

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

51 Stevenson Avenue		
Polmont		
Postcode FK2 0GU	Phone 07970659	Email Geoff.robinson@which.net

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)?

Please tick as appropriate ☒ Yes ☐ No

- (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis
Please tick ONE of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available ☒

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address ☐

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address ☐

- (c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate ☐ Yes ☐ 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?
- Please tick as appropriate X ☒ Yes ☐ 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: No real preference, the concern is that if profitable routes such as Edinburgh – Glasgow are solely economic it may result in reductions in evenings / weekend service levels

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

Q2 comments:

21 years, to cover back the payment of large capital expenditure items, but with breaks every 7 years in case of non-performance.

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

Q3 comments:

Would prefer transport Scotland to take the risk and have this a management contract

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

Q4 comments:

Would prefer transport Scotland to take the rewards and have this a management contract

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

Q5 comments:

Network rail

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

Q6 comments:

Bonus / Penalties similar to what is in place.

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

Q7 comments:

% of season ticket / advanced purchase revenue in bond

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

Q8 comments:

Ultimate early termination

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

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

Q9 comments:

Bonus / fines

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:

All routes should have the same criteria

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

Q11 comments:

Performance should be measured to the public timetable at all stations not just the final station. Currently skipping stations seems to be a frequently used tool resulting in long gaps of service at intermediate stations.

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

Q12 comments:

Would prefer realistic performance to be a priority over performance even if the journey slows down as a result. But don't lengthen the journey to result in long waits at stations for platforms just to ensure 100% timekeeping.

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, the stations are just as important as the trains themselves

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

Q14 comments:

Review of passenger complaints topics

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:

20 minutes is an acceptable standing time for most able bodied passengers. The current 10 minute limit isn't applied in the rush hours today.

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:

Absolutely not, the rail network is not reliable enough to do this and passengers will have significant increases in journey times because of missed connections. Areas of England have split services in this way and this has forced people into cars. A 10 minute delay on a direct service can turn into a delay of greater than 1 hour when a connection is missed. Changing trains can also be difficult at some stations.

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:

No, the franchises rarely take risks, the government will be a better director of this as they are accountable in terms of direct feedback to MSPs

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

Q18 comments:

Unsure

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

Q19 comments:

If it is to be used larger shares of the revenue resulting from the change

Scottish rail fares

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

Q20 comments:

To make rail a viable option for everyone, not just the more affluent.

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:

They should be regulated – non-regulation results in profiteering from the franchise holders

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:

Inflation, it would be feasible to increase at inflation+1% once improvements have bedded in, but care must be taken or discounts applied during the disruption of the upgrade work.

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:

It is about correct at the moment,

Scottish stations

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

Q24 comments:

Passenger counts (if service frequency is reasonable) and potential population / transport alternatives including walking / cycling.

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:

They are closer to the real user base

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:

Not sure

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

Q27 comments:

They need to see some benefit in doing so, such as improved services / facilities

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

Q28 comments:

Not sure

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, If you look at the current 1000 London – Aberdeen service, it saves a scotrail unit which can be used elsewhere on the Scottish network. The

Cross-border services have more capacity than the Scotrail trains, higher comfort levels etc. The problems occur when then cross-boarder service operate as well as rather than instead of the Scotrail service. The specification should be a joint provision. It could be possible to make savings by having Scotrail drivers / conductors take over the service north of Edinburgh and sub-lease the train so revenue extraction is removed.

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, This would direct passengers from stations north of Edinburgh wanting to travel to England onto other means. The railway network is not reliable enough and connections are not guaranteed, so long waits as a result of 10 minute delays will be frequent. East Coast services already use platforms 8 & 9 at Edinburgh Waverley which is totally unsuitable for long distance services. The stairs / lifts can't cope with the volume of people attempting to leave the station and this results in frustrations already as people attempt to make connections. It will also result in the loss of Haymarket as a connecting point, something that East Coast already recommend doing rather than using Waverley.

Rolling stock

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

Q31 comments:

Pay as you use?

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

Q32 comments:

Toilets an absolute minimum, first class / trolleys on routes with services of longer than 2 hours duration and significant volumes going the entire distance.

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:

Assess the competition, many competing buses have the facilities now so

parallel rail services should have investigations about use as a priority.

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:

Leave this to the franchisee – the first class seating doesn't make much difference to overall capacity but losing it could result in the passenger driving. The revenue figure of 5% seems to be a good reason to retain.

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

Q35 comments:

From experience the problems are passengers who have already consumed the alcohol rather than consuming it on the train itself. Alcohol is not sold on Friday / Saturday evenings but the travel environment is already made unpleasant by drunks.

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

Q36 comments:

During times of disruption information is often out of date, platform numbers at large stations should be put up earlier.

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:

Combination, if there really is no demand there is no point in running them

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:

No preference.

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:

I currently use the sleeper for early meetings in London, my usage has reduce since East Coast introduced the 0540 Edinburgh – London service. If there were connection into this service from Polmont I would cease to use the sleeper altogether. So from the central belt improvements to normal services would probably make the requirement for the sleeper redundant.

I am sure the value of the highland sleeper is probably more as this journey only has the realistic alternative of flying.

If the price of the sleeper rose to more than a day train / hotel combination I would stop using it.

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:

Energy reduction targets where best industry practice shows that are possible.