



PERFORMANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE

Meeting Room 3E-95, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ
Friday 24th November 2017 – 10:00am

AGENDA

1. **ORDER OF BUSINESS**
2. **APOLOGIES**
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
4. **MINUTES OF THE P&A COMMITTEE – Friday 8th September 2017**
5. **EXTERNAL AUDIT – CONSIDERATION OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE –**
Report by Jim Grieve
6. **INTERNAL AUDIT – FOCUS OF WORK –** Report by George Eckton
7. **FINANCE REPORTS –** Reports by Iain Shaw
 - (a) Financial Planning 2018/19
 - (b) Mid-term Review – Treasury Management Activity
8. **RISK REGISTER –** Report by Angela Chambers
9. **PROJECTS/DELIVERY PLAN UPDATE –** Report by Jim Grieve
10. **RTS MONITORING –** Report by George Eckton
11. **AOCB**
12. **PROVISIONAL DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
10:00am on Friday 2nd March in Conference Room 2, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ

Angela Chambers
Business Manager
Area 3D (Bridge)
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

17th November 2017

Telephone: 0131 524 5154 or E-mail: angela.chambers@sestran.gov.uk
Agendas and papers for all SEStran meetings can be accessed on www.sestran.gov.uk

PERFORMANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD IN SESTRAN OFFICES, MEETING ROOM 3E-95, VICTORIA QUAY,
EDINBURGH, EH6 6QQ
ON FRIDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 2017
10.00 A.M. – 12.30 P.M.

PRESENT:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation Title</u>
	Doreen Steele	Non-Councillor Member, SEStran
	Sandy Scotland	Non-Councillor Member, SEStran
	Cllr Chris Horne	West Lothian Council
	Cllr Dave Dempsey	Fife Council
	Barry Turner	Non-Councillor Member, SEStran
	Cllr Laura Murtagh	Falkirk Council

IN ATTENDANCE:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation Title</u>
	George Eckton	SEStran
	Gavin King	City of Edinburgh Council
	Andrew Ferguson	Fife Council
	Iain Shaw	City of Edinburgh Council
	Karen Jones	Scott-Moncrieff
	Rosie Docherty	Independent Consultant (for item 13)
	Chloe Collins	St. Andrews University

In the absence of a Chair, the Secretary took the chair for the first three items.

Action by

A1.. ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chair confirmed that the Order of Business was as per the agenda, subject to item 7(a) being taken before item 6, External Audit report.

A2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from John Martin, Non-Councillor Member, SEStran, Cllr Neil Gardiner, CEC, Cllr Russell Imrie, Midlothian Council, Cllr Jim Fullarton, SBC, Cllr Darren Lee and Cllr Phil Fairlie, Clackmannanshire Council and Cllr Brian Small, East Lothian Council.

A3. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

A4. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

It was agreed to appoint Sandy Scotland as Chair.

A5 MINUTES

The minutes of the Performance & Audit meeting of Friday 17th February, 2017 were noted and approved as a correct record.

A6. EXTERNAL AUDIT REPORT - Report by Scott Moncrieff

Karen Jones confirmed that work was ongoing but that it was hoped that a satisfactory conclusion would be achieved i.e. an unqualified audit.

Decision

The Committee noted the position and agreed that the action points from the audited accounts be considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

A7. FINANCE REPORTS

(a) Audited Financial Statement of Accounts 2016-17

Iain Shaw provided an update on the audited financial statements of accounts, 2016-17, and in particular the accounting treatment of RTPI hardware which had been decommissioned.

Decision

The Committee noted the update on the audited financial statements of accounts 2016-17; and noted that the accounts would be available in full for the Board.

(b) Public Services Forum (Scotland) Act 2010 (PRSA)

The Committee considered a report by Iain Shaw, Treasurer/Angela Chambers, Business Manager advising the Board of annual publication of certain information to be published.

Decision

The Committee noted:-

- (a) the content of the material for publication under the Public Services Reform (Scotland) Act 2010 and detailed in appendix 1 of the report;

(b) agreed that the relevant separate statements would be published on SEStran website; and

(c) as regards paragraph 8.4 of the report, remitted the Partnership Director to investigate how outcomes could be demonstrated more clearly quantitatively and qualitatively.

A8 RISK REGISTER

The Committee considered a report by Angela Chambers providing the Committee with an overview of SEStran's Risk Management Framework and reporting the results of an internal review carried out over the summer.

Decision

The Committee :-

- Agreed that the current Risk Register is no longer fit for purpose;
- Noted with approval the newly designed Risk Register template;
- Noted that a Risk Report will be brought to the November meeting of the Performance and Audit Committee; and
- Commended Sophie Pugh for her work in producing the revised format.

A9 POLICY & PROJECTS UPDATE

Keith Fiskien, Business Partner, presented a report by Jim Grieve, Head of Programmes updating the members on the Scottish Government's programme and approach to the comprehensive review of the National Transport Strategy ("NTS2") and on SEStran's progress on awarding the "FAST" grant.

Decision

The Committee noted the contents of the report.

A10 CYBER RESILIENCE: PUBLIC SECTOR ACTION PLAN -

The Committee considered a report by Angela Chambers, Business Manager on the global cyber-attack which affected more than 150 countries worldwide and had a high profile impact on some NHS services in Scotland, underlining the potential seriousness of the cyber threat.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Noted the contents of the report;
- (2) Requested that the Partnership should write to Scottish Government outlining SEStran's commitment to cyber resilience but seeking to understand the offer of further funding for small public bodies to undertake the actions within the proposed timescale; and
- (3) Agreed that a further report will be brought to a future meeting of the Committee when Scottish Government formalise and publish their Action Plan and Best Practice Guidance.

A11 CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO COUNCILLORS' CODE OF CONDUCT

The Committee considered a report by Andrew Ferguson, Secretary updating Members of a revision to the Councillors' Code which would affect Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) members,, and revisiting the position as regards SEStran's own Code of Conduct.

Decision

The Committee noted:-

- that the terms of the Scottish Government's change to the Code of Conduct for Councillors, was not available on the date of the meeting; and
- the terms of the current SEStran Code of Conduct.

The Committee agreed to exclude the public and press under the relevant provisions of the Act for the remaining items. Keith Fisker and Chloe Collins left the meeting at this point.

A12. LENGTH OF TENURE OF CHAIR/DEPUTY CHAIRS

The Committee considered a report by Andrew Ferguson, Secretary and Legal Adviser, advising members of the terms of the report to the Partnership Board on 11th August which advised on the revised guidance from Transport Scotland on length of tenure for Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs).

Decision

The Committee:

1. noted the terms of the report and associated note and discussed the issues arising from it; and

2. agreed to record the issues in the year's governance statement delegating the appropriate wording to the Partnership Director and Secretary and Legal Adviser, in consultation with the Treasurer and Internal and External Auditors.

A13. GRADING REVIEW

The Committee considered a report by George Eckton, Partnership Director, providing the Board with a summary of results and proposed implementations.

Decision

The Committee:-

1. agreed the implementation of the new grading structure for SEStran;
2. noted the grading review concluded the action agreed by the Performance and Audit Committee in September, 2016 and implements an action included in our statutory Equality Outcomes 2017-2021, agreed by the Board in March, 2017; and
3. noted the update provided on the continued lobbying by SEStran to have all RTPs included on the Redundancy Modification Order and the legal advice provided as part of the Grading Review which concludes that RTPs are covered by the provisions of the Order.

A14. AOCB

None

A15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Decision

The Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on Friday 24th November 2017 at 10.00 a.m.

SEStran External Audit 2016/17 – Ensuing Action

1. Introduction

The above audit was completed in September 2017, by Scott-Moncrieff and contained the following Governance Statement.

- “We have reviewed the Annual Governance Statement and have found that it is consistent with the accounts and has been prepared in accordance with Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: Framework (2016).
- The Partnership has adequate systems in place to record, process, summarise and report financial and other relevant data. We have not identified any significant weaknesses or governance issues in the Partnership’s accounting and internal control systems.”

and the following comment on Financial sustainability:

- “The Partnership has arrangements in place for short term (1year) financial planning, with budgets aligned to its annual business plan and regional transport strategy. However, the Partnership does not prepare medium to long-term financial plans due to the uncertainty over future funding allocations.”

The auditors proposed six Action Points for the Partnership to address and these are set out, in summary below, with the agreed action relative to each point included.

2. Action Plan Point Issue and Recommendation, with Management Comments

2.1 Action Plan Grading Structure

To assist the Partnership in assessing the significance of the issues raised and prioritising the action required to address them, the recommendations have been rated. The rating structure is summarised as follows:

Grade 5: Very high-risk exposure – major concerns requiring Partnership attention

Grade 4: Elevated risk exposure – material observations requiring senior management attention

Grade 3: Moderate risk exposure – significant observations requiring management attention

Grade 2: Limited risk exposure – minor observations requiring management attention

Grade 1: Efficiency / housekeeping point

2.2 Action Points

2.2.1 Authorisation of Journals

(Action owner: Treasurer, Due Date: immediate, Rating: Grade 3)

Observation

Our review of the journals environment found that there was a lack of segregation of duties over the posting of journals. Journals are prepared and posted without any secondary review or authorisation. Journals can be used to override controls and create fraudulent errors therefore, it is essential appropriate controls are in place

Recommendation

While our audit review in respect of the 2016/17 financial year did not identify any indications of management override we recommend that a review process is put in place for the preparation and posting of journals to the ledger.

Expenditure and Income monitoring reports are prepared in full consultation with officers of the Partnership for reporting to the Partnership Board, on a quarterly basis, in line with the Financial Regulations of the Partnership.

Any exceptional or unanticipated expenditure or income created by journal entry would be identified through this process.

Action

To enhance control, Partnership officers will receive a monthly report to include details of all journal entries processed, for review.

Strict separation of financial controls, segregation of duties and authorisation levels exist for all actual expenditure transactions of the Partnership.

2.2.2 Asset Recording and Tagging

(Action owner: Partnership Director, Due Date: 31 March 2018, Rating: Grade 4)

Observation

Assets within the asset register are not allocated a unique reference number and are instead grouped by type. In addition to this the physical assets are not individually labelled. It is therefore not possible to undertake a physical verification of assets from the register to the floor (or vice versa). There have been significant issues verifying the number of assets held and the value per item in year

Recommendation

To ensure assets are accounted for appropriately and prevent against the possible misappropriation of assets, we recommend that new assets acquired, across all sites are:

- brought into the fixed asset register with sufficient detail to allow each unit to be individually identifiable including purchase date and value per item; and
- appropriately labelled when brought into use to create a direct link between the fixed asset register and the physical assets.

Action

The Partnership Director has instructed that the Projects team oversee the creation of a full and comprehensive asset register for SEStran and an initial meeting with the Director, the Treasurer's representative and the projects team has taken place and a protocol for the future agreed. Work is underway to complete the register.

2.2.3 Register of Interest

(Action owner: Partnership Director, Due Date: 31 December 2017, Rating: Grade 3)

Observation

From our review of the Registers of Interests of members it was found that many of the declarations forms had not been updated since 2014. Upon further review, we identified an undisclosed related party transaction of £0.086million relating to an undeclared related party for Edinburgh and Lothians Greenspace Trust. The annual accounts have been updated to reflect the appropriate disclosures.

Recommendation

The Partnership should ensure registers of interest are updated on at least an annual basis

Action

All members of the Partnership Board are reminded and have been in Summer 2017 of the provision of regulations which provide for Board Members to give notice of registerable interests as outlined in SEStran Code of Conduct and all members of the Board, at the first meeting of the new session, have been reminded of their Code of Conduct responsibilities. Keeping entries in the Register of Interests up to date is ultimately the responsibility of individual Members. The Secretary of the Partnership is the proper officer to administer this issue and he has stressed that completing their register of interests accurately and promptly is a legislative requirement of the Board members and failure to maintain accurate and timeous entries would mean that they, individually, would not be complying with the Code of Conduct.

2.2.4 Reconciliation of Holding Accounts

(Action owner: Treasurer, Due Date: 31 December 2017, Rating: Grade 2)

Observation

The City of Edinburgh Council maintains a holding account on behalf of the Partnership. The holding account is reconciled on an annual basis. There is a risk that any errors in the allocation of items to the holding account are not discovered timeously.

Recommendation

The holding account should be reconciled with the Partnership records on a regular basis to reduce the risk of significant error.

Action

The indebtedness between the City of Edinburgh Council and the Partnership, as reflected in the holding account balance, was reconciled several times during 2016/17. The frequency of reconciliation will be formalised such that a reconciliation will be undertaken on a quarterly basis.

2.2.5 Income and Expenditure Controls

(Action owner: Partnership Director/Treasurer, Due Date: immediate, Rating: Grade 3)

Observation

While income and expenditure testing did not identify any misstatements to the annual accounts, we did identify many errors relating to income and expenditure invoice processing.

Income and expenditure invoices are sent to City of Edinburgh Council alongside a cover sheet that details the VAT coding, ledger coding and supplier/customer details. We found that the details on cover sheets were often incorrect which resulted in credit notes being raised on numerous occasions.

Income invoices were also found to have many errors in year which resulted in an under declaration of output tax of £12k (disclosed in the accounts as a debtor and creditor). A voluntary disclosure to HMRC was made in relation to this. As part of our review we found that there were weaknesses in the review and authorisation of invoices.

Recommendation

The Partnership should ensure all invoices are subject to rigorous checks and are appropriately authorised prior to submitting for processing by City of Edinburgh Council officers.

Action

New protocol/guidelines have been obtained from City of Edinburgh Council around the declaration of VAT and have been put in place. This processing change is continuing to be embedded across the organisation.

Controls on authorisation and review of invoice payments have been updated. The VAT issue has been resolved and the outstanding sum of £12k recovered.

2.2.6 Long Term Financial Planning

(Action owner: Partnership Director, Due Date: 31 December 2017, Rating: Grade 4)

Observation

The Partnership develops a budget for one financial year which is aligned to the annual business plan and Regional Transport Strategy. There is a risk that funding is used to support short term need rather than long term strategic priorities.

Recommendation

To ensure financial sustainability, the Partnership should develop medium to long term financial plans on a 3 to 5-year basis. This would assist the Partnership in highlighting risks to its sustainability and ensure funding is allocated in line with the long term strategic aims of the Regional Transport Strategy.

The removal of capital funding in 2009/10 means there is a difficulty for long-term strategic funding of RTS projects. The Director continues to monitor and advocate for investment by stakeholders in strategic priorities and for the return of long-term significant funding to RTPs through the second National Transport Strategy review process. However, given the main funder, Transport Scotland, has only been able to issue one year funding settlements in recent years, this has limited SEStran's ability to take a long-term budgetary approach to investment.

Action

With regard to the Councils' contributions to the Partnership, the Director has prepared a budget proposal for consideration, initially, by the SEStran Council Chief Officers' Group and then, subject to the outcome of the initial discussions, by the Partnership Board.

3. Conclusion

Appropriate action, as recommended by the audit, is underway and discussion among the named officials has taken place. Four of the action points are within the control of the partnership. Items 2.2.3 and 2.2.6, however, are not wholly within the control of the Partnership. In respect of 2.2.3 (the Register of Interests) the recommended regular reminders will be put in place. As regards 2.2.6 (Long Term Financial Planning) and in addition to the approach to the Councils, it is proposed to hold discussions with Transport Scotland to explore the possibilities of a longer perspective for funding agreements.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1** The committee is asked to note the contents of the report.

Jim Grieve
Programme Manager

17th November 2017

Policy Implications	None
Financial Implications	It is imperative that the recommendations made by the auditors are taken forward in order to ensure continued good governance status.
Equalities Implications	None
Climate Change Implications	None

Internal Audit Plan: 2017/18

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The paper seeks to inform the Committee of the timing of this process for Partnership and seek their views on focus on the internal audit for this year. The role of Internal Audit is to act as an independent, objective assurance and consulting function, designed to add value and improve the operational effectiveness of the organisation

2 Issues

- 2.1 The Partnership Board Director is scheduled to meet internal audit at Edinburgh to discuss a few emerging issues and potential issues for review before the end of the year. Last year the following issues were identified and subject of the annual report's¹ focus:

Issues	Control Objectives
Horizon Scanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a strategy and processes in place to identify potential threats, risks, emerging issues and opportunities, including but not restricted to, the proposals to realign SEStran and SESplan (the Strategic Development Planning Authority for Edinburgh and South East Scotland), and / or move to become a model 3 authority.
Sustainability of Major Projects: Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a strategy in place to identify alternative sources of funding to cover the expansion of information services provided; There is a strategy in place to engage with all partner authorities, and key public and private sector organisations to maximise the access to information services across all sectors and regions; and There is a strategy in place to cover funding of ongoing maintenance, repairs, fees and replacement costs for RTPI hardware and software in use.
Follow Up Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All agreed recommendations from the previous audits have been successfully implemented.

- 2.2 The Partnership Director would propose that the national review of regional roles and responsibilities across a number of policy review areas should be a focus of internal audit and its impact on the continuing operation of our functions. It is proposed a continuing focus on major projects, but also EU funded projects specifically would be welcome alongside a general follow up work on implementation of recommendations.

¹ <http://www.sestran.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/2017-08-11-Item-8c-Internal-Audit-Annual-Report.pdf>

- 2.3** The usual timescale is that internal auditors seek to have final report for June 2018 Committee meeting. Any draft report, is available will be subject of an initial report to the next Performance and Audit Committee for scrutiny in February 2018.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1** The current emerging issues are potentially critical to the operational effectiveness of SEStran and its functions. The Committee is asked to discuss the issues identified for the focus of 17/18 Internal Audit and to propose any further issues of focus for the review.

George Eckton
Partnership Director

17 November 2017

Policy Implications	None at present
Financial Implications	Internal Audit fees included within Service Level Agreement with City of Edinburgh Council.
Equalities Implications	None at present
Climate Change Implications	None at present.

Financial Planning 2018/19

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present to Performance and Audit Committee financial planning options for the Partnership for the 2018/19 revenue budget.

2 Background

- 2.1 Section 3 of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 requires the constituent councils of each Regional Transport Partnership to meet the Partnership's net expenses after taking account of grant from the Scottish Government (£782,000 since 2011/12) and any other external funding.
- 2.2 The net expenses of the Partnership are shared between constituent councils based on population. The current share ranges from 33% for City of Edinburgh Council to 2% to Clackmannanshire Council. Since 2008, the Partnership has only received revenue support monies from Scottish Government and no capital investment funding. Regional Transport Partnership's originally received a total of £35 million of capital investment funding in 2006/07.

Scottish Government Draft Budget 2018-19

- 2.3 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement for 2018/19 is anticipated to be announced in mid-December 2017. Funding is expected to cover one year only. This provides a challenge to address the external audit report findings about the need for a longer-term budget for the Partnership, and therefore necessitates the use of economic forecasts of future funding.
- 2.4 While based on a range of projections and assumptions, the recently-published Fraser of Allander Institute report on Scotland's Budget 2017 indicated the total Scottish resource budget (grant and tax revenues) is forecast to fall by 2.3% in real terms between 2016/17 and 2020/21. Under alternative but equally realistic scenarios (an 'upside budget risk' and a 'downside budget risk'), the Scottish resource budget could decline by 1.2% or by up to 3.8% by 2020/21.
- 2.5 If certain areas of Government expenditure are protected, 'non-protected' areas will shoulder a greater share of the burden. As an illustration, protecting just four Scottish Government budget priorities – health, policing, childcare and educational attainment – could mean that 'non-protected' areas face real terms cuts of between 9% to 14% over the current parliamentary term (2016/17 to 2020/21). It is possible that the non-education elements of local government will be the largest part of the budget which could be categorised as "non-protected".

- 2.6 Once protected areas of the budget are considered e.g. teaching budgets, adult social care and demographic pressures, constituent councils are generally planning on incremental savings of up to 5% year-on-year.

SESTRAN – Financial Planning 2018/19

- 2.7 Revenue budget planning is being progressed for 2018/19. Planning assumptions are being updated for:
- 2.7.1 Implementation of Single Status;
 - 2.7.2 staff recharges to projects in 2018/19;
 - 2.7.3 pay award and increment provision;
 - 2.7.4 the outcome of the Lothian Pension Fund triennial actuarial valuation;
 - 2.7.5 Scottish Government grant funding assumptions;
 - 2.7.6 other budget planning assumptions, including the desire from several constituent councils for further information and scoping of shared capacity and resilience via City Deals for regional governance.
- 2.8 Scottish Government grant funding has remained fixed at £782,000 since 2011/12. Council requisitions were previously reduced voluntarily by the Partnership by 5% in 2017/18 to £190,000. Council requisitions were fixed at £200,000 between 2012/13 and 2015/16. Appendix 1 shows budgeted expenditure and income since 2011/12.
- 2.9 A recommendation made by the Partnership's External Auditor on the audit of the 2016/17 annual accounts was: "to ensure financial sustainability, the Partnership should develop medium to long term financial plans on a 3 to 5-year basis. This would assist the Partnership in highlighting risks to its sustainability and ensure funding is allocated in line with the long term strategic aims of the Regional Transport Strategy".

Financial Planning 2018/19 Options

- 2.10 Three financial planning scenarios have been identified for 2018-19, with the options being capable of implementation in financial years beyond 2018/19 to address the External Auditor's recommendation noted at paragraph 2.9.
- 2.11 Options assume Scottish Government grant remains fixed at £782,000. The Scottish Government has yet to confirm the level of grant funding for 2018/19.

Option 1 – 5% reduction in constituent council requisition

- 2.12 Recognising the financial pressures facing constituent councils, the Partnership could reduce its requisition to constituent councils by 5% (£10,000); this following the 5% reduction in the 2017/18 requisition.
- 2.13 The reduction for 2017/18 was anticipated to be achieved from a forecast underspend on core expenditure. Since approving the 2017/18 budget, when

implementing Single Status, the findings of the Partnership's Pay/Grading Review showed historic pay/grading anomalies.

- 2.14 A 5% reduction (£10,000) in 2018/19 will increase budget pressure following implementation of the new pay structure and the proposed removal of the Pay Cap on public sector workers.
- 2.15 A 5% reduction in constituent council requisition will require a reduction in expenditure on projects. The likely area of reduction will be the Sustainable Transport Grants scheme, which provides match funding for councils and other stakeholders for Smarter Choices /Smarter Places and wider sustainable travel. This will impact on the Partnership's ability to deliver projects which are the primary method of addressing the long-term aims of the Regional Transport Strategy and will reduce funding towards the long-term aims of the Regional Transport Strategy.

Option 2 - 'Flat-cash' retain constituent council requisition

- 2.16 'Flat-cash' retain constituent council requisition would allow requisitions to be set at the 2017/18 level of £190,000. The Partnership would be required to absorb budget pressure arising from the new pay structure and the proposed removal of the Pay Cap on public sector workers. This option will also impact on the Partnership's ability to deliver projects which are the primary method of addressing the long-term aims of the Regional Transport Strategy.

Option 3 –increase constituent council requisition and progress “Intelligent Centralisation”

- 2.17 Investigate the opportunity to reduce costs to constituent councils from other sources of cost pressures within transportation services, by sharing services such as regional modelling or appraisal frameworks, sharing specialist skills or undertaking marketing/prevention measures for active travel/car use growth collectively. This would build on the success of the Trapeze software (Novus FX succeeding Routewise for bus service data) roll out across certain constituent councils where working through the Partnership has enabled costs to be reduced. This type of option represents savings by reforming current processes to be more efficient and cost effective for same/improved outcomes.
- 2.18 This would in a small but initial step explore opportunities councils wished to explore for a “Model 2” form of regional delivery following the declination of Model 3 structures. The Partnership Director recognises that the greater headline budget through the Partnerships would be offset by a reduction in spending within councils on such marketing or other shared outcomes, which would then be delivered at a regional level on a contractual basis with the councils as clients for these shared services.
- 2.19 It is envisaged that the business case for an increase in constituent council requisition of any significant magnitude would be by offsetting council spending on such marketing or other shared outcomes or prevention of negative outcomes and costly demand on services. This option is in line with the stated preferences of 5 of 8 councils in response to the Model 3 consultation which

advised of a position of wanting further discussions on the options for sharing resource and capacity.

- 2.20 This option would require scoping of the potential for regional working on initial key activities and the development of service level agreements. This would require to be progressed on a joint basis, with the intention of achieving greater spend through the Partnership, whilst making a compensating reduction in each constituent council's costs for the same activity.
- 2.21 Within the financial constraints currently facing Local Government and forecast to continue until at least 2020/21, the model of delivery for this option will require to be robustly developed to be affordable to constituent councils. The lead time for such development may preclude implementation of many options for 2018/19, but it remains relevant to the development of future financial plans by the Partnership. The Chief Officers Group meeting on 9th November 2017 agreed, prior to the end of 2017, to provide examples for 2018/19 of potential options for delivery by Summer 2018 of examples of joint working across councils and through the Partnership, with the aim being to reduce cost pressures and improve outcomes regionally of the statutory Regional Transport Strategy.

Risk Assessment

- 2.22 When approving the revenue budget in March 2018, the Partnership Board will be required to consider the risks inherent in the budget process and the arrangements in place to manage those risks. An initial risk assessment has been drafted and this is included at Appendix 2. An updated risk assessment will be reported to the Board in March 2018.

3 Next Steps

- 3.1 The SEStran Chief Officers Group reviewed this report at its meeting on 9th November 2017 and concluded that for 2018/19, either Option 1 or 2 should be progressed, with the potential to deliver Intelligent Centralisation to be explored for specific options for 2018/19, if possible. They also made a commitment, over the next 6-9 months, to look at future years budgets: 2019/20 and 2020/21 and the potential for joint resourcing and delivery through the Partnership.
- 3.2 Following review by Performance and Audit Committee, a report on financial planning for 2018/19 will be presented to the Partnership Board on 8th December 2017.
- 3.3 A revenue budget for 2018/19 will be presented to the Partnership Board for approval in March 2018.

4 Recommendation

Performance and Audit Committee is asked to note:

- 4.1 the financial planning assumptions currently being progressed for 2018/19;
- 4.2 the view of Chief Officers Group, noted at paragraph 3.1, on financial planning assumptions for 2018/19 and agree that a paper should be brought to the first

two meetings of 2018 on “aggregation” proposals for 2019/20 and if possible 2018/19;

- 4.3 the risk that Scottish Government funding allocations to Regional Transport Partnership’s may be reduced;
- 4.4 a report on Financial Planning will be presented to the Partnership Board on 8th December 2017;
- 4.5 a revenue budget for 2018/19 will be presented to the Partnership Board for approval in March 2018.

Hugh Dunn
Treasurer

Appendix	Appendix 1 – SEStran Budget 2011/12 - 2017/18 Appendix 2 – Risk Assessment
----------	---

Contact/tel/Email Iain Shaw
Telephone 0131 469 3117
iain.shaw@edinburgh.gov.uk

Wards affected All

Background Nil
Papers

Policy Implications	There would be a further reduction in the implementation of the long-term aims of the RTS
Financial Implications	At this stage, there is no financial commitment arising from this report.
Race Equalities Implications	There are no race equality implications arising as a result of this report.
Climate Change Implications	Subject to the approval of the revenue budget in March 2018, there may be a reduction in spending on sustainable travel grant projects.

Appendix 1
SEStran Budget 2011/12 – 2017/18

	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Core	467	461	463	465	550	551	478
Projects	791	709	504	1,076	2,384	725	510
RTPI	110	117	222	286	230	344	339
Total Budget	1,368	1,287	1,189	1,827	3,164	1,620	1,327
External Funding							
EU Grants	313	245	146	233	131	152	95
Other income	48	60	61	266	1,051	486	260
Bus Investment Fund				346	1,000	0	0
Total Ext. Funding	361	305	207	845	2,182	638	355
Scottish Government	782	782	782	782	782	782	782
Council Requisition	225	200	200	200	200	200	190
Total Funding	1,368	1,287	1,189	1,827	3,164	1,620	1,327

Appendix 2

Risk Assessment

Risk Description	Existing Controls
Pay awards. Each 1% uplift in pay provision equates to an increase of £3,300.	Alignment with Scottish Local Government pay policy.
Staff recharges – EU Projects. There is a risk that opportunities for additional funding through income for EU projects may reduce.	Any shortfall in employee cost recharges will be offset by a corresponding reduction in Projects Budget expenditure.
Inflation. There is a risk that there is an increase in price inflation.	Allowance will be made for specific price inflation and budgets adjusted in line with current cost forecasts.
Delays in payment of external grants results in additional short-term borrowing costs.	SEStran grant claims for projects are submitted in compliance with grant funding requirements to ensure minimal delay in payment. Ongoing monitoring of cash flow will be undertaken to manage exposure to additional short-term borrowing costs.
There is a risk that current levels of staffing cannot be maintained due to funding constraints and that the Partnership will incur staff release costs.	Recruitment control and additional sources of external funding will continue to be sought for activities aligned to the Partnership's objectives.
There is a risk that sources of additional income to the Partnership may become constrained in the current economic climate and/or due to changes in operating arrangements.	Develop revenue budget to take account of most likely level of external income in 2018/19.
Funding Reductions. Reduction in funding from Scottish Government and/or council requisitions.	Subject to decision by the Partnership Board, the draft budget will be prepared based on a 5% reduction in funding from council requisitions and Scottish Government grant. Continue to source and develop external funding.

Mid Term Review - Treasury Management Activity

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to review the investment activity undertaken on behalf of the Partnership during the first half of the 2017/18 Financial Year.

2. Background

- 2.1 In accordance with Investment Regulations in Scotland the Partnership adopted the appropriate Codes of Practice and approved an Annual Investment Strategy at its meeting on the 2nd March 2017.

3. Mid Term Review - Annual Investment Strategy

- 3.1 As approved in the Partnership's Investment Strategy, the Partnership continues to maintain its bank account as part of the City of Edinburgh Council's group of bank accounts. Any cash balance is effectively lent to the Council, but is offset by expenditure undertaken by the City of Edinburgh Council on behalf of the Board. Interest is given (charged) on month end net indebtedness balances between the Council and the Board in accordance with the recently withdrawn Local Authority (Scotland) Accounts Advisory Committee's (LASAAC) Guidance Note 2 on Interest on Revenue Balances (IoRB). The methodology will continue to be used until new guidance on the treatment of interest charges is made available. In line with recent short term interest rates, the investment return/charge continues to be low, but the Board gains security from the counterparty exposure being to the City of Edinburgh Council. Net end of month balances for the first half of the year were:

Opening Balance	£159,905.84
April	£177,001.86
May	£204,157.32
June	£328,878.40
July	£353,669.27
August	£454,246.87
September	£441,639.82

- 3.2 Although interest is not calculated until March, in line with the withdrawn guidance note, the interest rate averaged 0.103% during the first half of the financial year. This is a projected rate on current interest rates, if the Bank of England change UK Bank Rate then the figure may change marginally.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 It is recommended that the Committee notes the investment activity undertaken on behalf of the Partnership.

Hugh Dunn
Treasurer

Appendix None

Contact/tel Iain Shaw, Tel: 0131 469 3117
(iain.shaw@edinburgh.gov.uk)

Risk Management Framework

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This paper provides the Committee with a first full draft version of the proposed risk register, which is an integral part of SEStran's Risk Management Framework.
- 1.2 The report also highlights to the Committee an update on a specific risk to the Partnership: Cyber Security.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Performance and Audit Committee has received six-monthly updates of the risk register in recent years, as part of SEStran's commitment to a framework of risk management within the organisation. This will continue and a copy of the new condensed Risk Register is attached for discussion and further comment. SEStran has been using a Risk Register to record, report and evaluate risks within the organisation since May 2008 and the Committee should be assured that all risks are reviewed regularly by the relevant staff. The Committee is invited to discuss the identified risks included in the new format and whether there is need for further amendment or addition.

3. CURRENT KEY RISKS

- 3.1 Under the Digital/IT entry on the risk register, the report highlights the ongoing actions/lobbying of Scottish Government's (SG) Cyber Security Public Sector Action Plan. As reported in September, we have raised our comments with the Scottish Government on the Action Plan and have since welcomed their revisions to timescales and funding, allowing public bodies a full year to implement a cyber essentials pre-assessment and key action list. However, we have highlighted that, whilst the outcome of the pre-assessment is unknown at present, a further extension may be required to successfully achieve Cyber Essentials certification.
- 3.2 SEStran has also stated its concern that there is no provision from SG for further financial support being available to assist with implementation (should this be required), particularly for small public bodies like most RTPs. The Government's response is that if a public body finds that the costs of any remediation work are very high, they should contact SG to discuss. SG highlighted in their initial response to SEStran that if they found that lots of public bodies were unable to meet the controls without very high expenditure, they might look at whether any economies of scale could be achieved. Therefore, the Partnership effectively has a full year to put in place these basic controls, which we anticipate will be sufficient time to do so, and to take account of this requirement within budgets. It is a key risk to our security of information and records, but also a financial

risk to the Partnership, pending the outcome and cost of implementation of actions identified from the assessments.

- 3.3 The Committee should note that a meeting has been scheduled with our IT provider, Onestop, to discuss cyber resilience and cyber essentials accreditation; seeking their opinion on the appropriate level of accreditation suitable for SEStran. A verbal update will be given at the meeting and progress will be reported to future meetings.
- 3.4 SEStran's Business Continuity Management Plan, which sets out the procedures to be followed in the event of loss of normal operations, is an integral part of its cyber security framework. The plan is usually reviewed in September, however, given the significance of the SG's Action Plan, SEStran is seeking to postpone this exercise until January to allow adequate time to consider the implications of implementation.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The Committee is requested to discuss and comment upon the latest version of the Risk Register, and:
- 4.2 asked to note the update on key identified risk under Digital/IT of Cyber Security Assessments;
- 4.3 asked to note that discussions will be progressed to determine the appropriate level of Cyber Essentials accreditation required and further updates will be brought to future meetings;
- 4.4 asked to agree to the Business Continuity Management Plan review being postponed until January 2018.

Angela Chambers
Business Manager
November 2016

Appendix 1: SEStran Risk Register

Policy Implications	Potential revision to disaster recovery procedures.
Financial Implications	Potential cost of implementation of Cyber Security assessments.
Equalities Implications	None
Climate Change Implications	None

Risk Detail	Risk Category	Gross Risk Assessment						Planned Response/Mitigation	Net Risk Assessment						Risk After Mitigation	Date and Owner
		Probability		Impact		Risk Score			Probability		Impact		Risk Score			
Policy Appraisal: Poor Quality Lack of consultation	Strategic	1	Remote	3	Moderate	3	Low Risk	Partnership Director regularly horizon scanning for new relevant policies and responds accordingly using delegated powers if a response is required. New policy forums also enable greater visibility and integration of local policies into regional strategy	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low Risk	Low. Partnership staff also continue to monitor their networks for relevant policy discussions. Director chairs the relevant SCOTS Transportation Working Group.	November 2017 Partnership Director
Project Appraisal and Delivery: Incomplete or of poor quality Late Delivery	Reputational	2	Unlikely	4	Major	8	Medium Risk	Monthly monitoring and management intervention by the project officer, and over-seen by the Head of Programme. Key regional projects such as RTPi has regular communication with key clients and service providers, including standing quarterly stakeholder meetings.	2	Unlikely	3	Moderate	6	Low Risk	Low. Regular monitoring and management/project team meetings gave all across the organisation a clear view of progress and timescales greatly reducing risk	November 2017 Head of Programmes
Digital/IT: Server failure Comms failure: phones Website	People	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium Risk	SEStran has an up-to-date Management Plan for Business Continuity, clearly available in the office and remotely. Wesbite has a maintenance contract as does RTPi system, which regular updates and patches to avoid failure.	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low Risk	Low. We have employed IT consultants to deliver our IT and phone. Our website contract includes updates as part of a quarterly maintenance contract.	November 2017 Business Manager
Reputation: Social Media hacked and inappropriate comments Lack of brand awareness	Reputational	3	Possible	3	Moderate	9	Medium Risk	Social media passwords are high security; focussed brand enhancement work is undertaken, project as regularly monitored via monthly meetings	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low Risk	Low. Passwords are securely stored, updates of software regularly undertaken by staff and server providers. Work in ongoing to deliver a new brand for the Partnership as agreed at September 2017 Board meeting. Partnership staff continue to promote and advocate our policies via speaking, writing or wider networking	November 2017 Partnership Director
Statutory Duties: Fail to comply with statutory duties and legally challenged e.g. Transport 2005 Act; Community Empowerment Act 2015; Equality 2010 Act; Public Services Reform 2010 Act; new Gender Balance Bill. Freedom of Information and REcords Management Impact on accounts and statement of governance	Legal and Regulatory	1	Remote	4	Major	4	Low Risk	Monthly monitoring and management intervention by the project officer, and over-seen by the Partnership Director. We have a published Equality Outcomes and Records Management Plan. We have participation request information on the website etc	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low Risk	Low. Regular monitoring and programming of our statutory duties is undertaken by the Partnership Director, Head of Pogrammes and Business Manager. Including attendance at relevant training and guidance sessions identified by statutory partners. We also	November 2017 Partnership Director

Financial: Significant deviation from budgeted spend	Financial	1	Remote	3	Moderate	3	Low Risk	Budget and spend monitored by CEC Accountants, in dialogue with SEStran. CEC reports to Performance and Audit Committee & Board, quarterly. Necessary interventions by Director.	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low Risk	Low: There is also a current consultation on the ability for RTPs to carry forward expenditure to seek to	November 2017 Partnership Director
a) Pay awards: Each 1% uplift in pay provision equates to an increase of £3,300.	Financial	4	Probable	1	Insignificant	4	Low Risk	Alignment with Scottish Local Government pay policy	4	Probable	1	Insignificant	4	Low Risk	Tolerate	November 2017 Partnership Director
b) Staff recharges - EU projects: There is a risk that opportunities for additional funding through income for EU projects may reduce.	Financial	5	Highly Probable	3	Moderate	15	High Risk	Any shortfall in employees cost recharges will be offset by a corresponding reduction in Projects Budget expenditure.	4	Probable	2	Minor	8	Medium Risk	Medium: Other funding sources will be pursued	November 2017 Partnership Director
c) Inflation: There is a risk that there is an increase in price inflation.	Financial	5	Highly Probable	1	Insignificant	5	Low Risk	Allowance will be made for specific price inflation and budgets adjusted in line with current cost forecasts.	5	Highly Probable	1	Insignificant	5	Low Risk	Tolerate	November 2017 Partnership Director
d) Delays in payment of external grants results in additional short-term borrowing costs.	Financial	3	Possible	2	Minor	6	Low Risk	SEStran grant claims for projects are submitted in compliance with grant funding requirements to ensure minimal delay in payment. Ongoing monitoring of cash flow will be undertaken to manage exposure to additional short-term borrowing costs.	3	Possible	1	Insignificant	3	Low Risk	Low: Accruals procedure in place, along with financial planning.	November 2017 Partnership Director
e) Sources of additional income to the Partnership may become constrained in the current economic climate and/or due to changes in operating arrangements.	Financial	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium Risk	Develop revenue budget to take account of most likely level of external income in 2018/19.	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium Risk	Tolerate: Adapt expenditure accordingly	November 2017 Partnership Director
f) Funding reductions: Reduction in funding from Scottish Government and/or council requisitions	Financial	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium Risk	Subject to decision by the Partnership Board, the draft budget will be prepared based on a 5% reduction in funding from council requisitions and Scottish Government grant. Continue to source and develop external funding.	3	Possible	4	Major	12	Medium Risk	Tolerate: Manage organisation in accordance with available funding but ability of organisation to deliver RTS objectives will inevitably be reduced.	November 2017 Partnership Director
HR: Pension Liabilities Redundancy Contingency Inappropriate Behaviour Staffing/Incapacity	People	1	Remote	3	Moderate	3	Low Risk	HR policies and procedures have a regular review cycle, policy training and code of conduct are given to all members at induction, staffing levels and workload are monitored by senior management on a monthly basis. We have lobbied UK and Scottish Government on Redundancy Modification Orders. Managers hold regular meetings and formal reviews with staff. Engage with Pension Fund as required.	1	Remote	2	Minor	2	Low Risk	The risk is low. We have access to direct advice from Falkirk Council. Have undertaken a recent pay and grading review and update relevant policies.	November 2017 Partnership Director

Corporate: Removal of RTPs as part of the review of the National Transport Strategy.	Strategic	4	Probable	3	Moderate	12	Medium Risk	Regular monitoring being developed, lobbying for funding, inputs to NTS2 and STPR. Partnership Director is engaged in the NTS2 review, co-chairing one of the 4 strategic working groups and co-ordinating SCOTS responses to the review. The Partnership Chair represents all RTPs on the NTS2 Review Board and has sought and received assurances around retention of functions and undertakings transfer from Scottish Ministers.	4	Probable	2	Minor	8	Medium Risk	Medium risk. The NTS2 review set up a review of Roles and Responsibilities group. Transport Scotland have appointed consultants to support this governance review and will report in Spring 2017. There is also risks associated with the Planning and Enterprise + Skills reviews for RTPs. These cannot be reduced at present, however we are engaged fully and lobbying for the best interests of the Partnership.	November 2017 Partnership Director
EU Exit: Impact on learning and funding	Financial	5	Highly Probable	4	Major	20	High Risk	The Partnership has sought to engage in as many relevant EU projects and funds as it can whilst UK authorities are allowed to access these funds. This should mitigate the short-term impact of any EU Exit negotiated and implemented in the short-term.	5	Highly Probable	4	Major	20	High Risk	The risk is still High as there is significant uncertainty around the medium (3-5year) horizon for access to funds. However, in the current time, we have sought to mitigate by getting as much access to funds and projects as possible in the short-term and seek to monitor and tolerate the ongoing risk this poses to a key revenue and knowledge streams for the Partnership.	November 2017 Head of Programmes

Likelihood	Severity	Risk Score	At Risk
1 Remote	1 Insignificant	1	System and Technology
2 Unlikely	2 Minor	2	Reputational
3 Possible	3 Moderate	3	Strategic
4 Probable	4 Major	4	Financial
5 Highly Probable	5 Catastrophic	5	Governance
		6	Specific Operational
		8	External
		9	Legal and Regulatory
		10	People
		12	Physical
		15	
		16	
		20	
		25	High Risk

Impact				
Descriptor	Score	Health and Safety Impact	Impact on Service and Reputation	Financial Impact
Insignificant	1	No injury or no apparent injury.	No impact on service or reputation. Complaint unlikely. Litigation risk remote.	Loss/costs up to £5000.
Minor	2	Minor injury (First Aid on Site)	Slight impact on service and/or reputation. Complaint possible. Litigation possible.	Loss/costs between £5000 and £50,000.
Moderate	3	Reportable injury	Some service disruption. Potential for adverse publicity, avoidable with careful handling. Complaint expected. Litigation probable.	Loss/costs between £50,000 and £500,000.
Major	4	Major injury (reportable) or permanent incapacity	Service disrupted. Adverse publicity not avoidable (local media). Complaint expected. Litigation expected.	Loss/costs between £500,000 and £5,000,000.
Catastrophic	5	Death	Service interrupted for significant time. Adverse publicity not avoidable (national media interest). Major litigation expected. Resignation of senior management/directors.	Theft/loss over £5,000,000.

Likelihood		
Descriptor	Score	Example
Remote	1	May only occur in exceptional circumstances.
Unlikely	2	Expected to occur in a few circumstances.
Possible	3	Expected to occur in some circumstances.
Probable	4	Expected to occur in many circumstances.
Highly Probable	5	Expected to occur frequently and in most circumstances.

Impact					
Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25
Major	4	8	12	16	20
Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
Minor	2	4	6	8	10
Insignificant	1	2	3	4	5
Likelihood	Remote	Unlikely	Possible	Probable	Highly Probable

Maintain existing measures in place.
Review control measures. Even if the risk is low, there may be things that can be done to bring the risk rating down to minimal.
Improve control measures. If the Rating Action Band is greater than 3 or 4 then a review of the existing safety/control measures needs to be done, where
Improve control measures immediately and consider stopping work activity until risk is reduced.

Projects, Delivery Plan & EU Exit Update

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** The report provides the Committee with an update on key aspects of projects and initiatives progressed in the last quarter and covers the latest position on the process for the UK leaving the EU.
The report also includes an update on the RTS “Delivery Plan”.
Projects expenditure to date is shown in **Appendix 1**.

2. REAL TIME PASSENGER INFORMATION

- 2.1** 80% of the TV display equipment has now been distributed to both public and private premises throughout the region. Efforts are on-going to find locations for the remaining 57 screens.
- 2.2** RTPI enabled “Ticketer” ticket machines, funded jointly by SEStran and the Smart Ticketing Challenge Fund, are now installed in 5 more operators’ vehicles. SEStran’s system supplier, Ineo Systans, has now developed an interface with the “Ticketer” system and has successfully now brought in services operated by Prentice Coaches and Borders Buses into Bustracker SEStran. Work is now underway to bring in all of the other operators in the region, who are equipped with the Ticketer facility, into the system.

3. SESTRAN THISTLE ASSISTANCE CARD

- 3.1** The Card and App have now been expanded into all of the areas covered by the Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) areas, following agreement of each of the partnerships to adopt, promote and contribute to the costs of the Thistle Assistance Card initiative.
- 3.2** To further promote both the Thistle Assistance Card and Tripshare SEStran, an advertising campaign, through the STV television channel started in mid-September. This has encouraged both an increase in number of enquiries for the card and an increased number of Tripshare journeys recorded on the system.

4. Sustainable and Active Travel Grant Scheme

- 4.1** Work continues to progress the projects funded by the above. Because both EU projects ShareNorth and Regiomob are complimentary to the electric Bike project, a contribution from each; €40000 and €17000 (net €20,000 and €14,500), respectively is supporting the fund and enabling deliverables within both the EU projects to be realised.
- 4.2** A requirement of the Regiomob project is to select and trial a Best Practice promoted by another partner country. A Best Practice from the Italian partner, based in Rome, entitled PASTA (Physical Activity Through

Sustainable Transport Approach) has been selected for implementation in the SEStran region. PASTA “aims to show how promoting active mobility (i.e. walking and cycling) can lead to a healthier, more physically active population....” and provides a match to the electric bike project and a clear opportunity to progress the projects jointly, making the best use of available resources and sharing knowledge, which is what underpins the Regiomob project.

5. Regional Cycle Network Grant Scheme (RCNGS)

- 5.1** The £100,000 funding provided by Sustrans Scotland has been allocated for this financial year. With awards going to East Lothian Council, Edinburgh bioQuarter group, and Musselburgh Area Partnership.

6. European Projects Update

- 6.1** ‘**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.
- 6.2** The latest SocialCar meeting was held on 7th– 9th November. Sessions on innovation management, data governance and target groups were held. Members focused discussions around each of the app test phases. Test C to be conducted throughout November. Recruitment of Test users will be conducted in partnership with Queen Margaret University. Test users will be asked to test the app over a three-week period, and invited to return their feedback in December.
- 6.4** ‘**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.
 - 6.4.1** An element of the SHARE-North budget was earmarked for shared electric vehicles and their monitoring, in partnership with Edinburgh College. It is intended, therefore, to award a grant of £18,000 to the College as part of the project.
- 6.5** **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.”. The project attracts 85% funding from Europe.

6.5.1 SEStran Officers attended a REGIO MOB partnership meeting in Brussels, in October. This coincided with the European Week of Regions and Cities. The next stage of the project will be implementing the PASTA project in the SEStran region. SEStran will begin this process by tendering for Active Travel Audits at key sites to set a baseline for the project.

6.6 **SURFLOGH** aims to improve the role of logistics hubs in the network of urban logistics in the North Sea Region.

6.6.1 The Kick-Off Meeting was held in Amsterdam in September with all partners of the SURFLOGH project. The lead partner is currently working to complete all project formalities including completion of the necessary Partnership Agreement. SEStran will be leading on a work package with Napier TRI creating business models for urban freight hubs. SEStran will also be trialling a last mile delivery solution in the region.

7 Opportunities for New European Projects

7.1 Interreg, North West Europe

7.1.1 **SCRIPT** (Sustainable Carbon Reduction in Port Transport)

7.1.2 SEStran was advised in October that the partnership bid for the above was unsuccessful.

8 Further Initiatives

8.1 Borders Corridor Study

8.1.1 In the Scottish Government's Programme for Government a commitment was given to examine the case for improvements to the A1, A7 and A68, along with an extension of the Borders railway. Transport Scotland and its consultants are now considering a number of issues including accessibility in the Borders and links between its communities and the key markets of Edinburgh, Carlisle and Newcastle. The study will identify issues and opportunities on transport routes and identify where improvements can be made.

SEStran has been represented throughout the series of progress meetings, held to steer the strategy. At a meeting, held on 12 October, a range of emerging options along with a project Risk Register and Programme was discussed. The consultants have employed a GIS tool called "Storymap" to assist with the compilation and presentation of the significant amount of data gathered and this will be fed back to the stakeholders consulted initially on the study. The latest meeting, on 16 November, discussed the emerging draft study document, further stakeholder meetings (to feed back the draft findings), the programme, risk register and next steps towards completing the study.

8.2 East Coast Mainline Authorities Consortium (ECMA)

- 8.2.1** SEStran, along with TACtran, Hitrans and NEStrans has re-joined the association for 2017/18 and will take part in ensuing discussions which will include views on the latest HS2 announcements and their implications for the east of Scotland.

SEStran's Chair, accompanied by the Head of Programmes attended the last meeting, held in York on 3 October. In summary, there was discussion on the group's leadership, an approach from the HS2 project on possible joint working, political lobbying (possible all-party group), focussing on East Coast Main Line (as distinct from the wider transport corridor) and agreement that ECMA remains a worthwhile forum and needs to push on.

8.3 Can Do Innovation Challenge Fund

- 8.3.1** SEStran submitted two Expressions of Interest (further development of the Thistle card and reporting defects whilst on the daily commute) to the above, which is sponsored by Scottish Enterprise, but both were unsuccessful.

8.4 Hate Crime

- 8.4.1** West Lothian, Clackmannanshire and Fife Councils have agreed to pilot the regional hate crime transport charter. A questionnaire will soon be sent to operators to gauge their current levels of training with regard to hate crime on their network and their willingness to participate in the charter.

8.5 yTravel

- 8.5.1** SEStran awarded a grant of £60,000 to Young Scot in October 2017. SEStran is working with Young Scot to formally launch the yTravel project in January 2018.

8.6 X-Route: Star Paths

- 8.6.1** The trial of the 'star paths', as funded through the Scottish Road Research Board, was installed in Knightsridge, West Lothian in early October and was officially launched in partnership with Young Scot in November.
- 8.6.2** The application to the Regeneration Capital Grant Fund, to create an 800m stretch of glowing path as an extension of the trial, was unfortunately unsuccessful.

9 EU Exit

- 9.1** The negotiation process continues with press coverage that rarely provides any factual detail. There appears to be a degree of posturing going on by

both sides. The Prime Minister recently proposed setting a date of exit on 29 March 2019, in association with EU (Withdrawal) Bill. However, at the time of writing, others have suggested that to set a firm date which would take effect regardless of having an appropriate deal in place is perhaps not tactically sound.

10 RTS Delivery Plan

- 10.1** As reported previously, the Delivery Plan was refreshed and approved by the Scottish Ministers in 2015 and now covers the period 2015 to 2025. Albeit that future funding streams for SEStran continue to be highly unpredictable, as explained in the refresh, there are clear strategic priorities for transport that emerge from the RTS based on national policy, the Strategic Development Planning process and from Local Authorities, upon which SEStran should focus.

Based on these, the Delivery Plan seeks to provide a framework for SEStran's ongoing work programme, set out in the annual Business Plans.

- 10.2** In terms of project delivery, other than those discussed above, no additional funds have been made available to SEStran since the Delivery Plan was refreshed.
- 10.3** It is also now clear that, in respect of transport infrastructure investment, that the award of the Edinburgh & South East Scotland City region Deal will focus only on the grade separation of the Sheriffhall junction on the A720 city bypass and on west Edinburgh transport improvements.

11 Recommendations

- 11.1** The Committee is invited to note the contents of the report:

Jim Grieve
Head of Programmes
16th November 2017

Policy Implications	None
Financial Implications	As described in the report
Equalities Implications	None
Climate Change Implications	None

Appendix 1: Projects Expenditure to Date

EXPENDITURE

	Description	Budget	Actuals @ 6/11/17
	R15 PARK & CHOOSE STH TAY BRIDGE	10,000	0
	R17 SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AWARENESS	190,000	733
	URBAN CYCLE NETWORKS	120,000	19,883
	RTPI - REVENUE CONTRIBUTION	339,000	31,458
	RESEARCH - DEVELOPMENT	50,000	0
	EU SOCIAL CAR	47,000	31,214
	EQUALITIES FORUM ACTIONS	10,000	5,793
	SHARE - NORTH	40,000	19,774
	REGIO - MOB	33,000	37,453
	SURFLOUGH	0	1,565
		839,000	147,872

INCOME

	R15 PARK & CHOOSE STH TAY BRIDGE	0	-10,000
	URBAN CYCLE NETWORKS	-100,000	-18,812
	RTPI - REVENUE CONTRIBUTION	-160,000	-139,018
	REVENUE PROJECTS GRANT	-494,000	-326,883
	EU SOCIAL CAR	-47,000	-58,815
	EQUALITIES FORUM ACTIONS	0	-3,600
	EU CHUMS	0	55
	SHARE - NORTH	-20,000	1,536
	REGIO - MOB	-28,000	-720
		-849,000	-556,256

NET EXPENDITURE/ (INCOME)

-10,000 -408,383

Regional Transport Strategy Monitoring

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** The Regional Transport Strategy has specified a monitoring framework for key objectives and some targets/actions albeit not all. The paper seeks to discuss the continuity of the existing monitoring framework and progress outcomes outlined in the statutory RTS.

2. RTS MONITORING FRAMEWORK

- 2.1** The 2015 refresh of the Regional Transport Strategy outlined that several external factors including macro-economic trends and discontinuity of data sources have an impact on the ability to monitor performance against these objectives. Page 42 of the refreshed Regional Transport Strategy outlines that at some point in the future it may be necessary to carry out a critical appraisal of continuing with the identified indicator targets given the trends identified and the ability for SEStran actions to have an impact on performance, given reduced funding. Annex 1 provides a list of the current content and format of the RTS Monitoring Framework targets. It is proposed that the period of amendment is now and that whilst continuity of monitoring of outcomes is important, any adjustments will seek to continue to achieve the monitoring of objectives but not necessarily with the same dataset.
- 2.2** The strategic framework for the 2008 RTS and the refresh in 2015 is very much of its time. There is potentially a greater focus on identifying policies and actions than having a concise strategic framework. The current Scottish Government has continued, over the last decade, to move towards a greater focus on outcomes. There is also a greater analytical resource and focus on designing measurable and meaningful indicators and performance frameworks. Whilst, a strategy shouldn't be designed solely based on the availability of data, as this would limit transformational change, there has does need to be a clear relationship between outcomes targeted and development of effective and efficient monitoring.
- 2.3** Over Summer 2017, SEStran undertook a desk based analysis of the continuing cost and availability of existing data sources for RTS monitoring and to scope out whether further data sources, direct or proxy, are available to monitor and provide an indicator of performance against existing RTS objectives. From that analysis it is proposed that the existing format and presentation of the monitoring framework needs to be made more accessible and useable. The desk based analysis showed that the majority of indicators were no longer measurable by availability of data or relative cost of proxy data. In particular, a lot of the monitoring framework relied on Scottish Household Survey data, where the main limitation with that data is that transport and travel responses in SHS focus on getting a statistically significant national picture. For anything regional, some

kind of bespoke analysis would have to be done with the SHS data and we are investigating how to access the data and the cost.. However, for the very specific requests (e.g. SES region data on a question, but also by SIMD or disability or X other variable), we have received advice from Transport Scotland statisticians that we will start to run into problems with too few numbers of respondents and, therefore, may have to settle for the national data as a proxy.

- 2.4** Outwith the strategic framework of objectives and indicators, there were a number of “actions” outlined in the RTS which require to be monitored in terms of progress or providing a baseline for future monitoring and advocacy. These are detailed in Annex 2. It is proposed that an evaluation of these actions is undertaken over the next 2/3 months to see what has been progressed since the key dates 2008 or 2015 and what actions should therefore be prioritized as part of the 18/19 Partnership Business Plan.

3. COUNCILS ACTIONS

- 3.1** There has been previously a quantitative and qualitative aspect of self-reporting through Chief Officers by councils and it is proposed that this self-analytical process is reintroduced. Chief Officers have been providing regular updates since May 2017 which will have a significant impact on the actions identified in the RTS and the achievement of the wider vision. Previous annual reports have provided a table of expenditure detailing resources spent by constituent councils on delivering RTS outcomes. This would seem potentially an overtly fiscal lens of success which does not adequately cover the softer policy and behavioural change measures that our constituent councils deliver. Therefore, it is proposed that there should be a focus on the narrative reporting of actions, rather than creation of a financial league table.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1** The committee are requested to discuss the outlined proposed actions within the paper and agree to:
- the continued review and revision of the RTS Monitoring Framework
 - undertaking a prioritized analysis of progress listed RTS actions in Annex 2 and
 - to introduce the submission of regular concise narrative accounts of progress with key actions which contribute to RTS outcomes by each constituent council of the South East of Scotland Transport Partnership which would form the basis of the annual report monitoring until a new cost-effective and sustainable monitoring framework can be developed.

George Eckton

Partnership Director

Annex 1 – Copy of RTS Strategic Monitoring Framework

Annex 2 – List of RTS Actions

Annex 1

Targets for Economy

4.2.1 The economy targets are particularly aimed at reducing congestion, widening labour markets and ensuring key economic transport links are maintained and developed.

Objective 1.1 – to maintain and improve labour market accessibility to key business/employment locations

Access to key business and employment locations can be assessed in terms of the number of potential employees with a given travel time by public transport. This can be thought of as the labour market catchment for key, currently identified, employment centres. Improvements in public transport will increase this catchment, which can be defined in two bands – under 30 minutes and under 60 minutes.

Target: Relative to 2007, achieve a 10% increase in (public transport) labour market catchments (within 30 minutes, and within 60 minutes) for selected locations.

Objective 1.2 – to maintain and improve connectivity to the rest of Scotland, the UK and beyond

Key economic ‘gateways’ to the rest of Scotland, the UK and the rest of the World include the motorway network, major railway stations, Edinburgh Airport, and Rosyth, Grangemouth and Leith ports. This objective seeks to ensure links to these gateways and beyond are maintained and improved.

Target: To improve ‘connectivity’ to a range of key internal and external destinations – mainly indirectly via influencing other bodies such as bus and train operators, airport operators, other RTPs and Transport Scotland. SEStran has been working with Edinburgh Airport in developing its Airport Surface Access Strategy to ensure good quality public and sustainable transport is built into their strategy.

Objective 1.3 – to support other strategies, particularly land-use planning, and economic development

No quantitative target possible – only demonstrable synergies with other strategies, through new working relationships and structures.

Target: Demonstrable progress in collaborative working between SEStran, SESplan, planning authorities, economic development agencies and other appropriate stakeholders. For example, SEStran has become a Key Agency in the planning process in relation to Strategic and Local Development Plans. In the longer term, an RTS target (10 year) is to identify the transport infrastructure and services required to meet the relevant development plan requirements.

Objective 1.4 – to reduce the negative impacts of congestion, in particular to improve journey time reliability for passengers and freight

Commute-based mode share targets have been developed for the RTS. Achievement of these targets will reduce congestion in key corridors and improve journey time reliability. 'Time lost to congestion' is regularly monitored on the busier parts of the trunk road network by the Scottish Government, and reported annually.

Target: (i) Reduce 'car driver' share for travel-to-work by six percentage points over the period of the RTS (see Chapter 8 for details),; (ii) Over the period of the strategy, reduce (after 15 years) time lost due to congestion across the SEStran trunk road network; (iii) From the Scottish Household Survey (Travel Diary), reduce the proportion of car driver journeys made by SEStran residents which are reportedly affected by congestion between 0700 and 0900.

4.3 Targets for Accessibility

The overarching objective for accessibility is 'to improve accessibility for those with limited transport choice or no access to a car, particularly those who live in rural areas'. Targets for each sub-objective are proposed below.

Objective 2.1 – to improve access to employment

Through accessibility modelling, the RTS has established a measure for residential access to employment for all areas of SEStran, at a detailed spatial level. Modelling can be used to measure the impact of public transport improvements on this accessibility measure.

Target: For communities defined as most deprived by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), improve access (by public transport) to employment (using the above measure) by an average of at least 10% after 15 years).

Objective 2.2 – to improve access to health facilities

The accessibility modelling undertaken in the RTS also allows an accurate picture to be built of communities with long travel times, using public transport (defined here as greater than 60 minutes), to hospital services, where there are a significant number of zero-car households (see Chapter 6).

Target: Reduce the proportion of zero-car households with poor access (>60 minutes travel by public transport) during various time periods and to defined key hospitals by 50% over the period of the RTS (15% after five years).

Objective 2.3 – to improve access to other services, such as retailing, leisure and education

Target: Reduce the proportion of zero-car households with poor access (>45 minutes travel by public transport) to defined further education colleges, job centres and regional shopping centres by 20% over the period of the RTS (7% after five years).

Objective 2.4 – to make public transport more affordable and socially inclusive

There are a range of barriers to the use of public transport which the RTS is setting out to address.

Targets: (i) By, or before the end of the RTS, monitor the implementation of all DDA requirements regarding accessible buses and all public transport complies with the requirements of the Equalities Act 2010. (ii) Identify high fare ‘anomalies’ in the SEStran area by the end of the RTS period, relative to 2007 (iii) Seek to influence national policy in relation to the procurement of bus services, if necessary to meet other RTS targets.

4.4 Targets for Environment

Objective 3.1 – to contribute to the achievement of the UK's national targets and obligations on greenhouse gas emissions

Reducing the level of road traffic is central to the goal of cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

Target: Progress should be made at the SEStran level towards the Scottish Government's aspirational national traffic reduction target of a return to 2001 traffic levels by 2021, and the Scottish Government's emissions targets.

Objective 3.2 – to minimise the negative impacts of transport on natural and cultural resources

Target: To minimise significant effects on areas designated for, or acknowledged for, their biodiversity interests (including protected species), landscape and/or cultural heritage importance, from interventions in the RTS.

Objective 3.3 – to promote more sustainable travel

The achievement of more sustainable travel choices will be evidenced through changes in mode share, and in particular a reduction in the share of ‘car driver’.

Target: Targets for mode share (see objective 1.4).

Objective 3.4 – to reduce the need to travel

Advances in technology are creating opportunities for reducing the amount of travel undertaken, eg home working, teleconferencing, internet shopping etc.

Target: To stabilise and reduce the number of trips per person per year made using motorised modes, by 5% over the period of the RTS.

Objective 3.5 – to increase transport choices, reducing dependency on the private car

Target: Targets for mode share (see objective 1.4).

4.5 Targets for Safety and Health

Objective 4.1 – to improve safety (reducing accidents) and personal security

Targets: (i) By 2020, to cut the number of killed by 40% and seriously injured casualties by 55%; and to cut the number of children killed by 50% and seriously injured by 65%, all from a 2004-2008 base. There is also a target to reduce the slight casualty rate by 10% (ii) Over the period of the strategy, a 20% reduction (7% after five years) in pedestrians and cyclists killed or seriously injured (KSI) per trip made (using SHS data for trip making). (iii) Over the period of the strategy, a five percentage point improvement in the perception of the safety of travel by bus in SEStran (currently around 85%), using Scottish Government Bus Satisfaction monitoring data (two percentage points after five years).

Objective 4.2 – to increase the proportion of trips by walk/cycle

Targets: Targets for mode share (see objective 1.4); in addition, over the period of the strategy, a 5% point increase in walking and cycling mode share for all trips, SEStran wide. Cycling Action Plan for Scotland has a vision of 10% of all journeys will be by bike by 2020.

Objective 4.3 – to meet or better all statutory air quality requirements

Target: To contribute to meeting the national targets for air quality.

Annex 2 RTS Actions

Action: SEStran will co-ordinate and help local authorities with travel planning and help implement travel planning itself (including for schools, local authority employees, health boards and other public and private sector workplaces). This proposal is included as a high priority, due to its potential effectiveness against a wide range of RTS objectives. SEStran has provided a regional forum for the discussion of travel planning issues and knowledge sharing.

Action: SEStran has published guidance on Sustainable Development and on Parking Standards and Parking Management. This guidance has been adopted by the SEStran Partnership and SEStran Local Authorities are encouraged to implement this guidance in their development management processes as part of the statutory planning process. This should be a medium priority for SEStran authorities

Action: continue SEStran's car-share scheme and engagement with European car sharing projects; and offer links to local authorities' travel plan work. Establish likely value of personalised travel planning assistance in SEStran context and if shown to be good value, implement across the SEStran area. The car-share element is a high priority, as it already exists and should be sustained. Workplace travel plans and personalised travel assistance plans are a medium priority. Workplace travel plans and personalised travel plan assistance are, by definition, local. They should, in the first instance, be delivered as part of the developments likely to take place in the SEStran area over the appropriate development plan periods

Action: include establishing best practice on promoting and monitoring tele-working in the RTS. Consider role of travel plan officer and sustainable transport group in this context. This should be seen as a medium priority for SEStran, in the absence of national guidance. It would be practical to establish a region-wide approach, although pilot schemes may be established, possibly as part of travel plans for individual developments

Action: establish a good practice methodology, focussing on links between services/ infrastructure and awareness campaigns. This should be a medium priority for SEStran, as it supports wider travel initiatives, can be delivered regionally on a relatively short timescale and does not require any capital investment. This activity will include supporting sustainable travel events and promotion of sustainable travel at "green" events.

Action: it is recommended that the existing OneTicket as a multi operator ticket continues to be promoted as a medium priority. SEStran has recently taken over responsibility for the daily operation of OneTicket. In addition, as a medium priority, SEStran should work towards developing the coverage, attractiveness and sales of OneTicket across the whole region. SEStran will seek a change in the legislation referred to above to allow the full potential of integrated ticketing to be realised. As a high priority, SEStran will engage with Transport Scotland and bus operators in order to

progress the wider integrated ticketing agenda and in particular investigate the feasibility of introduction of electronic ticketing to One Ticket and the potential of a Scotland-wide smart ticketing system. SEStran will also seek the establishment of railtram integrated tickets through the proposed Edinburgh Gateway rail station serving the airport

Action: SEStran will objectively review past and present relevant [rail concession] schemes from across SEStran and elsewhere, before making further recommendations. This should be seen as a medium priority for SEStran

Action: SEStran will continue developing a Freight Quality Partnership⁹ at the regional level, as part of the RTS. Such a partnership supports agreed objectives and policies, and meets the requirements of the RTS guidance. This action is a high priority for SEStran.

Action: the consideration of HGV facilities, routing issues and HGV signing will be undertaken through the FQP. Through various European projects SEStran has already identified the potential for a Dryport in the Coatbridge area and a Distribution centre near Livingston/Bathgate. A freight signing strategy has been developed along with freight route maps. In addition SEStran has published information on available rail freight routes linking the region to the rest of the UK. This is a high priority for SEStran, supplementing the measures outlined above.

Action: A framework of suggested bands for maximum parking standards has been developed, depending on location, public transport accessibility and land-use, for all sizes of development and adopted by the SEStran Partnership. Local Authorities should take account of this framework in developing their own standards. This measure is promoted as a medium priority

Action: SEStran local authorities should take account of the SEStran parking management strategy in developing their Local Transport Strategies and implement DPE where appropriate. Local authorities should also consider a combined DPE management regime including the option of using SEStran as a facilitating body. High priority

Action: SEStran has established a regional park and ride strategy that has been adopted by the SEStran Partnership and the promotion of measures associated with the strategy is viewed as a high priority. Proposed new sites have been identified/appraised as part of this strategy to ensure a consistent, regional approach to Park and Ride. SEStran will also work with partners to tackle local problems that may arise from high parking demand around stations

Action: SEStran will encourage the development and use of alternative fuels within the SEStran area as a high priority.

Action: carry forward general support for road safety, linking to local and national actions, and consider how best to bring added value to the delivery and monitoring of

road safety in the SEStran area, This should be a low priority for SEStran, as local authorities are already working to this end.

Action: SEStran to share current practice amongst its members and identify gaps where these exist in localised [safer routes to school] networks. A high-level policy framework will be set to ensure consistency of provision across the area. This is a low priority for SEStran in policy terms, in so far as significant work has already been undertaken.

Action: SEStran to support the development of urban cycle networks as identified in our study as a high priority.

Action: To work closely in partnership with Sustrans on the development of these [regional active travel] networks. This should be supported as a high priority.

Action: SEStran will review best practice on cycling infrastructure; local authorities should take this into account in developing their LTS. Medium priority

Action: As a medium priority, SEStran will help local authorities to review off-peak and supported services across the SEStran area and identify major 'gaps' in provision.

Action: As a medium priority, SEStran will encourage bus operators to consider the introduction of alternative fuel buses by seeking grant from Scottish Government or any other source (Lothian Buses have already introduced Hybrid buses to their fleet)

Action: SEStran will seek to achieve an applicable minimum standard of vehicle across the area. Minimum standards should be encouraged in terms of vehicle age, accessibility, and emissions. SEStran should examine the options available in this context as a medium priority, recognising the difficulties faced by small operators in this regard, and other local issues.

Action: SEStran has reviewed fares levels across the area in terms of value for money. In the longer term, SEStran will seek to address inequalities in public transport fares across the SEStran area as a medium priority.

Action: SEStran will seek to identify barriers to integration and work with appropriate stakeholders to overcome these as a high priority.

Action: it would be sensible to encourage upgrading access first to those interchanges which are most heavily used and to which access is currently poorest. These will be identified by SEStran as a high priority.

Action: SEStran has reviewed bus stop infrastructure on key regional public transport corridors. The promotion of minimum standards at bus stops is a medium priority for SEStran.

Action: As a high priority, SEStran to build on recent work to implement, where practical, the SEStran Bus Passenger Information Strategy.

Action: Continue to promote and seek funding for the implementation of RTPI using up to date technology. This is a high priority for SEStran, as RTPI offers considerable potential, is a proven technology and is already in place in some areas. A common regional approach covering bus and rail should be adopted, particularly in IT terms, to ensure that systems are inter-operable.

Action: SEStran has investigated the potential for a region-wide taxicard in terms of delivering the RTS objectives, and as part of the rural transport hierarchy described in Chapter 7. This is a low priority for SEStran to review previous work and ascertain its current relevance.

Action: SEStran will identify the current levels of information service provision and its potential role to bring added value to the delivery of these services through our Equalities Group. This is a medium priority for SEStran, given the requirements of the DDA and benefits that could accrue from delivery. Mobility impaired information services are deliverable on a regional basis including bus RTPI.

Action: Best practice guidance has been produced, offering guidance on how best to consider transport provision in sustainable design. This guidance should be taken into account in the Strategic Development Plan for South East Scotland, and local authorities should also take account of it in developing their Local Transport Strategies and Local Development Plans.

Action: Initially this measure will be considered as a medium priority to encourage extending measures to all viable routes in Edinburgh, but may extend to specific routes in other council areas on a consistent basis as further bus lanes are introduced over time.

Action: SEStran to give further consideration to establishing a tourism signing strategy. This consideration should be a low priority for SEStran, as there is no statutory requirement for such a strategy.

Action: As a medium priority SEStran to promote the establishment of a regional coordination centre, and the development of demand responsive transport. This work will take cognisance of existing cross boundary co-ordination such as between Stirling, Clackmannanshire and Falkirk

Action: SEStran to compile an inventory of ITS systems in the area, assisting in information provision and the consistency of approach/inter-operability, although only as a low priority

Action: As a medium priority, SEStran to review the evidence on the effectiveness of car clubs in relation to the RTS Objectives, and consider supporting their extension into other areas

Action: As a high priority, SEStran to continue to build joint working practices with all relevant local authority structure, strategic development and local development planning teams

Action: As a low priority, SEStran will liaise with stakeholders from this sector of the travelling public. The regional aspects of PTW will be scoped and funds will be made available for investment in PTW-related infrastructure

The RTS has identified areas with relatively poor or no access to all the main hospitals relevant to SEStran residents, and highlighted those geographical areas with significant numbers of people and zero-car households with poor accessibility. In response, SEStran will, as a high priority [TYPE 3]:

- work with bus operators to explore the potential to adjust existing bus routes to serve some of these areas¹; work with hospitals to provide public transport journey plans along with all appointments;
- consider the potential for new routes to link settlements to hospitals, based on consultation with health boards to establish key needs at the detailed level;
- consider the potential for hospital to hospital bus services, serving locations identified as currently having a poor level of access;
- identify methods of managing parking to ensure the most efficient use of parking space at hospitals and maximise the use of public transport;
- review the provision of demand responsive transport in SEStran, with particular reference to rural areas where the provision of scheduled bus services would be highly uneconomical; and
- liaise with community transport groups to advise on best practice, drawing on experience from operational schemes across SEStran and beyond.

The following actions have high priority [TYPE 3]:

- SEStran will examine each area highlighted as: (i) deprived and (ii) suffering from relatively poor access to employment on a case-by-case basis. Detailed examination of the bus services available from these areas could suggest modifications to routes to improve access to employment for these geographical areas³. SEStran will promote modifications where practicable – these could include the modification of bus routes, or new links to defined public transport ‘hubs’; and
- SEStran will engage with local employment agencies and stakeholders to identify any further geographical areas where poor public transport is perceived as a major issue for labour market participation, including areas lacking direct public transport links with Edinburgh.

Action: A thorough review of current Community Transport and DRT schemes operating in SEStran is necessary – medium priority [TYPE 3] – to establish a comprehensive

baseline, including details of the type and scope of the scheme, cost, funding arrangements, customer satisfaction etc. In itself, this would provide a strong indication of current 'best practice' in SEStran. This could be undertaken by SEStran staff or consultants. Consultation should be undertaken with all providers of DRT and Community Transport as part of this exercise, and this will be on-going.

Action: SEStran will review rural transport/DRT provision across the area and consider the case for the development of a framework of provision, building on the above. The role of car clubs (see 6.16.8) should also be considered in providing a level of mobility without owning a car. This would move towards consistency of provision and equality of opportunity across the area. Linked to this is the promoting of electric vehicles and associated charging points. Car clubs are an excellent way to introduce drivers to the benefits of using electric vehicles. 7.5.9 The illustrative hierarchy suggested in the RTS used an eight-way classification of rural areas and suggested an appropriate 'level of service' for different journey purposes from these areas. This framework will be developed further in conjunction with relevant stakeholders, with a view, in the medium term, to ensuring equality and consistency of provision across the area. A SEStran led working group will be required to take this forward through with a realistic view of SEStran's capability to implement change.