

## 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

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

#### Surname

#### Forename

### 2. Postal Address

162-2 Grampian Road		
Aviemore		
Postcode PH22 1RN	Phone	Email tim@outinthehills.co.uk

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

Individual	/	Group/Organisation
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please tick as appropriate</i>		

(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)?  <i>Please tick as appropriate</i> <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 <i>Please tick ONE of the following boxes</i>
	Yes, make my response, name and address all available <input type="checkbox"/>
	or <input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address <input type="checkbox"/>
	or <input type="checkbox"/>
	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?  <i>Please tick as appropriate</i> <input 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?  <i>Please tick as appropriate</i> <input 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:

There is a natural split between economic and social routes, but even the economic routes might require an element of social input, e.g. night time trains between Glasgow and Edinburgh.

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

Q2 comments:

7 – 10 years, as long as there is a reward at the end for improved asset value, to encourage investment.

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:

Both should be done.

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:

It needs to be locally aligned. Bad performance on one or two routes should be penalised, not lost in an overall national average.

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

Q11 comments:

a) Penalties against the operator should be weighted towards the number of passengers affected: the figures should relate to the number of passenger journeys which are late, rather than the number of trains.

b) Compensation to passengers should be straightforward and awarded simply for delay, irrespective of cause, e.g. 100% rebate if over an hour late. This is the policy adopted by other operators, e.g. East Coast.

c) Delays should be measured as at the passenger's destination, not the train's final destination. E.g. if I am travelling Inverness to Perth and we are late at Perth, it is irrelevant to me how late the train is at its final destination of Glasgow.

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

Q12 comments:

Increasing the timetabled journey times so that more trains are punctual is disingenuous and merely downgrades the quality of the service. Franchise bidders should be bidding to run a service to a level which is at least as good as the current service.

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:

Yes. It should cover all aspect of rail passenger travel. Any monitoring should be independent.

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:

Standing is not acceptable, and any allowance for overcrowding should be no worse from the passenger's perspective than now.

Where there is currently regular overcrowding, conditions could be attached to the franchise so that additional capacity is introduced within a certain timeframe.

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:

No. Any journey which requires more than one train is a poorer passenger experience, with increased journey time, risk of missed connection, and increased stress.

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:

a) Minimum levels of provision need to be specified, especially where this relates to the social aspect of the rail network.

b) Additional specific requirements may need to be included, e.g. the provision

of night time trains between Edinburgh and Glasgow

c) There should also be a requirement for more trains to stop at certain stations, e.g. South Gyle and Edinburgh Park, where the daytime population can exceed the resident population of some other stations on the network which have more frequent services.

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:

The intention to deregulate intercity fares should only happen as long as a minimum level of service is specified.

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:

Fare increases should use CPI+

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:

a) A greater differential is acceptable to encourage off peak travel.

b) Peak travel should have no relevance on the social part of the network.

Whether some parts of the journey on these routes is within certain times is coincidental, and the passenger should not be penalised for it.

### **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:

The franchisee is best placed and should be responsible for the whole station. They need to be rewarded for asset improvements at the end of the contract. It is sensible for Network Rail to continue management of Waverley and Glasgow Central.

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:

Yes. They provide key connections to London and other English cities. If anything, there should be an increase in the number of cross-border services which continue further north.

- a) They benefit passengers by introducing an element of competition on the Inverness and Aberdeen routes. There is therefore an incentive for the Scottish franchise holder to improve the service. This benefits passengers on both operators.
- b) Any requirement to change trains at Edinburgh, especially to a different provider, is likely to reduce the attractiveness of the service. It will increase journey times, increase the risk of missed connection, and make rail less attractive when compared to car or air. Journeys which involve more than one operator are also more complicated in terms of fare structure. They therefore benefit taxpayers by encouraging rail use.
- c) These direct services on the Inverness and Aberdeen routes are vital tourist services.
- d) Removing these through services would directly contradict the Transport Priorities set out in section 2 of the Consultation:
- *Focus investment on making connections across, within and to/ from Scotland better, improving reliability and journey times, seeking to maximise the opportunities for employment, business, leisure and tourism;*
  - *Invest in maintaining our existing transport infrastructure to ensure it remains safe and reliable, so safeguarding current connectivity;*
  - *Facilitate the transition to a low carbon economy by providing integrated and cost-effective public transport and better connecting people, places and work;*
  - *Ensure Scotland is well connected with the rest of the world by working closely with the air, rail and sea transport industries to actively promote new international routes, services and sustainable infrastructure.*

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:

No. It would increase crowding and congestion on the station platforms.

## **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:

Essential: toilets; information system; CCTV; basic catering (tea trolley); luggage space; cycle rack or dedicated cycle space.

Longer term should aim for: wifi; additional catering on longer routes (meals etc.)

## **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:

First Class should be provided on a commercial basis. The few number of additional seats freed up is minimal compared with the revenue generated from First Class.

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

Q35 comments:

- a) It should be the behaviour that is policed, not the actual drinking.
- b) It should be dealt with on a journey by journey basis.
- c) The vast majority of passengers who might have a drink are not causing trouble, and a ban could be seen as an overreaction.
- d) If a ban is imposed it should only apply to the Scottish franchise, not to other operators.

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:

Yes, both the destinations and the intermediate stops.

It is part of the social network, but is also vital to the tourism industry.

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:

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:

a) It is essential to the tourism industry. It allows people to arrive in the Highlands in the early morning and undertake a full day of activities. It is also a service to residents who are able to travel to London for a day.

b) Additional early or late trains are not the answer, as the accommodation element would then still need to be obtained separately. To arrive early morning in Inverness would still need an overnight journey from England.

c) Oban and Fort William (and intermediate stations) are both justifiable destinations, but I appreciate it is impractical to split the train again at Crianlarich. However there should be a requirement to provide a connecting service between Crianlarich and Oban at the appropriate times (or between Crianlarich and Fort William if the sleeper goes to Oban).

d) Inverness (and intermediate stations) is also an appropriate destination in respect of tourism.

e) There might be a justification for en-suite in First Class, but it should only

be a long term aim to provide this in Standard Class.

f) The Sleeper should provide some sort of catering, more than just a basic tea trolley.

g) The Sleeper should also provide seating capacity which is available as part of the scheduled service between its stopping points within Scotland, e.g. between Inverness and Aviemore.

### **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: