or
- give insight into your transport users' needs and experience; and/or
- make new contacts in the communities of place or characteristic; and/or
- think of new ways of doing things.

The selected individual(s) will be invited, on a pre-arranged and closely supported and supervised way, to sit in on 3-4 Board meetings (and, if possible, a board committee twice) to observe first-hand how Boards work. These will be held in fully accessible locations and generally between the hours of 10am – 2pm weekdays.

This opportunity seeks to build the understanding, confidence and capacity of individuals to fill appropriate Board member posts in the future.

The position will be held for a maximum of 12 months.

Background

As outlined in SEStran's emerging Board Diversity Succession Plan as required by the Public Sector Equality Duty Amendment Regulations 2016³, the Board of SEStran have agreed to the appointment of Board Observers to offer a clear and tangible developmental response to the issue of promoting Board Diversity for SEStran within the wider context of our approach to our Equality Duties and

² See Schedule 2 of The Regional Transport Partnerships (Establishment, Constitution and Membership) (Scotland) Order 2005, and in particular [paragraph 1](#)

³ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0049/00497889.pdf>

published Equality Outcomes 2017-2021, particularly Outcome 1: promoting a diverse and representative organisation.

The guidance on membership of Regional Transport Partnerships⁴ states that RTP's can appoint observers, who as advisers can make a valuable contribution to overall diversity of governance, irrespective of technical expertise or knowledge of transport systems. This provision would allow SEStran to involve people on the Board who were not appointed as Non-Councillor Members but who would have useful input to make. The SEStran Board agreed in September 2016 to appoint 4-5 observers to the Board. These observers would not have a vote on the Board and would not be expected to participate in all discussions or all meetings.

The aim of this developmental opportunity is to provide wider opportunities to those interested in furthering their involvement in the work of the Partnership to gain experience of attending meetings with the intention that they are able to then go on and gain a seat on a Board.

The appointment of observers will also benefit the work of the SEStran Partnership Board by engaging with those who may have new ideas and who may bring an alternative viewpoint to the Board. SEStran will work with a range of equality organisations to publicise and appoint these observers

Objective:

The aim is twofold:

1. To give prospective board members a practical insight into how a Board operates and a good understanding of what the expectations are of a Member of a Board; and
2. To deliver outcomes concerning the outcomes required by SEStran's Board Diversity Succession Plan.

The role of Board Observer is targeted at individuals who consider that they have the skills, attributes and potential to be a Member of a Board, but have no experience at Board level. We would hope even without previous experience, Board Observers could help SEStran in collectively delivering the Principles of Good Corporate Governance through their involvement:

- Focus on the organisation's purpose and on outcomes for citizens and service users
- Perform effectively in clearly defined functions
- Promote values for the whole organisation and demonstrate the values of good governance through behaviour
- Take informed, transparent decisions and manage risk
- Develop the capacity and capability of the governing body to be effective
- Engage stakeholders and make accountability real.

⁴ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/47121/0020877.pdf>

Further background information on corporate governance processes and principles is available in the On Board publication.⁵

The Process:

The Board will ensure that new members receive induction training and that effective arrangements are in place to maintain and enhance the skills and motivation of all Board observers over their period of involvement with SEStran.

Chairperson or Vice-chairperson (and/or nominated Board Member/Partnership Director to:-

- provide information about the company/organisation, the Board, the RTS and current issues faced;
 - explain how the Board operates, composition, committee structure etc;
 - explain how the observer should or should not interact at meetings (generally it is recommended that the individual should not be expected to contribute as that relieves some of the pressure they may feel otherwise);
 - offer an opportunity to review board papers in advance of each meeting and after each meeting discuss the meeting and its outcomes;
 - allocate the individual to a relevant board sub-committee.
- Confidentiality agreement to be signed by both parties;
 - Any potential conflict of interest will need to be avoided or at a minimum declared;
 - Observers will be expected to sign an undertaking to follow the model Code of Conduct for members of Devolved Public Bodies.
 - Individual to be involved for at least a full cycle of board meetings (usually one year) as an observer;
 - Chairperson (or nominated Board member) and individual to have follow up discussion about the experience of attending the meeting and provide some mentoring.

Remuneration

No payment for Board Observer

Reasonable expenses will be met in accordance with SEStran's Business Travel Policy.

⁵ <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0047/00475242.pdf>

Potential assessment for this appointment

Subject to interest in the role, there may be an assessment process. If this takes place, the process is as follows. A written application and/or CV should be submitted which will then be assessed by the panel. Applicants who meet the requirements will be invited to attend an interview/discussion. This will involve a discussion, along with some competency based questions.

Please contact Emily Whitters, emily.whitters@sestran.gov.uk, for further details of how to apply.

Equality and Diversity

Accessibility to public appointments is a fundamental requirement and the public appointments process promotes, demonstrates and upholds equality of opportunity and treatment to all applicants.

SESTRAN will always give consideration to disability-related reasonable adjustments that an applicant might request to enable them to meet the requirements of the development opportunity and participate fully in the selection process.

SESTRAN is committed to appointment on merit, diversity and equality for public appointments. However, this opportunity is positive action under the Equality Act 2010 and is not employment, in the view of SESTRAN this is the implementation of positive action measures to overcome disadvantage, meet different needs and/or increase participation of people from a protected characteristics, as identified in our Board Diversity Succession Plan 2017 and our Equality Outcomes 2017-2021.

The Act does not limit the action that could be taken, provided it satisfies the statutory conditions and is a proportionate way of achieving the aim of overcoming a genuine disadvantage.

National Transport Strategy – early engagement survey

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** Transport Scotland have issued an early engagement survey seeking opinions on transport policy at all levels in the context of the development of a National Transport Strategy 2 by Scottish Ministers as outlined in the Programme for Government 2016-17.

2. Early Engagement Survey

- 2.1** As part of the development of a new National Transport Strategy (NTS2) Transport Scotland have issued an early engagement survey which is open to responses until 31 March 2017. It is proposed that SEStran will agree a response at its 2 March Board meeting and that this should be informed by comments from all consultative forums and groups.

- 2.2** The review of the NTS will set out an updated vision for transport for the whole of Scotland in 20 years' time and outline a plan to achieve this vision. The NTS2 will also look at how we can successfully address the strategic challenges facing our transport network and how we can make the most of the opportunities that present themselves. Transport Scotland has committed to delivering a collaborative review of the National Transport Strategy (NTS), by giving individuals and communities across Scotland a greater say in influencing the development of transport policy at local, regional and national level. As such, they are keen to gather your views at an early stage to help us shape the key themes of the NTS review.

- 2.3** Transport Scotland have stated that following the early engagement survey, there will be a wider programme of national engagement beginning in Summer 2017 ahead of a full public consultation. A copy of the consultation questions are outlined in appendix 1 and the link to the early engagement survey is below: <http://www.transport.gov.scot/news/have-your-say-scotland%E2%80%99s-national-transport-strategy>

3. CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1** The paper seeks to invite comment on the pre-engagement survey, which will be incorporated as appropriate into the final report to the Board in early March and the initial issues highlighted for further discussion at the meeting within the paper

George Eckton
Partnership Director
20th January 2017

Appendix 1 – List of Consultation Questions

List of Consultation Questions

1. Have you used, or referred to, the 2006 National Transport Strategy (NTS)?
2. When did you use it and did it meet your requirements? What, if anything, would you change about how the 2006 NTS is presented?
3. The current strategy sets out three outcomes: improved journey times and connections; reduced emissions; improved quality, accessibility and affordability. Do you think each of these will still be relevant over the next 20 years?
4. If not, what strategic outcomes should transport be trying to achieve?
5. If there was one thing that needs to change substantially now in transport, what would that be?
6. What do you think the main transport challenges and opportunities will be over the next twenty years?
7. How would you like us to engage with you during the development of the future strategy that will lead to a formal public consultation?

MODEL 3 SESTRAN PROGRESS REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** The report provides the forum with an update on the progress with “Model 3” discussions and an appended copy of Professor Rye’s report, which was presented to the Board on 2 December.

2. PROF RYE’S RESEARCH REPORT

- 2.1** The Board at their September 2016 meeting recognised that further discussions could benefit from specific research into strategic and any specific high-level implications for the SEStran area. Therefore, the SEStran Board agreed to engage Prof Rye for a short piece of research to test at a high-level all potential impacts/risks such a change on the following issues, alongside any further criteria agreed at the Board meeting, for the SEStran area:

- Planning and delivering transport solutions for all modes of transport across the region;
- The short, medium and long-term impacts and benefits of a change to a Model 3 Regional Transport Partnership and within this a high-level analysis of the prioritisation of actions to address current constraints on regional transport outcomes;
- Impact on positive pricing, multi-modal journey integration and economies of scale through regional travel planning, procurement and asset management;
- Improved cross-regional mobility for regional labour, training and employability;
- Improved community connectivity where there are no commercial services presently or services are under pressure;
- Provision of transport for people with disabilities and intersectionality across groups; and
- Contribution to the health, employability and welfare reform agendas.

- 2.2** Prof Rye’s research was finalised on 24 November and is attached as a separate appendix.

3. Model 3 Order Consultative Process

- 3.1** The SEStran Partnership Board agreed in December 2016 to a “Stage 1 of 2” consultation with constituent councils on the potential interest from them in supporting an Order making request to Scottish Ministers under Section 10 (4) of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 “the Act”, to support an initial Parliamentary Order (3 month statutory instrument laid in Parliament and assumed to be negative) SEStran moving from a Model 1 to a Model 3 RTP.

- 3.2** A letter from the SEStran Chair was sent to all SEStran Council Leaders on the 9 December seeking their views on which if any parts of Section 10 (4) or Section 14 of the Act there council would be interested in being subject of such an Order.
- 3.3** The Act outlines as examples some of the functions which may be the subject of an order under Section 10 (4): entering into quality partnership schemes; entering into quality contract schemes; entering into ticketing arrangements and ticketing schemes; providing information about bus services; installing bus lanes; providing subsidised bus services; making and implementing road user charging schemes; operating ferry services; managing tolled bridges; operating airports and air services; and entering into public service contracts. Chapter 2 Transport Functions: Further Provisions, Section 14 of the Act also provides for arrangement for performance by RTPs of certain transport functions etc., albeit this part of the Act does not provide an exhaustive definition of statutory functions relating to “transport”.
- 3.4** Transport Scotland officials did highlight that any order supported by Scottish Ministers would be before making an Order and it passing through Parliament, requiring a 3 month public consultation on the proposals. This would be a “Stage 2” of consultation, after any decision by the Partnership at a future Board meeting to progress after Stage 1 consultation with the process of making SEStran a Model 3 RTP.
- 3.5** The current timescale for this consultation, is between the December 2nd board meeting and the 2 March 2017 Board meeting. This would then enable an initial request to support an order to be made to Scottish Ministers prior to them launching the review of transport governance (Recommendation 21 of the Independent Review of Planning) as part of National Transport Strategy 2 consultation in early 2017.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1** The Forum are invited to:
- Note the update on the current consultation process with constituent councils on the interest in changing to SEStran from a Model 1 to a Model 3 partnership;

George Eckton
Partnership Director
20th January 2017

Andrew Ferguson
Secretary

Appendix 1 – Professor Tom Rye’s PTA models of organisation for regional transport governance final report



**Southeast Scotland Transport
Partnership**

**PTA models of organisation for
regional transport governance**

Report

Project No: 67751
November 16

Transport Research Institute,
Edinburgh Napier University,
10 Colinton Rd
Edinburgh
EH10 5DT
tri@napier.ac.uk

Prepared by: TR	Verified by: RL	Approved by: JG	
Status: Confidential	Issue no: 1	Date: 25/11/16	
Directory & File Name: C:\Users\tom\Desktop\tom1\research\SEStran rts\2016\SEStran Governance Report Edinburgh Napier University TRI Nov 2016.docx	Status: Draft v2	Issue no: 1	Date: 25/11/16
Directory & File Name: C:\Documents and Settings\Tombo\My Documents\proposals\Active travel proposal v2.doc			

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT	2
1.1 PURPOSE.....	2
1.2 REPORT STRUCTURE	2
2. DIFFERENT FORMS OF (P)TA.....	2
2.1 WHAT IS A MODEL 3 REGIONAL TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP AND HOW DOES IT DIFFER FROM WHAT SESTRAN IS NOW?	2
2.2 CAPACITY OF RTPS IN SCOTLAND.....	4
2.3 GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE OF RTPS	5
2.4 OTHER FORMS OF PASSENGER TRANSPORT AUTHORITY	5
2.4.1 <i>Passenger Transport Authorities and Executives in England (PTAs and PTEs)</i>	5
Capacity	6
Governance	7
Finance.....	7
2.4.2 <i>Transport for Greater Manchester</i>	7
2.4.3 <i>Transport for London (TfL)</i>	8
2.4.4 <i>Continental northern European PTAs</i>	9
3. CURRENT CHALLENGES AND HOW DIFFERENT PTA MODELS COULD ADDRESS THEM	11
3.1 INTRODUCTION AND CAVEAT.....	11
3.2 PLANNING AND DELIVERING TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS FOR ALL MODES OF TRANSPORT ACROSS THE REGION	11
3.2.1 <i>Economies of scale in delivery and Resilience</i>	12
3.3 POSITIVE PRICING AND FARES INTEGRATION.....	13
3.3.1 <i>Positive pricing for certain groups of travellers</i>	14
3.4 IMPROVED CROSS-REGIONAL MOBILITY FOR REGIONAL LABOUR, TRAINING AND EMPLOYABILITY; AND IMPROVED COMMUNITY CONNECTIVITY	15
3.5 PROVISION OF TRANSPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND INTERSECTIONALITY ACROSS GROUPS 17	
3.6 CONTRIBUTION TO THE HEALTH, EMPLOYABILITY AND WELFARE REFORM AGENDAS –	19
3.7 SUMMARY	20
3.8 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN A MODEL 3 SESTRAN AND OTHER ORGANISATIONS; AND MODEL 3 SESTRAN MEMBERSHIP	22
4. CONCLUSION.....	23

1. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 Purpose

This report has been produced by the Transport Research Institute, Edinburgh Napier University (TRI) on behalf of SEStran. The main purpose is to provide evidence and expert opinion on the benefits and possible disbenefits for the SEStran area in transitioning to a Model 3 Regional Transport Partnership (RTP), as defined under the 2005 Transport (Scotland) Act. In so doing, it describes the various models of passenger transport authority (PTA) that exist in Britain and elsewhere in Europe, and as far as possible based on evidence, discusses the advantages and disadvantages of each model.

1.2 Report structure

The report first considers what a Model 3 RTP is, and how this differs from SEStran's current statutory basis. It then describes the various other forms of (passenger) transport authority that exist in Scotland and England at present, and a generic model from northwestern countries of continental Europe. (The word "passenger" is in parentheses since a limited number of such bodies also have some powers over roads and/or land use planning.) From this it distills six models of (P)TA which are each described in terms of their responsibilities, finances and governance.

The six models are then discussed in relation to a number of challenges faced with regard to transport by the SEStran region at the present time. The purpose of this section is to consider which models are best placed to deal with these challenges, which were outlined in the client's project specification.

Finally, some specific issues related to the possible make-up of a SEStran Level 3 Partnership are discussed, as is the experience of local authorities in the north east of England that have recently voluntarily moved to a Combined Authority model (effectively, a form of PTA).

2. DIFFERENT FORMS OF (P)TA

2.1 What is a Model 3 Regional Transport Partnership and how does it differ from what SEStran is now?

Regional Transport Partnerships were created by the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005. The RTP elements of this legislation were intended to create an effective regional level of transport governance in Scotland that was perceived by the then government to have been missing since the creation of an entirely unitary district model of transport governance in 1996, and the abolition of the then regional councils. However, rather than move to a single model of regional transport governance, the 2005 Act set up RTPs as "Model 1" partnerships with limited powers; but with the option for Ministers to make orders to turn RTPs into organisations with a wider range of powers ceded from and with the agreement of their constituent local authorities – so called Model 2 and Model 3 partnerships.

The key statutory duty of a Model 1 RTP is to produce a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). A Model 1 RTP could be granted some powers to run concurrently with local authorities in the region to enable it to implement aspects of the RTS. The example cited in the 2004 Scottish Government consultation paper on RTPs was where the RTP might take powers to implement bus priority measures as part of regional Quality Bus Corridors, but the local authorities also retain road maintenance powers for those same corridors. In the case of SEStran and other Model 1 RTPs, however, they have to date taken on no additional powers or functions that run concurrently with those of their constituent local authorities.

In the 2005 Transport (Scotland) Act the additional functional (as opposed to administrative) duties and powers of a Model 1 RTP are listed as follows:

- Acquiring and disposing of land, including by compulsory purchase, where this is required for the discharge of its duties;
- Promoting or opposing private legislation;
- Participating in community planning; and
- Creating a company.

In addition, the functions that may be taken on by a Model 2 or Model 3 RTP are described as follows in Section 10 of the Transport (Scotland) Act:

“The functions which may be the subject of an order under subsection (1) above may, without prejudice to the generality of that subsection, include any of the following—

- (a) those conferred on local transport authorities by or under Part 2 of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 (asp 2) (bus services) and Part 3 of that Act (road user charging);
- (b) those conferred by or under any enactment and which relate to the management and maintenance of a bridge constructed in pursuance of functions conferred by, or by an order made under or confirmed by, any enactment;
- (c) those conferred on traffic authorities by sections 1 to 4 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (c.27) (traffic regulation orders) and on local traffic authorities by section 19 of that Act (regulation of use of roads by public service vehicles);
- (d) those conferred on councils by sections 63 and 64 of the Transport Act 1985 (c.67) (securing the provision of passenger transport and related consultation and publicity).

The following are examples of the functions which may be the subject of an order under this section—

- (a) entering into quality partnership schemes;
- (b) entering into quality contract schemes;
- (c) entering into ticketing arrangements and ticketing schemes;
- (d) providing information about bus services;
- (e) installing bus lanes;
- (f) providing subsidised bus services;
- (g) making and implementing road user charging schemes;
- (h) operating ferry services;
- (i) managing tolled bridges;
- (j) operating airports and air services;
- (k) entering into public service contracts.”

Whilst other the granting of other transport functions (e.g. road maintenance, road safety or parking enforcement) are not explicitly prohibited by Section 10, it is clear that the intention of the Act was that Model 2 and Model 3 RTPs would primarily concern themselves with public transport, and road pricing.

Currently in Scotland three Model 3 RTPs exist, SPT in much of the former Strathclyde area, SWESTRANS and ZETTRANS. These latter two RTPs have only one constituent council, respectively Dumfries and Galloway, and Shetland Islands. The functions ceded by these Councils to their RTPs are defined in relevant Statutory Instruments (passed in 2006) and are as follows:

For ZETTRANS and SWESTRANS, the functions transferred wholly to the RTP include those relating to local travel concessionary schemes, making quality partnership and quality contract schemes, ticketing arrangements and ticketing schemes. The function of making traffic regulation orders (TROs) and functions relating to the provision and maintenance of bus shelters are held concurrently by both organisations.

For SPT, all the functions that were previously held by the former PTA and PTE transferred to the new Model 3 RTP, with the exception of rail powers, which moved to the Scottish Government. SPT does not have the functions of making TROs and the other bus shelter related functions of the two other Model 3 RTPs.

It can be seen that the functions actually ceded to these three RTPs are much more limited than the alphabetically numbered list in Section 10 of the Act.

2.2 Capacity of RTPs in Scotland

In the absence of other data the capacity of RTPs is measured here as the number of FTE staff that they employ, and their annual spend on staff. It can be seen that the two Model 3 partnerships do not employ more staff than their Model 1 partnerships, with the exception of SPT, which of course has many staff employed in operational roles in bus stations, on the Clyde ferries, in travel inquiry bureaux and on the Glasgow Underground.

Partnership	Staff numbers
SWESTRANS	Employs no staff directly. Four staff from D&G Council run the partnership.
ZETTRANS	Employs no staff directly. Staff from Shetland Islands Council run the partnership.
Tactran	6
Nestrans	8
SEStran	10
HITRANS	9
SPT	551 people, £22.386 million staff related costs (as of 31/03/2016, taken from SPT 2016 Annual Report). Central support functions cost approximately £2.7 million per year.

2.3 Governance and Finance of RTPs

There is no difference in the Act between the governance arrangements for Level 1 and Level 3 partnerships.

In terms of finance, all RTPs lost all direct Scottish government funding in 2010. They are all dependent on a levy on their constituent local authorities. It is not clear from the limited research that was conducted for this piece of work as to whether the funding available for the functions ceded to ZETTRANS and SWESTRANS increased when they took on those functions, in comparison to the situation when their constituent councils carried out those functions.

In Scotland, RTPs have no responsibility for concessionary fares schemes for older people, nor for the distribution of bus operators' service grant to bus companies: these are exclusively national government functions. SPT runs an integrated ticketing scheme, Zonecard, accepted by all operators of all modes in its area, but this was set up many years ago when SPT was a PTA/E. In addition, RTPs, whether Model 1, 2 or 3 have no responsibility for securing rail services (whereas, prior to 2006, SPT was a signatory to the Scotrail franchise).

2.4 Other forms of passenger transport authority

2.4.1 Passenger Transport Authorities and Executives in England (PTAs and PTEs)

History and current functions

The 1968 Transport Act created Passenger Transport Executives as public transport coordinating and operating bodies in the metropolitan areas of West and South Yorkshire, Greater Manchester, Tyne and Wear, Merseyside and the West Midlands. In the regulated and publicly owned bus system that obtained prior to 1986, these PTEs were the main bus operator in their area, set service levels, subsidised fares and secured additional local rail services from the publicly owned operator, British Rail. They owned and operated bus stations, bus depots, and other transport infrastructure such as ferries, the Glasgow Underground and the Tyne and Wear Metro. They also promoted the construction of new transport infrastructure such as the Tyne and Wear Metro and many new railway stations.

From 1974, when metropolitan counties were created in England and regions in Scotland, the PTEs became accountable to and in part funded by their respective county or regional council. When the counties were abolished in England in 1986, the PTEs became accountable to and part-funded by a Passenger Transport Authority made up of elected members from their constituent district councils. At the same time they gradually stopped being bus operators (as their bus companies were subject to management buyouts) and could no longer specify bus services or fares in their areas due to bus deregulation under the 1985 Transport Act. They remained responsible for public transport coordination and securing socially necessary bus services, continued to run all operator integrated ticketing schemes, and continued to promote schemes such as Manchester Metrolink and Sheffield Supertram. From 2006 onwards they became the coordinating bodies for local transport strategy in their area in the English Local Transport Plan regime, a role that became statutory under the 2008 Local Transport Act in England. Also in 2006 all PTEs except for the one in Merseyside lost the role in assisting in specifying their

local rail franchise that they had had since 1993; although they still receive subsidy from DfT to pass on to rail operators running local rail franchises in their areas.

The Local Transport Act was also very important in creating the successor to PTAs, called Integrated Transport Authorities (ITAs). These ITAs could in theory take on more functions from their constituent local authorities, in the same way as RTPs are able to, subject to the agreement of those local authorities, and could also include more local authorities from beyond the original PTA/E boundary. In practice, none did so. In the 2009 Local Democracy Act (as amended by the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016) the ITAs were themselves superseded by Combined Authorities (CAs) and in some cases the separate PTEs were subsumed into the CAs. Compared to the PTAs that existed before 2008, CAs:

- Cover a bigger area (e.g. West Yorkshire CA includes the City of York, which was never part of the ITA or PTA before it).
- Can take on additional functions from Unitary District Councils such as highways (roads) functions – although as yet this has been limited only to a few powers in Greater Manchester.
- Advise on the specification of relevant rail franchises – although the statutory role remains exclusively that of DfT and ORR.
- **In future** they **may** have bus regulation powers over and above those in the 2000 Transport Act and the 2008 Local Transport Act (both pieces of legislation cover England and Wales only).
- Have some responsibilities and competence in the areas of economic development and training. The legislation that enables CAs to be set up is very broad in the scope of functions that could move to a CA, and they could move from either national or local government, but they are to be stipulated in the order setting up each CA.

CAs have led on the development of City Deal equivalents in England for their regions. They have been instrumental in securing additional transport infrastructure funding and permission to borrow; for example, in the case of Greater Manchester, some £1.5 billion over 10 years.

Since the creation of the national concessionary minimum fares entitlement in England in 2006, PTEs have been responsible for operating the concessionary fares scheme for bus in their area, for which they receive grant from central government. If this grant does not cover their expenditure on the nationally determined entitlement, they must make savings in other areas in order to continue to deliver free concessionary travel on bus. They are not responsible for the distribution of BSOG (bus service operator's grant, formerly known as fuel duty rebate).

Capacity

PTEs and their descendants in England have much greater organisational capacity in relation to public transport than the county and unitary councils in other areas. The reasons for this are primarily historical: set up as new organisations in 1968 with a specific remit to improve (socially necessary) public transport in their area, they were resourced accordingly. This level has been eroded over the years due to reductions in government spending but it remains greater than in non-CA areas.

Governance

The legislation for Combined Authorities does not stipulate precisely their governance, other than that they must be run by board composed of at least one elected politician from each of the constituent local authorities. In practice, the CAs now in existence have one to two members from each constituent local authority (in West Yorkshire, for example, there are 9 elected members from 6 councils), and a representative of the Local Enterprise Partnership as a non-voting member. Votes are not weighted by population and in the event of a tie a vote is deemed not to have passed. In the future some CAs will have an elected Mayor.

Finance

In the main at present CAs receive funding directly from national government, related to their former role as PTAs and PTEs. They also place a levy on their constituent local authorities. Transport capital investment comes from national government but it must compete with other training and economic development spending priorities – transport infrastructure funding previously allocated under the Local Transport Plan regime is no longer ring-fenced to transport. Mayors of CAs will have powers to increase council tax by up to 2 percentage points (if this is specified in the order establishing his/her CA).

2.4.2 Transport for Greater Manchester

This organisation is the transport arm of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority. As well as the public transport functions of the former ITA and PTE (similar to those of other CAs as described in the previous section), TfGM incorporates other transport functions, primarily related to data, modelling and performance monitoring of the regional and local road network. It also manages traffic signals across Greater Manchester, delivers some road safety activities, provides travel information for road users, and coordinates road works. Many of these functions transferred from joint units (funded by the 10 GM local authorities) that existed before TfGM was created, that were themselves created after the abolition of the former Greater Manchester County Council in 1986 in recognition of the value of and economies of scale achievable from a conurbation-wide approach to the provision of these services. Finally, TfGM owns the Metrolink light rail system, which is operated by a contractor, currently Transdev.

TfGM is governed by a committee of the Combined Authority, made up of 33 councillors from the 10 Manchester districts. Certain key decisions, primarily related to finance, are referred up to the CA governing board.

The scale of funding available to TfGM is significantly greater than for the transport arms of other Combined Authorities. This is primarily because Greater Manchester secured with the previous Chancellor of the Exchequer agreement for the Greater Manchester Transport Fund. This released additional funding from central government, and permissions to borrow, for investment in transport projects that are intended to increase regional gross value added (GVA) more than it would have increased in the absence of these projects. The total value of the fund is around £1.5 billion at 2012 prices, over ten years. The borrowing is to be repaid from an additional Council tax levy and from Metrolink fares surpluses. The investments cover mainly extensions to the Metrolink network, public transport interchanges, new bus links, a busway and some limited road construction.

The revenue budget for TfGM is outlined in Figure 1, below.

How money is spent	2011/2012
Support for concessionary travel	£66.4m
— Concessionary support is the money we pay to all operators, including bus, rail and Metrolink, to compensate them for the income they lose in providing free or reduced fares for those entitled to concessionary travel. In 2011/2012, we spent £66.4 million on concessionary support.	
Supported bus services	£31.2m
— We provide bus services when it is not considered economically viable for operators to provide commercial services, and if there is a need for communities to have access to jobs, health and education. We do this by designing and subsidising bus services to fill gaps in commercial operators' services. We also subsidise demand-responsive transport services (branded "Local Link") using community transport operators or taxi companies. We also provide dedicated school services throughout Greater Manchester for young people.	
Accessible transport	£6.1m
— Not everyone in Greater Manchester can use conventional public transport services so TfGM invests in services such as Ring and Ride which help to get more people to where they need to go. The expenditure also includes additional grants for travel training and a travel voucher scheme.	
Passenger facilities, services and support	£38.5m
— We use this money for a range of services to help passengers, such as the provision of passenger information, the operation and maintenance of bus stations, safety and security, Travelshops and bus shelters. It also covers activities such as consultations and support costs for TfGM Committee and since April 2011 has included traffic signal maintenance.	
Rail grant	£82.0m
— This money is given to us by the Department for Transport. We then pass on these funds to Northern Rail, the main rail franchise operator in Greater Manchester, and keep a small amount to support our activities in promoting and monitoring train services in the area.	
New responsibilities	£1.4m
— The change to TfGM in April 2011 meant new functions were added to the role of the organisation and which needed to be funded. The specialist teams which performed these tasks as parts of other public bodies are now part of the TfGM organisation.	
Financing	£57.0m
— This is the cost of investment in major transport capital programmes for Greater Manchester, such as Metrolink and the other schemes included in the Greater Manchester Transport Fund. This includes the cost of borrowing repayments and interest.	
	£282.6m

Figure 1 – revenue spending by TfGM, 2011/12 (from TfGM Annual Report 2011/12)

2.4.3 Transport for London (TfL)

TfL was set up under the 1999 Greater London Act, which also created the elected body, the Greater London Authority (GLA), of which TfL is the transport executive arm. TfL brought together the former London Transport and the Office of the Traffic

Director for London which prior to the creation of the GLA were accountable to boards appointed by the Department for Transport. TfL is responsible for all aspects of highway management and development on London's strategic road network, for the underground, for buses, for light rail and for rail services operating wholly within Greater London. It directly owns and operates the underground, whilst other public transport services are operated by private companies under contract to TfL in a regulated environment in which TfL sets fares and services, both routes and frequencies.

TfL is accountable to a board appointed by the Mayor of London and it takes its strategic direction from the Mayor's Transport Strategy, a document prepared by the GLA. The GLA also has a strategic land use planning function, meaning that there is some institutional alignment between strategic land use and transport planning. The Mayor governs the GLA with its nine elected members acting as a scrutiny body, although also one that approves the Mayor's budget.

The GLA receives government grant for its operations and permission to borrow for its investments. In addition the Mayor levies an additional Council tax.

For 2016/17 TfL's total turnover is budgeted to be around £10.4 billion. Some £4.8 billion of this is planned to come from fares (46%). Of the balance:

- £1.4 billion will come from government grant (for capital and operations);
- £1 billion will come from local business rates (including some £159 million from incremental business rates from a specific enterprise zone used to part-finance an extension of the northern Line into that zone) and council tax;
- £2.1 billion will come from borrowing and cash reserves; and
- Around £900 million will come from property, advertising and congestion charge income.

The grant, business rate and council tax income equates to about £300 per head, given a Greater London population of 8 million (compared to £72 per head in Greater Manchester, although bear in mind that TfGM has no roads functions). The direct government grant for general operations (£447 million) is due to be phased out over the next 2-3 years and due to this TfL is aiming to be self-financing in its operations by 2019. Nonetheless, its funding from tax will remain high in relation to other public sector public transport bodies in Britain. (Source of all financial data: TfL Annual Report and accounts 2016.)

2.4.4 Continental northern European PTAs

In countries such as Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, France and Germany it is typical to have a form of regional passenger transport authority. These vary as follows:

- Some report to directly elected regional councils whilst others are accountable to a board made up of elected members from constituent districts and cities.
- Some are funded by direct government grant, whilst others receive funding from regional taxation, and others from a levy on constituent authorities.
- Some are responsible for bus, tram and rail, whilst others cover only bus and tram.

The important commonality is that there is a public sector regional public transport body that runs public transport in its region either by awarding competitively tendered contracts to private operators to run public transport services or by a directly awarded concession. This body sets fares, routes and frequencies, is responsible for (integrated) ticketing, and coordinates services and carries out marketing. This body is in some way politically accountable and it receives a portion of its operating costs from taxation, and the rest from fares. Since none of these countries ever previously deregulated their local or regional public transport services, these regional public transport bodies have developed from an earlier public sector model – typically ownership and direct operation of local public transport by individual local authorities.

An example of such a body for which financial information is readily available is the PTA in the Skåne region of southwest Sweden. The PTA is part of Region Skåne which is a directly elected regional council. It sets public transport policy and finance. Planning, tendering, ticketing and marketing of local and regional buses and regional trains is carried out by its 100% owned executive arm, Skånetrafiken, which also owns the rail depots and trains needed to run regional rail services. Services are provided by private operators running under gross cost contracts to Skånetrafiken. Some 1.25 million people live in Skåne and around 152 million public transport trips per year are made. A monthly all modes season ticket costs around £120. Operations are subsidised at an annual cost of £177 million (2013, cash prices, 10.5SEK=£1 (excluding annualized capital costs of rail depots)). This subsidy amounts to £1.16 per trip across bus and rail combined. (Source: Region Skåne, 2015.)

3. CURRENT CHALLENGES AND HOW DIFFERENT PTA MODELS COULD ADDRESS THEM

3.1 Introduction and caveat

The client has asked how well different models of PTA, and specifically a Model 3 Regional Transport Partnership, are equipped to deal with current challenges and to deliver outcomes that are important for its constituent authorities and relevant to the planned City Deal. In this section, each of the five models of PTA described in the previous section of the report is evaluated in relation to the challenges specified by the client. The wording of this challenges as set out in the brief for this report is reproduced in the subheadings of the report's following sections.

The evaluation here is based on the form and organisational capacity of each of these 5 models of PTA currently in existence. This is an important point: it should not be assumed that a *new* Model 3 RTP in the SEStran area (or other model of PTA, should new legislation permit this) will necessarily have the same organisational capacity as PTAs of the same model that currently exist. This is because, as pointed out earlier, much of the capacity of existing forms of PTA results from their history. However, since it is outwith the scope of this report to try to predict the capacity of a new PTA of a given type, this report has to take the capacity of existing PTAs of each type as its starting point. This issue should be borne in mind when interpreting the results.

3.2 Planning and delivering transport solutions for all modes of transport across the region

The ability of an organisation to deliver “transport solutions” depends on its functions, finance and capacity. A limited number of transport solutions thought by the authors to be of particular interest to this study are listed in the following table, together with the numbers of each solution delivered in different areas of Britain in the since 2000, and showing the number delivered in Model 3 RTP or CA areas. Given the scope of the study and in view of data availability, the list of transport solutions covers only public transport. The table excludes London because of its high level of public finance and very different powers but includes Scotland and Wales.

Table 1 – Transport solutions and where they have been delivered

Transport solution	Number delivered since 2000 (of those, number in CA or Model 3 RTP areas)
New tram and light rail lines (including extensions of existing networks)	11 (7)
New busways of any length	11 (6)
Railway lines reopened to passengers	12 (4)
New railway stations	58 (12)
Statutory quality bus partnerships	6 (1)
Multi-operator ticketing	Many urbanised counties/unitaries in England (7)
Public sector control of bus routes, fares and frequencies through franchising	0

It can be seen that in cases relating to new busways, light rail and quality partnerships, the CAs have been most active. However, rail is a rather different story, with the majority of new stations and railway lines (re-)opening in non-CA areas, particularly since 2005, when CAs lost their direct rail powers. Scotland and Wales have predominated in the new railway line and station statistics since then, reflecting the greater powers acquired by their national administrations over rail in 2005. In addition only one area, a CA, Tyne and Wear, made an attempt in 2015 to get formal permission from central government to move to a franchised system for its bus network, but its application was refused. In contrast, the TfL area and continental PTAs have this power.

In relation to multi-operator ticketing, the Local Transport Act (2008) in England and Wales marked a major change as it allowed operators to collaborate on delivering ticketing without fear of breaking competition law. Since then, a large number of multi-operator ticketing schemes have developed in English areas outside the CA areas. Prior to 2008, other than the CA (then PTE) areas there were very few such schemes. Those within CA areas are multi-modal whereas outside CA areas they are limited mostly to bus; and the market share for these tickets is higher in CA areas, with Tyne and Wear's multi-modal multi-operator ticket used by around 10% of passengers. However, in no case in any area is the multi-operator ticket cheaper than a comparable single-operator product.

In the TfL and continental PTA areas, multi-modal ticketing does not distinguish between operators – fares are the same regardless of operator used and are usually based on the number of fare zones travelled through. (London makes a distinction between fares for rail/underground and bus travel; other areas usually do not.) In northern continental Europe, period passes generally offer far better value for money than single tickets; an adult monthly pass for all modes in Skåne, SW Sweden, costs around £120, whilst an annual all modes (tram, metro, train and bus) pass for the Munich metropolitan region costs €795.

It is not possible to be definitive about the reasons why CA areas deliver more in some areas but it is likely a combination of greater capacity, some additional finance, and the fact that they speak to national government on behalf of a very large number of people in each region, in comparison to most unitary authorities outside CA areas. (This has particularly been the case in Greater Manchester.) It is also clear that changes in national legislation relating to rail and to ticketing have influenced CAs' ability to deliver in comparison to non-CA areas. The ability of TfL and continental models to deliver is because they have similar organisational capacity but in addition they contract operators to run their services in a regulated environment, and the PTA retains the fares revenue which it can use to cross-subsidise from more profitable to unprofitable routes.

3.2.1 Economies of scale in delivery and Resilience

An argument for delivering transport services at a regional rather than local level is the potential to achieve economies of scale – more or the same service delivered with less financial input. The workforce size of each of the English CAs, including their transport arms, and their salary bills, are shown in the table below (sourced from the annual report and accounts of each organisation). These data may not be 100% accurate because of the definition of which staff work for which organisation, but they provide an order of magnitude impression and should be compared with the

data in Table 1 regarding the number of staff employed in the Scottish RTPs. Of course, the majority of the CAs below employ relatively large numbers of staff involved in operations such as Tyne and Wear Metro (which employs 330 of the staff at Nexus). Nonetheless, a relatively large number of staff are employed in strategy and planning roles also.

Table 2: Staff costs and numbers at English CAs and PTEs or equivalent

Authority	Salary bill 2015/16 (£000's)	Total employees
WYCA including former WYPTE	11,740	454
Nexus (Tyne and Wear PTE)	27,775	597
South Yorkshire (SCRCA) including SYPTE	5,477	230
Merseyside CA (LCRCA) including former Merseyside PTE	22,511	819
West Midlands CA and former PTE	14,002	341
Transport for Greater Manchester	24,023	707

In terms of staff employed to plan and procure tendered bus services compared to the budget spent, it is helpful to compare Nexus (Tyne and Wear PTE) with SEStran. In five authorities in the SEStran area, CEC, Fife, Falkirk, SBC and Midlothian, some 12 staff are employed to work solely or partly on this task. In total they allocate a budget of some £9.93 million (2016/17) although it should be noted that this is dominated by Fife, with £5.5 million. At Nexus some 12 staff are employed to work solely or partly on the same task and to manage a budget of £7.9 million. Obviously these are only two examples and a more thorough analysis would have to be undertaken to draw full conclusions about the economies of scale or otherwise arising from the two governance models.

In addition to the resilience aspects, one further advantage of concentrating the staff responsible for this function within one organisation in a region is, as organisations lose staff in funding cutbacks, to retain some level of knowledge and specialisation in this function within the organisation. Where only one member of staff in an organisation is responsible for the function, if they are lost, their knowledge and skills are lost to the organisation. With respect to the function of tendering bus services, this loss of organisational knowledge is less likely to happen in Nexus than it is in a small unitary authority.

3.3 Positive pricing and fares integration

Fares integration in terms of multi-operator multi-modal ticketing was discussed in the previous section. The term “positive pricing” is taken to mean, for example, limits to fares increases, or fares set in relation to affordability, or to their comparability with motoring costs. With respect to bus fares, the only powers that any public authorities in Britain outside London have over the fares set by operators on commercial services are contained in the 2008 Local Transport Act (England and Wales only). This permits a statutory quality bus partnership to include stipulations on maximum fares. To the author’s knowledge, the only QBP to do this are in the

Bristol Bath and Northeast Somerset area, an area with exceptionally high fares – for example, £5 single to travel 15km.

In areas such as SWESTRANS and ZETTRANS, where there are few or no commercial services, then the Model 3 partnership has a big influence over fares levels as it procures the vast majority of bus services in its area, for which it sets fares. Elsewhere, where subsidised tendered services form a small proportion of a much larger network, the tendering authorities must set fares on their subsidised services that are broadly in line with those on commercial services in the same area (i.e. they are not permitted by the 1985 Transport Act to “undercut” commercial fares). Where CAs are owners and/or operators of metros and light rail, as in the West Midlands, Manchester and Tyne and Wear, they have direct control of the fares on these services.

As noted above, TfL and continental European PTAs **do** set fares in their specific regulatory environments. Politically they are able to make the choice as to the proportion of public transport operating cost that comes from fares, and the proportion from tax. It is notable that over the past 10 years public transport fares in Norway, for example, have broadly mirrored changes in motoring costs, whilst those in Britain on both bus and rail have increased much faster. This has been achieved without significant increases in subsidies due to increases in efficiency driving down operating cost; however, now these efficiencies have been achieved, it may not be possible to keep down fares without additional subsidy.

3.3.1 Positive pricing for certain groups of travellers

People of retirement age

People of state retirement age and over, and disabled people, receive a national minimum concessionary bus fare of free travel on local bus services in England. They cannot travel in the morning peak on weekdays but otherwise travel is unlimited. In Scotland, the entitlement is more generous, as it starts at aged 60 and has no time restrictions. There is some evidence that the free concession has increased social inclusion for the poorest pensioners (e.g. Rye and Mykura 2006) and led wealthier pensioners to drive less.

CAs in England negotiate their own agreements with operators on reimbursement for the concessionary scheme in their area. They receive money from government to pay the reimbursement. However this often does not fully cover the cost of the scheme (due to its popularity, and its open-ended nature) such that the CA must either change the reimbursement mechanism to pay less to the operators, or it must take finances from other functions. The former mechanism can backfire since operators may respond by cutting services. In Scotland, the concessionary fares scheme is national and operators are reimbursed by Transport Scotland.

Unemployed people

Jobseekers across Britain are eligible for the JobSeeker plus card and major bus operators give a 50% discount on their fares with this card.

However, in addition, most CAs operate schemes providing jobseekers with free bus (and where available metro/tram) travel to interviews, plus a month's free travel

once a job has been secured, so that people can afford to travel to work before their first pay packet comes in. This scheme was nationwide for a period around 2013 for anyone with a JobSeeker plus card, but has since been scaled back. The only area that appears to operate it currently that is **not** a CA is the City of Nottingham. Between 2003 and 2014 this scheme is estimated to have helped 13,000 jobseekers back into work in the West Midlands alone (source: Centro, 2014). Another evaluation in one part of the West Midlands found that over 80% of those who used the scheme would have found it extremely difficult to access job opportunities without the scheme (Urban Transport Group, 2015).

3.4 Improved cross-regional mobility for regional labour, training and employability; and improved community connectivity

In Britain outside London the primary power that CAs, Model 3 RTPs and local authorities all share in regard to these outcomes is the ability to secure “socially necessary” services under subsidised contracts with bus operators, to run services in places and/at times where there are no commercially provided routes. For example, in the West Midlands (personal communication, October 2016):

Subsidised bus services – a range of tendered ‘socially necessary’ bus services provided by Transport for the West Midlands (TfWM) under successive Transport Act duties – top-up the commercial network at certain times/places, and add around 11% more bus kilometres to the network.

TfWM assesses local needs for tendered services, using Accessibility Planning techniques for large changes to the network, and also ensuring a maximum 400m walk from urban households to their nearest bus stop. Tendered service needs are also prioritised on journey purpose – with work and school journeys given highest priority, all subject to a minimum level of demand, and value for money (cost/demand) test.

Operating tendered services cost £7.4M in 2015/16, a small reduction from the previous year, reflecting continued pressure on funding. The funds purchased 11.8m bus kilometres, which saw 10.9m boardings. Bus kilometres and boardings figures have also reduced year-on-year, but boardings on tendered services are still 4% of the total.

There is evidence from individual case studies that CAs have used their subsidised bus service budgets to take very specific and successful steps to improve access to employment. An example, taken from Urban Transport Group (2015, p 7) is as follows:

SOS is the largest online fashion store in both the UK and Europe. ASOS partnered with Unipart to manage its European distribution centre when it relocated to South Yorkshire. ASOS Unipart began recruiting in early 2011, teaming up with Jobcentre Plus they sought to draw candidates from a jobseeker market of largely semi-skilled people aged 19-25 from the local area.

Initial survey data showed that more than 75% of candidates did not drive or have access to vehicles. This made it nearly impossible to get to the site, where buses were infrequent and there were no evening or Sunday services. Jobcentre Plus was finding that up to 92 potential candidates per week were unable to accept or apply for a role at ASOS. In response, South Yorkshire

PTE, in partnership with local bus operators, altered bus routes stopping at the site and adjusted and expanded timetables to match shift patterns.

Following the alterations, bus patronage on the enhanced services grew from 108 in the first week of service in late June 2011, to 831 per week in September 2011. The bulk of this increase is likely to represent people connected to jobs that they otherwise could not have reached.

However, it is not clear whether schemes like this are more likely to be provided in CA than non CA areas. From the point of view of this report, the key general issue is whether CAs and Model 3 RTPs can deliver more socially necessary bus services, and if so whether they do so more efficiently, than their unitary authority counterparts. Whether they can deliver more is primarily related to funding, although also to the competitiveness of the local market for tendered services as well as its operating conditions; and whether they can do it more efficiently relates to their capacity, expertise and ability to achieve economies of scale and secure a better deal from their bidders.

An analysis of Bus and Coach Statistics for Great Britain (DfT, 2015) shows that the CAs in England deliver exactly the same proportion of the total socially necessary bus mileage in England as they have population: 26% of the supported bus mileage and 26% of the population (excluding London) in 2015 (down from 38% of the total supported bus mileage in 1987). By virtue of course of their small geographical area, this means that the density of this service is higher in the CA areas than in counties and unitaries outside, but this will not necessarily be the case if the CAs grow geographically (as the northeast CA already has) without a growth in their supported services budget. In terms of spend, the CAs account for 41% of the total £302 million spent on supported services in England outside London in 2014/15. They spent £10.50 per person on these services in that financial year, whilst non-CA areas spent £8.10.

On top of this should be added revenue support to metro services Tyne and Wear of around £35 million per year; and to rail services in all CA areas (which is a grant direct from DfT which the CAs then pass on to operators). In general these figures imply that more is spent on subsidy to public transport services in CA areas than outwith these areas, supporting a denser network of socially necessary services.

The Merseyrail franchise is rather unique in the British rail system and therefore worthy of note. Although run by private operators, they provide a service under gross cost contract to the transport arm of the Merseyside CA, which then takes the revenue risk for the network. The network consistently achieves levels of service, service quality, investment and customer satisfaction that are well above average. However, the subsidy (which comes from the DfT, to Merseytravel) is the highest in the industry, at £86.2 million in 2014/15 – around £80 per year for each person in the CA area, and 12.4 pence per passenger km (compared to a national average negative subsidy (i.e. payment to DfT) of 1.3 pence per passenger km).

Because several CA areas have light rail or metro, and in most of these they control the fares and because, for historic reasons, rail networks are denser in the CA areas than outside them (except for in London), they receive more rail subsidy than non CA areas, then in total the density of the subsidised public transport network is far higher than outside the CA areas. However, without extremely detailed analysis it is not possible to quantify this density, but all other things being equal it means that

access to jobs and community connectivity will be higher in the CA areas than outside them. Nonetheless, it is crucial to remember the role of historical funding decisions in producing this situation; creation of a new CA or similar will not automatically replicate the situation in existing CAs.

3.5 Provision of transport for people with disabilities and intersectionality across groups

Disability, race and gender often overlap to create and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage; this is intersectionality. Public transport services that meet the needs of one group of people, for example disabled people, are also likely therefore to have beneficial impacts on people suffering from other forms of disadvantage. Demand responsive public transport created primarily for disabled people will also help people without a disability but living in poverty in areas without conventional public transport to reach the services, and jobs, that they need, for example. Another example of intersectionality is in relation to gender. In almost all parts of the world – and Scotland is no exception to this - women are more likely than men to use public transport, and more likely to need public transport to balance work and caring responsibilities. However as Bramley et al (2016) also highlight, getting women into greater full time employment has significant positive impacts on the gender pay gap and in-work poverty

There is evidence from falling use of Dial a Ride services across Britain that disabled people may be moving to conventional public transport as those services become more accessible, and also to car, as evidenced by increasing use of Motability services (see Hunter, 2015). Nonetheless, there remains a large group of people whose disabilities mean that they cannot use conventional public transport vehicles or that they cannot walk to and from the stops/stations due to long walking distances and/or walking environments that have not been subject to the reasonable improvements that roads authorities have a duty to make under the Equality Act 2010 to make them accessible. In addition, in some areas there are simply no conventional scheduled public transport services. Therefore, these people depend on their car, if they have one and can drive; or on friends and family; and/or on flexible and demand responsive accessible transport services.

There is unfortunately no single “directory” of the services offered in different areas of the UK for people who have problems using, or have no access to, conventional public transport. It is also not always clear what type of service is provided in an area, since different service providers provide different services and information about them is not always coordinated. This also means that the information provided here may not be fully complete. However, based on the information available to the authors, three areas’ provision of flexible and accessible transport are described in the table below, which covers one unitary authority, one Model 3 RTP and one CA area. (This table does not show any such transport that is provided or funded by another public sector body, such as a Health Board.)

Table 3 – comparison of accessible transport services in different PTA areas

Area	Type of service and fare	Overall cost/year to authority	Trips/year (approx)	Cost/trip to public sector	Trips and funding per head of population
SPT	MyBus – scheduled and infrequent accessible services that divert from route to provide door to door service in an area or corridor. Must be booked. Free to concession holders.	Unclear – up to £4 million?	490,000	£8 (excludes capital costs of vehicles at least some of which are owned by SPT)	0.22 trips £1.81
City of Edinburgh	Dial a Ride fully accessible fully flexible bookable up to 1 hour in advance, £5 for 5 mile trip Dial a Bus similar to MyBus in SPT area, £1.25 per trip	Total for both £757,000	110,000	£6.88	0.23 trips £1.64
TfG Manchester	Ring and Ride, very similar to Edinburgh Dial a Ride but trip lengths limited, low/free fare Local Link – bookable shared minibus running in certain local areas	Around £5 million per year	1,327,000	£3.76	0.47 trips £1.79

Table 3, above, shows some evidence that a better and cheaper service is provided in Greater Manchester than the other two areas, one a unitary and one a Model 3 RTP. SPT's service is well used and its cost per trip is not excessive but it is not very flexible. Edinburgh's service is flexible but at a high cost to the user that does not appear to be reflected in a lower public subsidy per trip than the other two schemes where users pay much lower charges. Transport for Greater Manchester appears to be providing the best combination of value for money to the public purse, and to the user, whilst providing a flexible service. However, whether this is the result of it being a combined authority or some other factor such as the organisation having had more bids for the relevant contract(s) is unclear.

In PTAs in other northern European countries the availability and right to accessible transport varies widely and there is not scope in this report to give a full review. However, to take the example of Sweden, here some 3.3% of the total population has the right to use a low cost, fully accessible, fully flexible demand responsive form of public transport which must be provided by law by local authorities (called *färdtjänst*). Users must book, they have to pay between £2 and £7 per trip and there is a limit on the number of trips that they can take. The average number of trips taken per eligible person per year is 35 (11 million in total across Sweden), at a cost to the public purse of £300 million (a cost that is separate from the subsidy for

conventional public transport). This ridership is much higher than in comparable British schemes, but cost coverage from fares is also, and cost per trip to the public purse is several orders of magnitude greater.

In addition, most regional public transport authorities run demand responsive services on semi-flexible routes in areas without conventional public transport for people who are not eligible for *färdtjänst*. These cost no more than the equivalent bus fare, but may run only once or twice a day. (All data from Wretstrand, personal communication, November 2016.) They are funded from within the regional public transport budget which is able to do so more effectively than in the British system since the regional PTAs keep the revenue from all public transport operations and can therefore use the profits from more profitable routes to cross-subsidise less profitable and demand responsive routes.

3.6 Contribution to the health, employability and welfare reform agendas –

The links between transport, health and employability are complex but it is clear from academic evidence that mental and physical health are negatively affected if an individual is not able to participate fully in society, and lack of transport can be a factor in this (Currie et al, 2010; OECD, 2016). The question for this report is whether a Model 3 RTP would be better placed to reduce these transport-related barriers than the current governance situation can do and better promote Inclusive Growth as outlined in Scotland's Economic Strategy:

The Scottish Government's Inclusive Growth policy framework captures the multidimensionality of IG. The fulcrum of these areas is in the labour market. As a long term enterprise, inclusive growth is about promoting more and better quality jobs; and ensuring that all have the opportunity to contribute to the economy.

There are also the challenges of projected high levels of population growth in the region; an effective regional transport planning organisation is likely to be required to respond to these.

An analysis of the likelihood that a PTA could deliver benefits in these areas boils down once again to the evidence that Model 3 and other forms of PTA are able to more efficiently provide a higher level of subsidised bus service and specialist transport for disabled and other socially disadvantaged people than their Model 1 and Unitary Authority counterparts. The information presented above in Sections 3.4 and 3.5 indicates that the evidence that Model 3 RTPs and English CAs are more able to do this than their unitary and Model 1 counterparts is not clear. More service may be provided, but this is at a cost, and it is not clear that efficiency increases with the scale of the operation.

The recent emerging findings of the Royal Society of Art's Inclusive Growth Commission was published in September 2016¹. The report focussed on a definition of Inclusive Growth as a broad based growth that enables the widest range of people and places to both contribute to and benefit from economic success.

¹ <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/emerging-findings-of-the-inclusive-growth-commission/>

One of the key messages was the need to invest in social as well as physical infrastructure. Specifically in a transport context, this debate focussed on the need to prioritise connecting people to economic opportunities, through better skills planning and provision, through the provision of better local transport services as much if not more so that traditional physical road network infrastructure improvements. The report clearly highlights that simply building transport links is not enough to change patterns of economic mobility and cultures.

The report also stresses that whilst transport connectivity is important for realising the benefits of agglomeration, its effectiveness is predicated on connecting high-skilled workers with high-skilled jobs and investment to drive up productivity and growth. However, the report highlights that there are numerous communities across the UK within a few miles of such improvements to transport opportunities that do not always benefit. These opportunities can be denied by an ingrained mindset the report observes against working in the city centre or the sheer cost of travel to a low paid or zero-hour contract role. Whilst some communities and people will clearly benefit from places becoming, in effect, commuter towns for bigger city centre focussed labour markets, other people and places typically low skilled or economically inactive, risk being further excluded.

Therefore, the report observes, transport services and accessibility can be a preventative measure as part of a wider integrated economic strategy if actions go beyond traditional capital-based transport investment. However, it also highlights that prevention is an elusive business, where investment generates returns that fall into someone else's budget, thereby discouraging the original investment. They suggest moving beyond a "cookie-cutter" approach to segmentation of policy responsibility and focussing on genuinely geographically inclusive place-based strategies tailored to the needs, ambitions and nuances of a place's economic geography. This would help address a key Commission finding that inequalities are driven partly by distance from public services and decision making.

The Infrastructure workstream of the Edinburgh Region City Deal is to undertake further work on the investment proposal to understand the impact on areas of high deprivation and unemployment up to 30 minutes travel time from the individual projects. This is intended to provide an evidence base to underpin the potential impact on inclusion and also to support the regional Employability and Skills Programme to improve the employment rate and reduce welfare dependency. Because PTAs have traditionally and continue to focus on public transport services and fares just as much as infrastructure provision, it would be useful if this research could look further at the impact of a PTA on accessibility to employment or training opportunities.

3.7 Summary

Table 4, below, tries to summarise the findings of this chapter by rating the different possible forms of PTA according to their ability to deliver on the outcomes set out in the client's specification for this report.

Table 4: Summary showing different PTA models and their possible impacts on outcomes

Outcome	Model 3 RTP	Combined authority	TfL or continental PTA
<i>Planning and delivering transport solutions for all modes of transport across the region</i>	Clear that SPT offers a wider range of transport solutions (e.g. multi-modal ticketing; busway; Subway; extensive rail network) than found in Model 1 RTP areas	English CAs have delivered consistently more of many types of new schemes and transport solutions than have unitary areas. This likely due to greater capacity and funding, mainly for historic reasons	Easier to deliver schemes and other solutions due to greater funding and regulatory control. Greater organisational capacity for historic reasons
<i>Economies of scale in delivery</i>	Little evidence but data limited	Little evidence but data limited	Little evidence but data limited
<i>Positive pricing and fares integration</i>	SPT runs Zonecard – pretty much unique in Scotland	All CAs have run multi-modal multi-operator ticketing for many years; but more expensive than single operator ticketing Outside CA areas, multi-operator ticketing appearing due to change in competition law GB's only quality bus partnership with fares caps is in non-CA area	These types of authority have control over fares. TfL seeking to eliminate operating deficit. Fares therefore not especially low. Elsewhere in northern Europe, fares for regular travellers extremely cheap. Multi-mode and multi-operator tickets standard
<i>Positive pricing for certain groups of travellers</i>	Subject to national concessionary fare	All CAs run special fares deals for job seekers, not available in non-CA areas (except Nottingham). Subject to national concessionary fare	Due to control of fares and revenue, PTA can choose to set lower fares for certain groups. No need to negotiate with operators regarding compensation for any concessions.
<i>Improved cross-regional mobility for regional labour, training and employability; and improved community connectivity</i>	Little evidence that SPT runs more tendered bus services per head than do local authorities in Model 1 RTP areas	Higher spending per head on tendered bus services in these areas than in unitary authorities. Denser service. Certain services specifically designed to enable access to employment for people on low wages.	Ability to cross-subsidise unprofitable services with revenue from profitable services (due to gross cost contracts in regulated environment) allows provision of more service on low demand routes than in equivalent areas of Scotland.
<i>Provision of transport for people with disabilities and intersectionality across groups</i>	No evidence to suggest that provision better in these areas than in unitary or Model 1 areas	More work required to demonstrate that CAs achieve economies of scale and better provision than unitary counterparts.	As above; cross-subsidy can be used to support demand responsive services in rural areas
<i>Contribution to the health, employability and welfare reform agendas</i>	Evidence limited	Evidence limited. If more services provided in these areas than outside, ceteris paribus then travel should be less of a barrier to health and employability in CA areas	Levels of service higher and (except TfL) fares lower in these areas compared to PTA and unitary areas. Transport therefore less of a barrier to social inclusion.

Overall, then, this table shows that there is limited evidence that Model 3 RTPs and CAs necessarily provide much better performance against outcomes than do their unitary counterparts. They are not necessarily more efficient in what is delivered per £ spent or person employed. They do offer resilience benefits, as there are more people working on the same issue in an RTP or CA compared to in a local authority. In addition there is evidence that the English CAs deliver more and more different types of scheme than their unitary counterparts, but this is most likely due to greater organisational capacity and knowledge, which is something that they have acquired over time. Their greater funding also allows them to provide special fares for jobseekers, and for investment in light rail; and the greater funding is itself partly a product of greater organisational capacity and the ability that comes with that to lobby central government more effectively for funds. However, to deliver major changes in regional public transport affordability and service the CAs would have to be funded differently and operate in a regulatory context more akin to that in the rest of northwest Europe. The difficulty with that would be the transaction costs and general organisational upheaval.

3.8 Relationships between a Model 3 SEStran and other organisations; and Model 3 SEStran membership

Other regional public transport organisations

At present in the SEStran area there is another public transport organisation that has some aspirations to operate at a more regional level: Transport for Edinburgh (TfE). TfE, an arm's length company 100% owned by the City of Edinburgh Council, was created as a holding company for Lothian Buses and Edinburgh Tram in order that they could operate without competing with each other and still comply with competition law. TfE has also become a brand for public transport in Edinburgh and on Lothian Buses services (and those of its subsidiaries) in East and Midlothian in particular, and TfE does have aspirations, as set out in its draft Strategy, to operate and manage other parts of the local and regional transport network, but currently there it has no statutory basis other than as a holding company.

It would be possible for a Model 3 SEStran RTP to be created without any formal reference to or agreement with TfE, but a more positive option would be to agree on functions that TfE might carry out (ceded to it by City of Edinburgh and potentially other Councils under a Service Level Agreement) and those that SEStran might carry out. In the longer term, SEStran might take a largely policy and strategy role, akin more to a combined authority in England, and TfE could be an executive arm, more akin to TfGM or Nexus. However, this would be complex to set up given TfE's main and key role as a holding company for Lothian Buses and Edinburgh Tram.

Clackmannanshire, Falkirk and Stirling as members of a Model 3 SEStran

The principal benefit to these authorities of being part of a Model 3 SEStran created under current legislation would be to be part of a larger organisation responsible for public transport coordination and procurement of certain services, with the organisational knowledge, capacity, skills and resilience that this could bring. It could potentially ease the challenges of coordinating transport across unitary authority boundaries in these parts of the region and others.

4. CONCLUSION

This report has first described the form, governance, functions and financing of different forms of passenger transport authority, before trying to analyse their relative ability to deliver on the outcomes from public transport that are required by the authorities within the SEStran region and the Edinburgh City Deal. There is evidence that they do deliver more transport improvements than their unitary authority and Model 1 RTP equivalents, and that they offer a wider range of ticketing, information and interchange facilities; they also spend more per head on tendered bus services than do their unitary counterparts. However, systematic evidence is lacking to be able to demonstrate unequivocally that they exercise their functions more efficiently and effectively, and that those functions are delivering more on outcomes, than in non PTA areas. This may of course be more a function of the lack of evidence than actual proof that PTAs *are* no more efficient/effective.

On the other hand, of the nine City Deals to be brokered by the Government in the first wave of the initiative, seven are in areas with a passenger transport authority. In this sense there is a clear link between having this form of regional public transport governance and being in the first tranche of city regions to be offered this form of financing of infrastructure and revenue spending for economic growth. Having a PTA also allows the region to speak with one voice to central government about its needs for (public) transport; and to show that it has the expertise required to deliver on these large spending commitments. Taking a regional approach to transport planning is also more likely than a more fragmented approach to be able to deliver cross-regional improvements in public transport connectivity. A PTA also offers organisational resilience in public transport coordination and planning that a number of smaller authorities with very small numbers of staff will find it hard to provide.

References

Currie, Graham, et al. "Investigating links between transport disadvantage, social exclusion and well-being in Melbourne—Updated results." *Research in Transportation Economics* 29.1 (2010): 287-295.

Most recent Annual Reports from SPT, and West Yorkshire Combined Authority, Nexus, Merseyside PTE, Transport for Greater Manchester, Transport for the West Midlands, Transport for London, and South Yorkshire PTE.

Lothian Handicabs (2015) Annual Report 2014. Handicabs, Edinburgh.

DfT (2015) Bus and Coach Statistics GB. DfT, London.

Urban Transport Group (2015) Ticket to Thrive: the role of urban public transport in tackling unemployment. UTG, Leeds.
<http://www.urbantransportgroup.org/resources/types/reports/ticket-thrive-role-urban-public-transport-tackling-unemployment>

Hunter, D. (2015) Working paper on ridership on Dial a Ride services around Britain. Not for Profit Planning, Edinburgh.

OECD (2016) Making Cities Work for All www.oecd.org/regional/making-cities-work-for-all-9789264263260-en.htm

Projects Update

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report provides the Forum with an overview of current SEStran projects.

2. REAL TIME PASSENGER INFORMATION (RTPI)

2.1 BustrackerSEStran provides live bus times for all of the services operated by both First Scotland East and Stagecoach Fife, within the SEStran region. This has improved the reliability of the bustracker website and mobile app for the general public, and is anticipated to increase patronage of bus services as a result.

2.2 A substantial number of public premises throughout the region are displaying, or have committed to displaying live bus times on digital screens alongside public information and news bulletins. To date, SEStran has committed to approximately 155 digital screen installations in a variety of public and commercial buildings within the SEStran area.

2.3 To accelerate the roll out of the remaining screens (approximately 130), SEStran has employed an experienced Marketing Officer to distribute all remaining equipment by the end of the 2016/17 financial year. .

2.4 Following SEStran's information session for smaller bus operators held in July 2016, SEStran are working with INEO and transport consultants WYG to enable a link between bustrackerSEStran and GPS-enabled ticket machines operated by smaller bus operators in the SEStran region.

2.5 A Smart Ticketing Challenge Fund was launched by Transport Scotland, in October 2016. The fund provides capital funding to public sector organisations looking to develop interoperable smart ticketing. Modern ticket machines are also equipped with a GPS facility which can facilitate a connection to the RTPI system. Following consultation with the region's bus operators SEStran has submitted a bid, for a 40% ERDF funding contribution, towards ticket machine upgrades for 5 bus operators (Blue Bus Ltd., Peter Hogg of Jedburgh, A1 Coaches, Edinburgh Coachlines Ltd. and Eve's Coaches).

3 SESTRAN THISTLE CARD – APP DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

3.1 The Thistle Card App is designed to replicate the original SEStran Thistle

card with an initial page for the customer to input their protected characteristic using the same previously agreed symbols. The second page displays the information to be shown to the bus driver.

3.2 The new Thistle Card App was added to the app store in a soft launch to gain feedback. SEStran has now incorporated the feedback received from stakeholders to date, and would now like to encourage Forum members to circulate the app through their own communications channels.

3.3 SEStran is now in discussion with developers to identify potential to include usage statistics and where the app is being used. These additions can be added as feedback incrementally as use of the initial app increases. This data could be used to inform bus operators in the future to improve services.

4 X-ROUTE STUDY

4.1 SEStran commissioned Young Scot to conduct a Co-Design project called X-Route, which engaged young people on how to improve cycling in their area and the barriers they face.

4.2 The X-Route study¹ involved groups of young people, from various socio-economic backgrounds across the south east of Scotland, discussing the barriers they face when considering using active travel as a means of transport. The report was conducted using Young Scot's Co-design method, where young people are involved much earlier in decision making process through a highly participative approach developing informed insights, ideas, recommendations and solutions for service development, policy and practice.

4.3 The report has produced a number of interesting results and insights from the workshops so far and the young people have raised a huge variety of issues faced, including some concerns. However, they have also proposed some ingenious solutions, including some proposals that SEStran is seeking to progress via a bid to the Scottish Roads Research Board

5 EUROPEAN PROJECTS UPDATE

5.1 'SocialCar' aims to integrate public transport information, car-pooling and crowd sourced data in order to provide a single source of information for the traveller to compare multiple options/services.

5.2 The last Social Car meeting was held in Brussels as part of the mid-term

¹ http://www.sestran.gov.uk/uploads/XRoute_document_2016_Final_2.pdf

conference on the 22nd of November. Local Stakeholder groups will resume in February/March of this year, and will seek additional test users later in 2017.

- 5.3** ‘**SHARE-North**’ addresses the concept of ‘Shared Mobility’ and looks at the development, implementation and promotion of Car Clubs, Bike Sharing and Car Sharing. The planned living labs will integrate modern technology with activities to support changes in mobility behaviour. The objectives are: resource efficiency, improving accessibility (incl. non-traditional target groups), increased efficiency in the use of transport infrastructure, reduction of space consumption for transport, improving quality of life and low carbon transport.
- 5.4** The last SHARE-North partner meeting was held in Kortrijk and Ghent in Belgium on the 6th to 11th of November. SEStran held a workshop around a Shared Mobility Manual for Municipalities. As part of the project’s dissemination tasks, a series of webinars are to be held during the lifetime of the project. The first took place on the 20th of January, with an introduction to the ‘Sharing Economy’.
- 5.5** ‘**REGIO-MOB**’ aims to promote “learning, sharing of knowledge and transferring best practices between the participating regional and local authorities to design and implement regional mobility plans (or Regional Transport Strategies) bearing in mind the stakeholders with regional relevance and contributing to the sustainable growth of Europe.” Accordingly this project provides an opportunity for SEStran to attract European funding towards the necessary development of the RTS and to learn and share knowledge with other cities throughout Europe. The project will attract 85% funding from Europe.
- 5.6** The last REGIO-MOB consortium meeting was held in Edinburgh at the City Chambers on the 11th and 12th of January. Park and Ride and Edinburgh’s A90 Queue Management System were two examples of best practice chosen by the REGIO-MOB project partners. Presentations from both Edinburgh Council and Stagecoach were given, and a subsequent workshop hosted by SEStran was held.

6. OPPORTUNITIES FOR NEW EUROPEAN PROJECTS

6.1 Interreg, North West Europe – March 2017 Call

6.1.2 SCRIPT (Sustainable Carbon Reduction in Port Transport)

It is well understood that transport, in general, is a major contributor to

carbon emissions totals and freight transport's contribution is significant; with a particular concentration around ports and their hinterland as a result of the necessary traffic required to transfer goods to and from the ports.

6.1.3 SEStran and partners' objective is to engage with ports and freight transport operators and their supply chains in selected estuarine and inland waterway locations within the North West Europe area to effect large-scale behavioural change with respect to the use of low carbon logistics and transportation and the implementation of different low carbon solutions. Work continues towards a submission in March this year with a meeting due to be held in Brussels in February.

6.2 Interreg, North Sea Region

6.2.1 Surflogh

6.2.2 The Surflogh project bid, aimed at improving the role of logistic hubs in the network of urban logistics in the North Sea Region, was unsuccessful from the Interreg North Sea Region programme in October 2016. However, the consortium involved, having taken account of feedback from the unsuccessful submission is keen to re-submit at the end of January 2017.

6.3 Horizon 2020

6.3.1 E-MOTIVE

In partnership with Leeds University, Institute for Transport Studies and CENIT in Spain, SEStran is currently pursuing a bid to Horizon 2020. The consortium for this project now includes 8 academic/research institutes, 5 cities/regions and approximately 10 demonstration projects in total. SEStran's role in this project will focus on Young People, developing SEStran's existing relationship with Young Scot as a demonstration project. The deadline for submission of this project is February 2017.

6.3.2 SEStran is currently in discussion with Napier University's Transport Research Institute (TRI) regarding future bids under the headings of "...innovative solutions to achieve sustainability..." and "improving, acceptability, inclusive mobility and equity..." to be considered later this financial year.

7. EU Exit

7.1 The UK government has announced that the Article 50 process will be

initiated at the end of March 2017. However, a recent court judgement has ruled that the exit decision needs formal parliamentary support. In a speech on 17 January, the PM announced that the decision will be put before parliament along with the strategy for exiting the EU.

- 7.2** In the meantime, The Scottish Government has announced that it will be,....” passing on in full to Scottish stakeholders, the guarantees on EU funding that the UK Government has provided to cover the period between now and the point that the UK proposes to leave the EU – to provide stability and certainty for these key sectors of the Scottish economy.” The guarantee covers all European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) Programmes 2014-20, including European Regional Development Funds (ERDF), European Social Funds (ESF), European Territorial Co-operation (ETC) programmes, agri-environment schemes, and all projects funded directly by the European Commission through, for example Horizon 2020.
- 7.3** Some 45% of the 2014-20 ERDF and ESF programmes are already committed, with almost all the approved projects running to the end of 2018. The Managing Authority (MA) will report to the Joint Programme Monitoring Committee (JPMC) on 30 November 2016 with options for committing the funds for the second phase of the programme.
- 7.4** The guarantee provides reassurance for projects which have been approved by the Managing Authority (MA) and those which will go through the approval process before the UK leaves the European Union.
- 7.5** As members will be aware, ministers representing both the UK and Scottish governments have been appointed to deal with the exit process. Until the process starts, there is nothing further to report and SEStran continues to pursue partnerships and bids in an effort to secure further EU funding while the opportunity remains.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1** That the Forum notes the content of the report

Lisa Freeman

Strategy & Projects Officer

20th January 2017