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Executive Summary

Background and purpose of this consultation

1. This document meets the Government’s commitment to consult on whether the Mayor of London’s rail powers should extend beyond the Greater London Authority boundary.

2. The White Paper, *The Future of Rail* published in July 2004, set out government’s proposals for the restructuring of the rail industry. These proposals were subsequently implemented through the Railways Act 2005. As a result, the Department for Transport (DfT) has now assumed control of rail policy, strategy, funding, and the letting of passenger franchises in England.

3. The White Paper also proposed changes to rail decision-making in London to secure greater integration within and between modes. The DfT subsequently began work with stakeholders, including Transport for London (TfL) and the Association of Train Operating Companies (ATOC), to implement changes to the Mayor’s responsibilities for rail services within the GLA boundary. These included rationalising fares structures and ticketing technology across the different modes of transport and giving the Mayor an increased role on discrete services.

4. In the White Paper the Department undertook to consult on the possibility of allowing the Mayor to specify and pay for services in an area outside the GLA boundary.

   “Because the London commuter rail network does not stop at the GLA boundary, we will look at whether it is feasible to give Transport for London the right to specify and pay for services in an area slightly bigger than Greater London which makes more sense in rail transport terms. However, we will need to ensure that the rights and interests of rail passengers outside of London are protected, and will want to consult fully with the Greater London Authority and neighbouring regional and local bodies before reaching a conclusion on this proposal”. (paragraph 5.7.6)

5. This paper meets that commitment. It requests views on the following:

   • the scope of the Mayor’s powers beyond the London boundary;

   • the network over which these powers should extend; and,

   • the governance structure – how the Mayor/TfL should be required to work with Local Transport Authorities and regional bodies outside London in exercising these powers, and how disagreements will be resolved.

Scope of the Mayor’s powers

6. This paper asks for views on whether the Mayor should have the ability, subject to agreed governance arrangements and within a defined network extending beyond the London boundary, to:
买额外的列车服务；

提出降低服务水平并利用在TfL或相关地方交通管理局管辖范围内节省的费用（不限于国家铁路服务）；

提出并，如合适，买下改变列车服务停靠模式；

应用理性的集成票价和票务（包括可能在票价设定中发挥作用）；以及

为其他增强措施支付费用（例如站台改善）。

网络范围，市长应行使的权力

7. 伦敦内近郊通勤网络不完全在GLA边界内。因此为了市长的新权力在GLA边界内起作用有效，就需要将它们向网络延伸，超过伦敦边界，火车可以在这些地方折返。

8. 在某些路线只存在一个可行选项。在其他路线则存在多个选项。

治理结构，行使市长的权力

9. 旅者和其他利益相关者在伦敦外有直接利益在影响他们的铁路服务的提议。这些利益应反映在任何新权力转交到市长的治理安排中。

10. 铁路法2005年允许TfL董事会任命两名成员来代表伦敦外的地区。

11. 该文件也考虑了TfL应如何与伦敦外的利益相关者合作，以便制定和推行任何提议。两种选择被提出，征求观点：

- TfL应被要求在推进任何提议之前，与指定的利益相关者进行咨询并获得相关地方交通管理局的同意。

- TfL应被要求在推进任何提议之前，与指定的利益相关者进行咨询并获得相关地区委员会的同意。

12. 尽管秘书处总是任何提议的最终仲裁者，但政府更倾向于找到一种方式，让涉及各方能够自己解决提出的问题。因此，就应采用何种程序在出现分歧时应采取的程序也应要求对意见进行征求。
Introduction

London

1. In 2000 the Government created a directly elected Mayor and assembly for London. The Government devolved nearly all transport responsibilities to the Mayor and required him to develop an overarching Transport Strategy for London. In developing this strategy, the Mayor is required to promote integrated and economic transport services to, from and within Greater London.

Railways

2. The Future of Rail White Paper set out the Department for Transport’s plans for greater co-ordination over the long term planning of the rail network. Subsequently, the Railways Act has allowed the Government to take charge of setting the strategy for the railway, and to streamline the structure of the rail industry at the national level. With the wind-up of the Strategic Rail Authority and the passing of functions to DfT, a new approach is being taken to the rail industry planning process. Annex A outlines the process in more detail.

3. The White Paper can be found at http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_railways/documents/divisionhomepage/031104.hcsp

4. The Rail White Paper identified the importance of integrated transport networks and set out the Government’s commitment to an increased role for the devolved administrations, together with local and regional stakeholders. The White Paper made a number of proposals for extending the Mayor’s responsibility for rail services within the GLA boundary. Since its publication DfT, with key stakeholders including TfL and ATOC, has been working on implementing these proposals. Outlined below is an update of each of the work packages.

Fares and Ticketing within London

5. The White Paper included a commitment to work on “proposals to rationalise fare structures and ticketing technology across different types of public transport in London... (including) the setting of Travelcard fares” (WP 5.7.3). Following substantial discussions at working level with TfL and ATOC, the Secretary of State has decided that, subject to agreeing detailed terms, he wishes to see zonalised single/return rail fares in London and the introduction of smartcard ticketing, at the earliest feasible date.
Discrete Services (within London)

6. The White Paper said:

- we would look at “options for giving an increased role to the Mayor on discrete services that lie entirely, or almost entirely, within the GLA boundary”. (WP 5.7.3).

- “the Mayor should be able to buy additional services or propose savings … on the same basis as … Passenger Transport Executives” (WP 5.7.4)

7. Discussions have now been completed on the transfer of Silverlink Metro services to the control of Transport for London. This transfer will take place on 11 November 2007. With respect to all other National Rail franchised passenger services operating entirely within London, TfL has now been given the power to propose changes to DfT’s draft baseline franchise specifications. It can propose extra services or higher standards which they wish to fund or propose service reductions from which they would be able to retain the net savings. TfL’s proposed changes will only be accepted if:

- network capacity is available and impacts on performance outputs are acceptable. This will need to be confirmed by Network Rail who will also consider whether the proposal generates additional infrastructure costs or requirements for compensation for other operators. Any disputes on these issues will be referred to the ORR;

- TfL is confident that it has the necessary funding available to cover the franchise term and any longer-term costs that would need to be met after the franchise has expired. It will also need to ensure that proposals are consistent with TfL’s own internal policies on audit and appraisal;

- Proposals are deliverable and enforceable; and

- Proposals are consistent with the Government’s objectives and strategies for the railway, including financial objectives.

8. DfT will not require savings generated by reductions in services to be ring-fenced for a particular purpose within the TfL budget.

9. The Secretary of State will make the final decision on franchise specifications and can ultimately reject any proposed changes from TfL.

Wider Government Policy

10. The proposal of this consultation fits with government proposals for additional powers and responsibilities for the Greater London Authority. The Government recently consulted on these proposals and Ministers will announce a final package of proposals in the spring.
Consultation Proposals

Introduction

11. This paper seeks views on whether the Mayor of London, via Transport for London, should:

- have powers to propose changes to National Rail services which primarily serve Greater London, but which extend beyond the GLA boundary, and if so, how those powers would be exercised;

- which services the powers should apply to; and

- what governance arrangements should be put in place to ensure the views of non-London residents and stakeholders are considered and their interests protected.

12. The consultation questions set out below address these issues in turn.

The Mayor’s Proposed Powers

13. This section deals with questions on the scope of the Mayor’s powers. The network and services over which these powers should extend, and the governance arrangements under which they would be exercised, are dealt with in the subsequent sections. It is proposed that the Mayor should, within a defined network extending beyond the London boundary, have the power to:

- propose “franchise increments” – train services additional to DfT’s base specification, that TfL would buy;

- propose “franchise decrements” – reductions to train services in DfT’s base specification, adding any savings made to TfL or the relevant local authority’s transport budget, and allowing them to be spent elsewhere within their jurisdiction (not restricted to National Rail services);

- propose and, if appropriate, buy changes to train service stopping patterns;

- apply rationalised integrated fares and ticketing arrangements (including a possible role in fares setting); and

- pay for other enhancements, such as station improvements.
Mechanism for proposing changes to services

14. As part of the National Rail passenger franchise procurement process DfT produces an “outline specification” or “core proposition” for each franchise, detailing the services it wants to buy, which is then consulted on with stakeholders. To ensure the best price and value for money for public expenditure, the Government would prefer TfL’s proposals to be made as increments or decrements to this franchise specification at the appropriate stage in the procurement process. DfT does not propose to rule out the possibility of TfL proposing changes during the term of any new franchise agreement (or to current franchises where the necessary contractual mechanisms exist), but it is noted that this would involve a more protracted process.

15. Changes proposed by TfL to services operating in part outside the London boundary would be subject to the same principles that govern the acceptability of proposed changes to services operating entirely within the boundary, in addition to any governance arrangements (as outlined below) that are adopted. These principles and a detailed description of how the powers would operate, are outlined at Annex B.

16. It is proposed that TfL and the Local Transport Authorities involved would be able to keep any savings generated by decrements. DfT will not require savings generated by decrements to be ring-fenced for a particular purpose within the TfL budget or the Local Authority’s transport budget.

Fares, Zones and Ticketing Technology

17. Discussions on the scope of TfL’s powers with respect to fares on the National Rail network in London are continuing. The Department is considering whether the Mayor should be given power jointly with Train Operating Companies to set fares for rail services operating entirely within the Greater London boundary.

18. This paper seeks views as to whether such powers should also be extended to specified services extending outside the GLA boundary, if they are granted.

19. If the Mayor is given this power within the extended boundary, the Department would not be able to ring fence any extra revenue generated. In line with the Future of Rail White Paper commitment, this would allow regional and local stakeholders to make decisions across different transport modes.
Payment for other enhancements such as station improvements

20. If extra services are required to meet demand it may be necessary to make improvements to the stations to increase capacity.

Q 4: Should the Mayor be able to pay for enhancements to stations outside the GLA boundary?

Network and services over which the Mayor’s powers should extend

21. Railway operations do not fit neatly with the administrative boundary of London. A different boundary therefore needs to be drawn defining the “inner suburban” service network over which the Mayor’s proposed role in service increments, decrements, fares & ticketing and station enhancements would apply. It is proposed that this network should be defined by service groups and “boundary stations”.

22. Proposals for boundary stations are set out in the table and map below. They are largely based on the most appropriate point to terminate inner suburban services (ie where facilities exist to reverse a train without disproportionate impacts on network capacity). On some routes only one realistic option exists. On others choices exist, and we have highlighted these. However, it is not envisaged extending the Mayor’s powers to services extending any substantial distance beyond the GLA boundary. The map at Annex D shows the local authorities who would have an interest.

Q 5: What should comprise the network for the Mayor’s powers outside London? Should the proposed preferred list of boundary stations be adopted, or should the indicated alternative option be considered?
Proposals for changes to the stopping pattern of services

23. In addition to the proposed powers over the “inner suburban” service network, there is the issue of the Mayor’s powers to propose, and (if appropriate) pay for additional stops within London on “outer suburban” services which typically serve areas beyond the London boundary and run fast through Greater London to the central London terminus. It is envisaged that in most cases, this would allow for a single additional stop within the London boundary in support of the Mayor’s proposed network of key interchange stations outside central London, and would be subject to the process and principles outlined in Annex B. A single additional stop should allow the Mayor to achieve his aims without causing an unduly adverse effect upon journey times for travellers from more distant stations.

24. It is proposed that this power would not extend to “inter city” or long distance services (broadly meaning services originating beyond the boundary of the South East or East of England regions).

Q 6: Should the Mayor be able to propose, and, if appropriate, buy additional stops within London on “outer suburban” services? Should “inter city” services originating beyond the South East and East of England regions be excluded from such powers?
## Proposed routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>Principal London Terminus</th>
<th>Boundary Station Preferred Option</th>
<th>Boundary Station Other Option</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Regional Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Eastern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross/Cannon St</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars</td>
<td>Sevenoaks via Swanley</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross/Cannon St/Victoria</td>
<td>Orpington</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>(Kent)</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria/London Bridge</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria/London Bridge</td>
<td>Tattenham Corner</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria/London Bridge</td>
<td>Epsom/Epsom Downs</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Western</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Hampton Court</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Shepperton</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Windsor and Eton Riverside</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Surrey, Windsor &amp; Maidenhead</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Western</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire, Slough</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiltern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylebone</td>
<td>West Ruislip</td>
<td>High Wycombe</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thameslink</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross Thameslink</td>
<td>St Albans</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross/ Moorgate</td>
<td>Welwyn Garden City</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross/ Moorgate</td>
<td>Hertford North</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Anglia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Street</td>
<td>Cheshunt</td>
<td>Hertford East</td>
<td>Hertfordshire, Essex</td>
<td>Hertfordshire, Essex</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Eastern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Street</td>
<td>Shenfield</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenchurch St</td>
<td>Grays</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance

25. The Mayor is democratically accountable to people living in London. Travellers and other stakeholders outside London, however, have a direct interest in proposals which affect their rail services. Those interests should be reflected in the Governance arrangements for any new powers passing to the Mayor.

Additional seats on the TfL Board

26. The Railways Act 2005 includes provisions to require the Mayor to appoint at least two members to the TfL Board, who can represent the interests of people living or working in areas outside Greater London. Ministers stated during the passage of the Act that this requirement would only be brought into effect if the Mayor is granted power over rail services that extend beyond the GLA boundary.

27. As set out in the Act, before making an appointment, the Mayor must consult the regional planning body for each of the regions where the areas served by the services are situated.

28. This additional representation gives regional stakeholders a direct voice in TfL decisions. But there is a case for further safeguards.
**Additional Governance Arrangements**

29. The Department wishes to see consensus on the decisions made and will expect TfL to work closely with authorities to eliminate objections to proposals. The Department also favours a uniform approach to governance of these issues.

30. In a number of locations any new powers may only extend over one or two stations outside the boundary. It is therefore important to ensure that any governance arrangements are relatively simple and do not become a burden on the authorities involved. In addition, in many locations these arrangements will only need to be called upon occasionally, since train service changes only occur (in general) once per year, franchise specifications occur on average every 7 years and infrastructure plans and changes have an even longer lifespan.

31. The governance arrangements discussed in this section would only cover service and infrastructure plans and specification. The day to day management of the train service will remain with the train operating company.

**Governance Options**

**Option A**

- TfL should seek the *agreement* of the Local Transport Authority affected by the proposal. If the authority agrees it would then be necessary to obtain Network Rail’s approval. The proposal would then be presented to the DfT. Agreements between the Local Transport Authorities and TfL would need to be enshrined within a Memorandum of Understanding.

- Where a service crosses or runs close to the boundary of another local authority, TfL would be required to obtain *approval* from both Local Transport Authorities. The table at page 11 listing the proposed stations also records those authorities that TfL would work with for services on that line.

- TfL would not be required to gain the agreement of the Local Transport Authority affected if they wished to decrement a service they had previously incremented and were paying for in full. They would, however, be required to consult with them.

- TfL would additionally be required to consult relevant stakeholders, such as Regional Assemblies, the London TravelWatch and Local Transport Authorities over any proposed changes.
Option B

- TfL agree any proposals with the affected regional body, the South East Regional Assembly and the East of England Regional Assembly. These bodies represent the interests of all the local authorities, enabling them to take a wider view of the implications of the proposals. This might also solve the problems where services run close to two local authority political boundaries, since these can consider the wider needs of the region.

- TfL would not be required to gain the agreement of the Regional Assembly affected if they wished to decrement a service they had previously incremented and were paying for in full. They would, however, be required to consult with them.

- TfL would additionally be required to consult relevant stakeholders, such as Regional Assemblies, the London TravelWatch and Local Transport Authorities over any proposed changes.

Q 7: Which option offers the best governance arrangements?

Appeals Process

32. Whichever of the above options is implemented, an appeals process will be required when the parties can not agree. In practice, as TfL will be specifying service changes, it is they who are most likely to activate any appeals process.

33. It is therefore proposed that disagreements should come to the Secretary of State and feed through the normal franchise dispute resolution process. The Secretary of State would act as the final arbiter if the relevant parties cannot agree.

Q 8: Are the proposed appeals arrangements satisfactory?
Annex A – The overall structure of the new rail Franchising Process

High Level Output Specification

1. The Secretary of State for Transport will set desired outputs for five years on the basis of the available funding: this will be a High Level Output Specification (HLOS) for the industry. It will consider long term drivers of rail demand and the solutions that can be applied to meet these demands. It will be updated every five years (or as necessary) to form the input required to the ORR’s Periodic Review Process. In conjunction with the five year regulatory review process, it will seek to prioritise Government funding to achieve the greatest value for money and the most cost-effective transport solutions. It will produce a set of outputs that the Government will expect the industry to achieve with the funding that is available.

Regional Planning Assessments

2. The Regional Planning Assessments (RPAs) will form the basis for planning rail services over the medium to long term at the regional scale. The recent consultation on the regional devolution of decision-making highlighted a key role for RPAs in respect of devolved decisions around rail priorities. RPAs take into account other relevant regional policies and priorities presented in regional spatial strategies, regional economic strategies and regional transport plans. They will also reflect more local planning strategies, for example local transport plans.

Route Utilisation Strategies

3. The ‘medium level’ strategic framework will be provided by Route Utilisation Strategies (RUSs) which will consider in more detail the options for the best use of the network’s available capacity. Within the funding and outputs specified by the Government, Network Rail will be responsible for drawing up the RUSs, taking account of funder and customer requirements, and which will be taken into account in subsequent franchise specifications (although a RUS is a key component, but not a pre-requisite, for a specification). They will set out the detailed options for services and provide a framework for analysing the net cost and value for money of variations of services (as well as network capability and scope) from a baseline of the current service level.

4. This information, along with the previous franchise history and the franchise-specific funding picture will enable the Department to draw up a baseline franchise specification. This will set out the service description and expected outputs that the successful bidder will be expected to achieve. This will take into account the previous franchise specification, the template franchise agreement, the objectives for the franchise and the level of funding available. It will also take into account relevant RPAs and RUSs, and other studies.
Annex B – How the Mayor’s powers would operate in practice

1. The process by which TfL’s powers would operate in practice is outlined below. It is expected that this process will coincide with new franchise specification arrangements.

2. All proposals must be consistent with the Government’s objectives and strategies for the railway, including financial objectives.

3. In all instances, the Secretary of State would retain the final decision on the franchise specification and would still be able to reject TfL’s proposals.

Proposing increments to services

4. Depending on the Governance arrangements settled on, TfL will need to engage with the relevant local bodies. Given that service increases will result, this is not expected to be an onerous process.

5. TfL would then face the following requirements, which are consistent with the proposed arrangements for PTEs:

   - Network Rail’s confirmation, subject to regulation by the ORR, that the necessary capacity is available will be needed before any proposal for extra services/service changes can be taken forward to be priced.

   - In making this decision Network Rail will need to take into account the recommendations of the relevant RPA and RUS. Issues such as engineering access arrangements will also need to be considered. In the event of a disagreement, the Office of Rail Regulation will be the final arbitrator.

   - TfL will not propose any increments unless they are confident that they have the necessary funding available to cover the franchise term and any longer-term costs that would need to be met after the franchise has expired. They will also ensure that proposals are consistent with TfL’s own internal policies on audit and appraisal.

   - Proposals must be deliverable and enforceable.

   - All proposals must be consistent with the Government’s objectives and strategies for the railway, including financial objectives.

6. The Secretary of State would still retain the final decision on the franchise specification and would still be able to reject TfL’s proposals.
Proposing decrements to services

7. Where TfL wish to propose a decrement below the franchise’s baseline specification, for services that extend beyond the GLA boundary, they will need to gain the agreement of the regional stakeholders specified in the governance arrangements before making the proposed withdrawal.

8. Where TfL wish to propose a decrement to a service that they had previously incremented and which is paid for entirely by TfL, they will not be required to reach agreement with regional stakeholders. TfL would, however, be required to consult with them before making the changes.

9. If the service decrement is to proceed, all relevant rail authorities would then need to be informed.

Proposing changes to the stopping pattern of services

10. If the consultation concludes that the Mayor should be able to propose, and (if appropriate) pay for additional stops within London on “outer suburban” services, TfL would need to engage with the relevant local bodies, as specified in the Governance arrangements. Depending upon the arrangements chosen, this would be either the Local Transport Authority, or the affected Regional Assembly.

11. Proposals would then be reviewed by the DfT to determine operational feasibility as well as any performance, economic, and financial impacts.
Annex C – Partial RIA

Introduction

1. The Government White Paper, *The Future of Rail* (2004) made a case for consulting regional stakeholders on the possibility of extending the London Mayor’s role beyond the GLA boundary, specifically, giving him the right to specify and pay for services, extending the boundary as far as makes sense in rail terms. The Department for Transport has begun to consult on the feasibility of this proposal.

Purpose and Intended Effect

2. The White Paper elucidates a desire for a more integrated public transport system within localities. This entails a greater flexibility and interchangeability between public transport modes. The proposal of the White Paper seeks to rectify this imbalance by extending the London Mayor’s/Transport for London’s sphere of influence slightly beyond the confines of the current GLA boundary so that it makes sense in rail transport terms. This will allow TfL to propose changes to commuter services as far as stations where they can reasonably be able to turn the train around. If it was decided to go ahead with this, the Mayor would not have to use his powers; there is no corresponding duty on the Mayor to use the powers in any specific way. Therefore the benefits to the commuter would depend wholly on whether the Mayor decided to use this power. The Mayor has indicated that he is interested in using these powers, but has yet to determine the detail, and as such the commuter may expect:

- a more uniform service with greater integration between services;
- greatly enhanced connectivity with their onward journey once they get off the train inside the GLA;
- a rationalisation of fare structures across the commuter network;
- other ticketing and infrastructure benefits instigated as the Mayor/TfL see fit.

Risk assessment

3. The central risk involved in this project is that the Mayor is unaccountable to an electorate outside the GLA area. Consequently, options are being considered to ensure that regions and Local Transport Authorities neighbouring the GLA boundary have a clear voice when new proposals are announced.
Base Case

4. Do nothing – keep the Mayor’s role confined to the limits of the GLA boundary. The ability to buy additional services would not be possible along some rail routes within London as the nature of some of the stations within the boundary do not allow for train services to be terminated and reversed. Even if this was possible, it would not make sense from the commuters point to stop additional services one stop from the end of the line just because it extends beyond a political boundary.

Options

5. Several different options exist relating to the scope, geography, and governance of the White Paper’s proposals. A full list of options can be found in the Consultation document. The differing options are all interconnected; it is likely that if the consultation responses support a wide scope for the Mayor’s role, this will necessitate a slightly more complex governance system. Conversely, if the scope of the Mayor’s role is limited, it is likely that the governance structure will be relatively limited.

Benefits

6. With the number of rail commuters travelling into central London forecast to grow by 40% by 2025, it is rapidly becoming more important to integrate commuter transport modes. The extension of the boundary will allow TfL to meet passenger requirements both within and beyond the GLA boundary. Their requirements to access an integrated public transport network within London will be met, and the GLA boundary will not remain a relevant impediment to their travel choices and needs.

Environmental Benefits

7. No direct environmental benefits have been established, although it is naturally hoped that the changes will improve public transport around the London area. This may in turn lead to a decrease in commuters who use their cars.

Costs

8. DfT retains almost no formal powers over London transport, although it does provide the main source of external funding for Transport for London (TfL) through the GLA Transport Grant. However, the GLA Act does not allow any conditions to be attached to this grant which accounts for about 50% of TfL’s income (most of the rest is from fares, with a small contribution from council taxes and congestion charging income). As part of the Spending Review 2004 settlement, agreement was reached in July 2004 with TfL and the Mayor on a longer-term funding settlement to 2009-10. Most of the decisions about transport, including the use of funding from Government are a matter for the Mayor. If we give the Mayor these further powers, he would have to fund any changes from the budget he has already as there is no extra funding from DfT.
Monitoring and Review

9. The governance arrangements that are established between TfL and the authorities outside the GLA boundary will ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of the commuter.

10. In the White Paper we stated that we would look at introducing greater changes at a later date for rail services if we were satisfied that they would bring the expected benefits. A review of this power outside the GLA boundary would form part of that investigation.

Consultation

11. A consultation exercise is being undertaken widely throughout regional and rail industry stakeholders, and will include all parties that may have an interest in the proposed amendment. A partial RIA has been included in the consultation document, on the grounds that it is impossible for the Department to know what precise implementations the Mayor will add (or take away) from services. The partial RIA seeks to assess the benefits and risks involved in extending the Mayor’s role, not those of any changes he might subsequently be able to make.
Annex D – Map showing administrative boundaries around London
Annex E – Code of Practice on Consultation

The code of practice applies to all UK public consultations by government departments and agencies, including consultations on EU directives.

Though the code does not have legal force, and cannot prevail over statutory or other mandatory external requirements (e.g. under European Community Law), it should otherwise generally be regarded as binding unless Ministers conclude that exceptional circumstances require a departure.

The code contains six criteria. They should be reproduced in all consultation documents. There should be an explanation of any departure from the criteria and confirmation that they have otherwise been followed.

Consultation criteria

1. Consult widely throughout the process, allowing a minimum of 12 weeks for written consultation at least once during the development of the policy.

2. Be clear about what your proposals are, who may be affected, what questions are being asked and the time-scale for responses.

3. Ensure that your consultation is clear, concise and widely accessible.

4. Give feedback regarding the responses received and how the consultation process influenced the policy.

5. Monitor your department’s effectiveness at consultation, including through the use of a designated consultation co-ordinator.

6. Ensure your consultation follows better regulation best practice, including carrying out a Regulatory Impact Assessment if appropriate.

A full version of the code of practice is available on the Cabinet Office web-site at:


If you consider that this consultation does not comply with the criteria or have comments about the consultation process please contact:

Andrew D Price
Consultation Co-ordinator
Department for Transport
Zone 9/9 Southside
105 Victoria Street
London, SW1E 6DT

e-mail: Consultation@dft.gsi.gov.uk
Annex F – How to Respond

The consultation period runs from 9 March to 31 May, 2006. Please send consultation responses to:

Oliver Mulvey
Zone 3/26
Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DR

020 7944 3191
oliver.mulvey@dft.gsi.gov.uk

If you would like further copies of this consultation document it can be found at www.dft.gov.uk or you can contact Oliver Mulvey.

When responding please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If responding on behalf of a larger organisation please make it clear who the organisation represents, and where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.

Information in responses to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. These are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want your response to remain confidential, you should explain why confidentiality is necessary. Your request will be granted only if it is consistent with the obligations arising from these regimes. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act. In the majority of cases this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.