

## Respondent Information Form and Questions

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

### 1. Name/Organisation

#### Organisation Name

Glencoe and Loch Leven Marketing Association

Title Mr ☒ Ms ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Dr ☐ **Please tick as appropriate**

#### Surname

Young

#### Forename

Laurence

### 2. Postal Address

Roshinish House

Old Ferry Brae

Ballachulish

Argyll

Postcode PH49 4JX

Phone 07860 558005

Email lmcpy@hotmail.com

### 3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual

☐

Group/Organisation

☒

**Please tick as appropriate**

(a)	Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?
	<b>Please tick as appropriate</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(b)	Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis <b>Please tick ONE of the following boxes</b>
	Yes, make my response, name and address all available <input type="checkbox"/>
	or
	Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address <input type="checkbox"/>
	or
	Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address <input type="checkbox"/>

(c)	The name and address of your organisation <b>will be</b> made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).
	Are you content for your <b>response</b> to be made available?
	<b>Please tick as appropriate</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

(d)	We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?
	<b>Please tick as appropriate</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

## Consultation Questions

The answer boxes will expand as you type.

### Procuring rail passenger services

1. What are the merits of offering the ScotRail franchise as a dual focus franchise and what services should be covered by the economic rail element, and what by the social rail element?

Q1 comments:

2. What should be the length of the contract for future franchises, and what factors lead you to this view?

Q2 comments:

3. What risk support mechanism should be reflected within the franchise?

Q3 comments:

4. What, if any, profit share mechanism should apply within the franchise?

Q4 comments:

5. Under what terms should third parties be involved in the operation of passenger rail services?

Q5 comments:

6. What is the best way to structure and incentivise the achievement of outcome measures whilst ensuring value for money?

Q6 comments:

7. What level of performance bond and/or parent company guarantees are appropriate?

Q7 comments:

8. What sanctions should be used to ensure the franchisee fulfils its franchise commitments?

Q8 comments:

## **Achieving reliability, performance and service quality**

9. Under the franchise, should we incentivise good performance or only penalise poor performance?

Q9 comments:

10. Should the performance regime be aligned with actual routes or service groups, or should there be one system for the whole of Scotland?

Q10 comments:

11. How can we make the performance regime more aligned with passenger issues?

Q11 comments:

12. What should the balance be between journey times and performance?

Q12 comments:

13. Is a Service Quality Incentive Regime required? And if so should it cover all aspects of stations and service delivery, or just those being managed through the franchise?

Q13 comments:

14. What other mechanisms could be used for assessing train and station quality?

Q14 comments:

## **Scottish train services**

15. Can better use be made of existing train capacity, such as increasing the permitted standing time beyond the limit of 10 minutes or increasing the capacity limit? What is an acceptable limit for standing times on rail services?

Q15 comments:

16. Should the number of services making use of interchange stations (both rail to rail and rail to other modes) be increased to reduce the number of direct services? What would be the opportunities and challenges of this?

Q16 comments:

17. Should Government direct aspects of service provision such as frequency and journey time, or would these be better determined by the franchisee based on customer demand?

Q17 comments:

18. What level of contract specification should we use the for the next ScotRail franchise?

Q18 comments:

19. How should the contract incentivise the franchisee to be innovative in the provision of services?

Q19 comments:

### **Scottish rail fares**

20. What should be the rationale for, and purpose of, our fares policy?

Q20 comments:

21. What fares should be regulated by government and what should be set on a commercial basis? Do your recommendations change by geographic area (the Strathclyde area example), or by type of journey (for example suburban or intercity)?

Q21 comments:

22. How should we achieve a balance between the taxpayer subsidy and passenger revenue contributions in funding the Scottish rail network? At what rate should fares be increased, and how feasible would it be to apply higher increases to Sections of the network which have recently been enhanced?

Q22 comments:

23. What should the difference be between peak and off-peak fares? Will this help encourage people to switch to travelling in the off-peak?

Q23 comments:

## **Scottish stations**

24. How should we determine what rail stations are required and where, including whether a station should be closed?

Q24 comments:

25. What are the merits or issues that arise from a third party (such as a local authority or local business) being able to propose, promote and fund a station or service?

Q25 comments:

26. Should only one organisation be responsible for the management and maintenance of stations? If this was the franchisee how should that responsibility be structured in terms of leasing, investment, and issues relating to residual capital value?

Q26 comments:

27. How can local communities be encouraged to support their local station?

Q27 comments:

28. What categories of station should be designated and what facilities should be available at each category of station?

Q28 comments:

## **Cross-border services**

29. Should cross-border services continue to go north of Edinburgh? In operating alongside ScotRail services, how do cross-border services benefit passengers and taxpayers? And who should specify these services, the Department of Transport or the Scottish Ministers?

Q29 comments:

30. Or should the cross-border services terminate at Edinburgh Waverley, allowing opportunities for Scottish connections? And if so, what additional benefits would accrue from having an Edinburgh Hub?

Q30 comments:

## **Rolling stock**

31. What alternative strategies or mechanisms could be used to reduce the cost of the provision of rolling stock?

Q31 comments:

32. What facilities should be present on a train and to what extent should these facilities vary according to the route served?

Q32 comments:

## **Passengers – information, security and services**

33. How should we prioritise investment for mobile phone provision and / or Wi-Fi type high-bandwidth services?

Q33 comments:

34. How should we balance the need for additional seating capacity and retain the flexibility of a franchisee to offer first-class services if commercially viable?

Q34 comments:

35. What issues and evidence should be considered prior to determining whether or not to ban the consumption of alcohol on trains?

Q35 comments:

36. How can the provision of travel information for passengers be further improved?

Q36 comments:

## **Caledonian Sleeper**

37. Should we continue to specify sleeper services, or should this be a purely commercial matter for a train operating company?

Q37 comments:

It has long been accepted (following many a review and much consultation in the past!) that the Caledonian Sleeper service requires financial subsidy. If left as a commercial matter, the service would lapse and the important wider social, economic and commercial benefits would be lost.

38. Should the Caledonian Sleeper services be contracted for separately from the main ScotRail franchise? Or should it be an option for within the main ScotRail franchise?

Q38 comments:

Some change seems appropriate, as the system is not working well in all respects at present.

Our frequent users of the sleeper report a good service, well operated and with a strong reservation/booking/management system. But the service seems to lack effective sales and marketing. In a highly professional, modern transport world, successful travel operators must adopt sophisticated, flexible and technologically advanced promotional techniques; these do not appear to be available to ScotRail.

39. We would be interested in your views in the level and type of service that the Caledonian Sleeper Services should provide. Including:

- What is the appeal of the Caledonian Sleeper Service, and if there were more early and late trains would the appeal of the sleeper services change?
- What is the value of sleeper services to Fort William, Inverness and Aberdeen and are these the correct destinations, for example would Oban provide better connectivity?
- What facilities should the sleeper services provide and would you pay more for better facilities?

Q39 comments:

The **appeal** of the sleeper is that of a time machine; it shortens long and difficult day journeys to the highlands to waking minutes rather than hours.

This is less so for the lowland sleeper, where developments in rail and other means of transport consistently shorten travel times. But to use any other form of public transport to Oban and Fort William involves a considerable journey time and a somewhat tortuous journey (changes, walks across Glasgow between train/bus stations, etc).

The Caledonian Sleeper provides a service that is **unique** and powerful. Further, there is a strong “USP” here that is not leveraged in publicity or marketing.

Another **appeal** is the environmental one. Without a sleeper service, given the paucity and restrictions of other forms of transport, the realistic option is the car. The sleeper is very green.

The **appeal** and viability of the Caledonian Sleeper could be ***substantially improved by a more commercial and entrepreneurial approach***. In relation to the design of the service, much can be learnt by looking at European provision. In relation to sales and marketing, the service needs to adopt approaches common to other transport industries (eg more dynamic variable pricing; packaging; consolidated tariffs with tour operators and other transport providers).

We are not persuaded that there should be more services at different hours. Let's make the one we have "world class", and promote it effectively.

The **value** is in supporting the effective transport infrastructure of the nation. Sleeper services provide a key means of access to distant places and this is especially important to tourism. This long established group of over 90 tourism businesses in the south west of Lochaber represents enterprises that benefit from international visitors to a remote part of Britain. A good sleeper service is an integral part of the necessary infrastructure to attract and support tourists.

Further, many of the businesses use the sleeper service in their own right, finding it an important means of travel to London in the conduct of their business (eg attending travel shows and trade events). The sleeper is an invaluable business support service in running an enterprise in a remote rural location.

In considering the **correct destinations**, it would appear logical to assess journey times and alternatives. Whilst it might not be appropriate to maintain sleeper services to Edinburgh because there are a number of alternatives and the journey time is now considerably shortened (when taking the sleeper, it's time to wake up almost as soon as one has gone to sleep), places like Oban, Fort William, Kyle and Wick are difficult to access from London and journey times are substantial. *They are serviced by access routes where large sections will not be made faster by modernisation.*

The sleeper service currently provides good **facilities**. Travellers want a service they can book easily (the call centre service works well, but internet services could be improved) with ticketing services friendly and flexible. They look simply for a clean cabin and a good sleep. We do not think private facilities are essential on the train – but there do need to be excellent, modern shower facilities in the stations at each end of the service. *Rather than focus principally on the physical, there needs to be focus on the business side of the operation.*

In relation to this, the flexipass is an excellent product for frequent travellers, and more could be done to extend offerings around this, and promote them much more powerfully. Passengers may well value other benefits – for example, why must everyone leave the train on arrival, rather than gain the

benefit of more sleep, if this is important to them (ie make the existing service more customer focused).

Experiences on the continent give good examples of current, professional standards in sleeper provision. We should seek to be as good as the best, and investment in stock would therefore seem important. We have fallen behind.

The public are used to the high but minimalistic standards of travel lodges and sleeper facilities need to be designed with modern tastes and fashion in mind. WiFi, for example, seems essential? One member suggests more modern touches, such as a small display screen to show location, and estimated arrival time?

From use of the sleeper, we note that considerable space is provided for disabled travellers, yet proportionately these berths appear to enjoy relatively little activity; is there the opportunity to upsell these more spacious facilities?

The sleeper service is already considered by some to be relatively expensive. Business travellers might well be prepared to pay substantially more; especially if there were a few premium cabins in each coach, with enhanced facilities?

Bargain Berths and discounted, demand-related fares are excellent, and we contend that much more could be achieved with flexible pricing.

The issue is perhaps less about price and more about perceived value – it appears that little is done to promote the service and to highlight the true value of the fare and highlight the many benefits that surround travel by sleeper.

## **Environmental issues**

40. What environmental key performance indicators should we consider for inclusion in the franchise agreement or the High Level Output Specification?

Q40 comments: