

LONDON BUSES TRIPARTITE MEETING

Date: 6th February 2018

Venue: Wapping, 11th Floor, Palestra

Attendees	Initials	Representing
Claire Mann	CM	Director of Bus Operations (Buses)
Tom Cunnington	TC	Head of Bus Contracts and Development
Jane Lupson	JL	Senior Bus Safety Development Manager
Sean O'Shea	SOS	Chief Operating Officer, Metroline
Karen Fuller	KF	HR Director, RATP
John Murphy	JM	Regional Officer (UNITE)
Kevin Stagg	KS	Chairman of London Advisory Committee (UNITE)
Andrew Cruickshank	AC	Executive Manager, Buses
Hannah Sullivan	HS	Commercial Development Manager, Buses

1.	INTRODUCTIONS & UPDATES	
1.1	<p>Introductions and Apologies</p> <p>The minutes of October 11 were approved. Apologies came from Bob Scowen.</p>	
1.2	<p>Previous Actions Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Send forecast for 2017/18 operated kms reduction ▪ Provide definition of community resolution ▪ Ascertain number of assault cases successfully prosecuted ▪ Provide update on spits kits roll out ▪ Unite to advise of instances where spit kits aren't rolled out ▪ Change License for London wording in clause 2c from "disciplinary" to "suspended". ▪ Set up meeting with Mayor's Office to agree FAQs ▪ Operators to form working group for drafting purposes ▪ Update clause 4 of TUPE guidance as agreed ▪ Detail maintenance and driving requirements for health bus ▪ Press offices to liaise over anti-racism statement ▪ Keep late finishes on Tripartite agenda 	<p>CLOSED</p>
2.	BUSINESS UPDATE	
2.1	<p>Business Plan and Current Performance</p> <p>CM explained the key performance indicators used on the Buses Scorecard and the high levels of performance on scheduled services, excess wait time and average bus speeds. She added the Safety Performance Index was made up of a basket of measures which looked at incidents as well as enhancing safety culture.</p> <p>JM suggested an alternative name for bus speeds to avoid the risk of appearing inconsistent with messages about enhancing safety, such as average rate of travel.</p> <p>JM said it would help to have a measure for higher average numbers of passengers carried by bus to help move forward and justify actions taken in the Business Plan.</p> <p>CM said patronage had started to improve beyond previous Business Plan expectations over the past six periods but growing the number of fare-paying passengers was a</p>	

	<p>substantial and continuing challenge. The network would continue to respond to falling patronage in some areas and look for growth in others, to ensure vehicles were utilised as much as possible in the most needed areas.</p>	
2.2	<p>Ford Chariot Shuttle Bus</p> <p>CM said there were trials of demand-responsive minibuses in London suburbs, administered through London Service Permits (LSPs). This entailed careful scrutiny of licence requirements to control the transport operations and to avoid the risk of impacts on mainstream bus services. CM agreed to a request from JM to send a list of on-demand services to Unite with details of the type of arrangements envisaged.</p> <p>JM said Unite was opposed to services taking patronage from network routes and potentially hiring drivers with less training and expertise.</p> <p>CM advised TfL could be legally challenged if it sought to unreasonably block services and was working with its Innovation team to manage the trials. The process for obtaining LSPs might change if there were lessons to be learned, however in this regard TfL is the regulator of LSPs, and has to obey the legal framework in which they sit.</p> <p>ACTION: Provide on-demand bus routes list to JM.</p>	CLOSED
3.	BUS SAFETY	
3.1	<p>Bus Safety Programme</p> <p>JL updated the meeting on progress over the last six months. She said the first of two decision meetings had been held on which technical solutions to take forward on principal safety issues. Once methods for combating these were agreed, protocols for examining their effectiveness and testing could proceed. JL said testing dates for elements of the Bus Safety Standard would be provided to Unite so its representatives could see what was being looked at this spring and could attend those of particular interest. If particularly promising technologies were identified and effective, these could start to be introduced ahead of other elements.</p> <p>Safety training was also being looked at both for all drivers (new and existing) and their driving instructors. This was currently being procured and once a training provider was appointed and had concepts of what might be possible, more detail could be provided on the shape and content.</p>	
3.2	<p>Driver Training and Route Familiarisation</p> <p>JM expressed concern at current variances to vehicle type training and route familiarisation among operators, and asserted some took place in drivers' own time. He also felt responsibilities were shifting from the corporate to individual level.</p> <p>JL said the new safety assurance processes used by TfL were focussing more on safety culture as well documenting evidence. This helped build up a picture of how operators approached safety such as through route risk assessments and training on the type of vehicle they might drive.</p> <p>SOS said route learning was signed off not just by the driver receiving it but also by a second driver acting as a verifier at Metroline, reflecting this safety culture approach.</p>	

	<p>KF added all operators would be able to demonstrate they had delivered training in this area, and TfL could also see where this was and was not taking place.</p> <p>CM said the Sandilands incident had shown the need for greater assurance. The current assurance programme, adoption of a Safety Performance Index, and driver training were all areas where a focus was needed to achieve Vision Zero.</p> <p>JM felt that while there was a reasonable standard of safety in London some operators were pulling this down.</p>	
3.3	<p>Bus Safety Innovation Fund</p> <p>CM itemised the winners of the new Bus Safety Innovation Fund and explained that it was the bus operators leading delivery of the projects, with TfL providing the funding. It was the operators who would liaise with union representatives directly, and TfL was reminding operators engaged during this process. SOS cited Metroline as speaking to staff representatives who would be using trial equipment to address any arising issues.</p>	
3.4	<p>Training for Headways</p> <p>KS suggested driver training for managing headways would assist safety as he felt there had to be a link between incidents and drivers trying to keep to schedules. At the start of his career, driver training put safety and comfort of passengers first, and this similar approach would help new starters who might otherwise feel pressurised to achieve headways.</p> <p>JL suggested it was important to communicate to drivers that safety was the top priority and to ensure this was the first thing that came through in training. SOS said this was exactly the approach at Metroline because if a driver had a collision or a passenger suffered an injury they had failed.</p> <p>CM said TfL would look at whether this could be included as a theme in training.</p> <p>JM said he was encouraged by the Bus Safety Summit looking at safety from a preventive and corrective rather than punitive approach which helped issues be addressed openly.</p> <p>In response to JM's concerns around fatigue, CM said it was challenging to manage how someone came into work and part of this involved families understanding and adjusting to someone becoming a bus driver and working shift patterns.</p>	
4.	HEALTH BUS	
4.1	<p>Staffing Costs</p> <p>SOS advised on provision of a single-deck vehicle for fitting out as a health bus, how it would pass from operator to operator, and be maintained. JM expressed concern that costs of staffing the vehicle were disproportionately high and wanted more detail on the type of health advisors envisaged. It was agreed that Lee Vehit and Caroline Simpson would pick up this issue and see what options were available to keeping costs proportionate.</p> <p>ACTION: Lee and Caroline to meet and agree a proposal for initial circulation to JM and TC for them to consider options for proportionate staffing costs</p>	TC/JM

5.	FITMENT OF SPIT KITS	
5.1	<p>Rollout</p> <p>TC reported on the adoption of spit kits by bus operators making up the fleet. Arriva was currently addressing insufficient quantities of kits and had agreed with the local representative to stock them at garages.</p> <p>JM said the more progressive operators had gone ahead with fitment in the cab but others were not as far ahead as TfL envisaged. KS said checks of vehicle needed to include spit kits so that there was a robust process going forward.</p>	
6.	SECURITY TRAINING	
6.1	<p>Security Training</p> <p>JM said that the Metropolitan Police Service advised a Mayor's Trade Union Forum in summer that front-line staff should receive security training. This would help drivers know how to react to a terrorism incident in London such as at London Bridge when a driver was blocked in traffic.</p> <p>CM said Project Griffin was there to cover security risks. TC added security cards were previously issued to drivers in 2016 and garages displayed posters. He reported that a recent terrorism exercise was held at Dalston and this would inform what advice and communication might need to be given out.</p> <p>TC said this would need to recognise threats and different styles of learning. On a separate subject, he said he would send JM dates of Hello London training course dates in case he could sit in on one or more sessions before it ended in spring.</p> <p>ACTION: Send Hello London dates to JM</p>	TC
7.	TUPE MATTERS	
7.1	<p>New Guidance</p> <p>The new guidance on TUPE has been sent out following amendments linked to previous actions.</p>	
7.2	<p>Late Finishes</p> <p>TC said much better bus network performance in the face of lessening roadworks had reduced late finishes to nominal levels compared to a year ago.</p> <p>JM asked for statistics to show how well this issue was being managed by operators as some companies were more reasonable to drivers than others in addressing this, and as fatigue was highlighted in the GLA Transport Committee's <i>Driven to Distraction</i> report and could influence Vision Zero.</p> <p>SOS said there were statistics on total overtime and scheduled hours which might give an indication.</p> <p>CM said TfL could look at how a comparison might be given across operators. However, she added, that this issue had softened considerably and where ever there were road disruptions finishing on time would be a challenge.</p> <p>ACTION: Look for data to highlight late finish exceptions</p>	TC/AM
7.2	<p>License for London</p> <p>It was agreed to review implementation of License for London in autumn 2018</p>	

8.	BUS SAFETY INNOVATION FUND (BSIF)	
8.1	This was raised under section 3.3.	
9.	NEXT MEETING	
10.1	Date The next Tripartite Meeting is April 26, from 1030 to 1230.	
11.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
11.1	<p>Support of Statement</p> <p>JM is to raise progress with Unite's Press Office. TfL Press Office sought an update yesterday and was awaiting feedback. The current statement reads:-</p> <p><i>London is a world city, embracing different nationalities and people from all backgrounds. No more so is this reflected on the capital's buses where over 25,000 drivers from across the globe keep London on the move 24 hours a day.</i></p> <p><i>We are proud of this diversity. It is what makes London stronger and makes it the outward looking tolerant city we know and love. Together we pursue a zero tolerance approach towards racism and hate crime on London's buses. Intolerance and fear has no place on our capital's buses. No one, either bus drivers or the 1.3 billion passengers a year they carry, should be subject to racism or hate. Together we are one London.</i></p> <p>ACTION: Update on proposals from Unite Press Office</p>	
	Ends	