

DfT-DPTAC Rail Sub-Group Meeting

11/09/19 11.00 – 13.00

Attendees:

DPTAC	DfT	Additional Attendees
David Mapp	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (ORR)
David Partington	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (ORR)
Matthew Smith	[REDACTED]	
Niki Glazier	[REDACTED]	
Tanvi Vyas	[REDACTED]	
Roger Mackett	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	

Key Points and Actions:

1. Welcome and Introductions – David Mapp

- 1.1 David Mapp welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies noted were: Mike Brace and [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- 1.2 David Mapp asked for disclosure of any conflicts of interest. Matthew Smith is working with ORR on ATP Guidance. It was agreed that this presents no material conflict of interest.

2. ORR Accessibility Activities – [REDACTED]

- 2.1 ORR published their revised DPPP Guidance in July. As part of the revision, DPPPs are to be referred to as Accessible Travel Policies (ATPs). [REDACTED] detailed the reasoning and key points behind the revised Guidance.
- 2.2 One key issue addressed by the new Guidance was the reliability of assistance, with the reliability of both booked assistance and turn-up-and-go assistance in need of improvement. ORR had monitored Passenger Assist to identify the reliability of assistance, and had led five industry focussed workshops to identify the issues driving unreliability. One emerging factor was whether staff felt accountable for their actions when providing assistance, and the effectiveness of communication between staff at different locations. To address this, ORR have developed an assistance ('handover') protocol for rail staff to use ahead of the planned improvements

to Passenger Assist. It was planned to use passenger and mystery shopping exercises to monitor the extent to which reliability improved as a result of the improved Passenger assist app. and new handover protocol. DPTAC asked for an update on RDG's Passenger Assist app. **Action:** Secretariat to circulate update from RDG on Passenger Assist.

- 2.3 With regard to staff training, ORR had contracted an industry disability expert to review and compare all operators' training material, with a specific remit to identify gaps and omissions in current training packages. The expert had also developed guidance on what operator training should cover, including its frequency and format. IN response to a DPTAC suggestion ORR highlighted that they are supportive of senior management receiving the same training as operational staff, though this has not been mandated in the new Guidance. ORR also raised a concern around the extent to which temporary staff should receive full training, suggesting that disability awareness training for temporary staff should be mandated through operator franchise agreements.
- 2.4 On notice periods, ORR had reviewed operators' processes and notice periods for booked assistance. ORR's long-term aim is for people to be able book assistance on the day. To achieve this, ORR have adopted a phased approach to the minimum time required for someone to book assistance before they travel, although operators had raised concerns about this approach. DPTAC noted that the provision of assistance increased demand for rail, and that operators should do more to understand the extra revenue generated from providing accessible services.
- 2.5 On ORR's submission to the Williams Rail Review, ORR had recommended that passengers should be provided with assistance at every station. This didn't necessarily mean staff being present at every station, but that it should be possible to pre-book or provide assistance upon request. ORR had recommended to the Williams Review that DPTAC lead work to establish the criteria for station accessibility, based on a 'whole system' joined-up approach. DPTAC noted that the key issue which needs to be addressed is the toxic combination of unstaffed trains and unstaffed stations, where it was very difficult to provide assistance.
- 2.6 DPTAC recommended that ORR adopt a planned approach to ATP monitoring and enforcement, including the need to set out a clear agenda and data gathering techniques. DPTAC noted that senior managers weren't frequently involved in the ATP Guidance review, and recommended ORR present the new guidance to the RDG board to ensure that the new Guidance is properly understood by industry leaders.

3. DfT Research into Non-Disabled Rail Users – [REDACTED]

- 3.1 [REDACTED] introduced herself as a Social Researcher in DfT's Rail Analysis Team. DfT had published a report on [Research on Experiences of Disabled Rail Passengers](#) in July, and wanted who don't travel by rail. The aim of this

is to understand, and thus reduce, current barriers for disabled people accessing the rail network.

- 3.2 DfT haven't identified the methodology yet, but are exploring the use of both qualitative and quantitative elements. The final report is expected to be published in Spring 2020. **Action:** ██████ to share research into non-disabled rail users scoping document with DPTAC for written comments.
- 3.3 DPTAC provided the following advice:
 - 3.3.1 The research should also investigate the reasons why some non-disabled people don't travel via rail as there may be parallels with the results from the research into the reasons for non-use by disabled people - for example geographical area or the social background.
 - 3.3.2 The survey should ask respondents for journey purpose.
 - 3.3.3 Respondents should be questioned on whether they'd like to travel more via rail.
 - 3.3.4 That step-free access and access to staff assistance are covered.
 - 3.3.5 The research should cover a range of impairments, and the barriers related to those impairments.
 - 3.3.6 The results of the research should be disaggregated so that the results for disabled people and their personal assistants/carers could be analysed separately, where required.
 - 3.3.7 The research may want to cover adults who have disabled children. ██████ noted that this hasn't been considered yet, but she will explore the issue further.
 - 3.3.8 Some people don't consider themselves disabled, but the research should still attempt to cover those people.

4. Williams Rail Review Update – David Mapp and Matthew Smith

- 4.1 David, Matthew, and Keith have all signed Non-Disclosure Agreements with regard to their engagement with the Williams Rail Review. As such, David and Matthew were restricted on the information they could provide during the meeting and consequently only provided a broad overview of the work.
- 4.2 DPTAC have had positive engagement with the Review Team over the summer. The high-level conclusions from the Review have been shared with DPTAC. DPTAC have provided two further written submissions based on their discussions with the Review Team.
- 4.3 David, Matthew, and Keith met with Keith Williams on 3rd September. This enabled DPTAC the opportunity to provide feedback on the Review's emerging conclusions. David and Matthew are also meeting the Review

Team again on 20th September, to review and comment on the Review's draft policy paper on accessibility.

4 DCO/DOO update – David Mapp

- 4.4 Following DPTAC's meeting with Andrew Jones and Nusrat Ghani to discuss the results of the Steer report on the *Effects of Modes of Train Operation on Disabled Passengers*, DfT had decided to progress DPTAC's recommendation to seek legal advice on DOO/DCO and the Equality Act. **Action:** DPTAC to provide [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with its views on what DfT's legal advice should cover.

5 Plan for ATP and RVAR/TSI Reviews – David Mapp

- 5.4 David highlighted that the Rail WG's workload was due to increase significantly until January 2020, as a result of the parallel need to review comment on both PRM-TSI/RVAR dispensation/exemption requests and draft train operator ATPs. In order to help accommodate the additional work, those DPTAC members who been able to commit additional time would be paid for an extra day each month during the September-December period. In addition, a number of non-Rail WG DPTAC members had offered to support the Rail WG with the ATP reviews.
- 5.5 David had devised a plan in which at least two DPTAC members would review each ATP. DPTAC won't be providing detailed compliance checks against the guidance as this is ORR's responsibility. Instead, DPTAC will focus on the tone, format, and language to ensure each ATP is a useful document from the perspective of a disabled rail traveller.
- 5.6 [REDACTED] noted that the number of RVAR exemption and PRM-TSI dispensation requests had increased from a predicted 10-12 to 27. As a result, it was agreed that those Rail WG members dealing with PRM-TSI/RVAR dispensation/exemption requests would meet for additional full day meetings on 2nd October and 14th October. **Action:** Secretariat to arrange RVAR/TSI meetings.

6 Next year's meetings – David Mapp

- 6.4 Following positive feedback, the same meeting schedule will be adopted for 2020, with four face-to-face meetings per year and teleconferences in between.
- 6.5 Building work has started in Great Minster House (GMH) and will continue until December 2021. As a result, it may not be possible to host Rail WG meetings in GMH during the course of the refurbishment. **Action:** Secretariat to ask Rail WG members for stakeholders who would be willing to host future Rail WG meetings, and to send out Doodle Polls for the 2020 face-to-face meetings.
- 6.6 **Action:** Secretariat to invite Network Rail to a face-to-face meeting in 2020.