
Confidential Minutes

Agenda item : 13
Drafted : 27.4.10

Confidential minutes of the Consumer Affairs Committee held on 10 March 2010 at 6 Middle Street, London EC1

These minutes are in addition to the public minutes of a meeting of the Committee on the same date. In that meeting it was resolved, under section 15(2)(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item(s) to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded for this part of the meeting.

Contents

- 1 Confidential minutes**
- 2 Demographic data on complainants**
- 3 Audit 1**
- 4 Audit 2**
- 5 Meeting review**
- 6 Glossary**

Present

Members

David Barry (In the Chair and Vice-Chair), Terry Bennett, Daniel Francis, Sophia Lambert, Teena Lashmore, Sharon Grant (London TravelWatch Chair)

David Leibling (Observer)

Secretariat

Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Bryan Davey	Director, Public Liaison
Mark Donoghue	Committee Administrator
Christine Evans	Casework Manager

Minutes

1 Confidential Minutes

The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2010 were approved and signed for the record. There was one amendment to the minutes, minute 2, paragraph 3, sentence 2 needed to read as May not March.

The Director, Public Liaison confirmed that the London Overground (LOROL) audit would take place in March. The Eurostar audit will be tabled at the May meeting.

The Chair reported that he would be having a meeting with Transport for London (TfL) to discuss their use of 0843/0845 telephone numbers.

2 Demographic data on complaints

A member noted that they had been seen a report where the police complaints organisation received a majority of complaints from white middle class professionals. They asked whether the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) had been asked for further views on the data in the paper. The Chair of London TravelWatch felt that London TravelWatch was different from the organisation which dealt with police complaints. She had received a suggestion, from a member, to organise a stall at events.

The Chair felt that more work should be done on the demographic data to raise the profile of the organisation. Complaints are a resource and London TravelWatch should be an advocate for voiceless consumers.

3 Audit 1

The Casework Manager introduced the paper to members. A member felt that the paper was too dense. The audits presented in the report were on procedures. However, London TravelWatch's audits were on the customer/user's point of view and operator's responses. Members felt that London TravelWatch should still press London Buses to agree to carry out a complaint handling audit.

The Casework Manager noted that the audits were by the BSI (British Standards Institute) and general reviews. She did not have access to the types of cases that had been looked at.

The Chief Executive reported that she would be meeting TfL to discuss future audits. She noted that this is a step forward from the original position ie. No access to past audits, etc.

A member asked for the London Buses customer and complaints feedback policy to be circulated.

Action: Committee Services

It was agreed to send a copy of the Oyster audit to London buses to show them what London TravelWatch did. The Chair of London TravelWatch felt that the audits were meaningless unless the terms used in the reports were defined. The benchmarks need to be meaningful as well.

The Director, Public Liaison noted that being given the audits meant a step forward from where we were. He recognised that London Buses had gone about the audits in a vigorous way, but there was not enough information on what had happened at the company level.

A member noted item 4.4(c) which stated that a majority of operators meet timescales. He felt that London TravelWatch should not be pleased at this. It should be all operators.

4 Audit 2

The Director, Public Liaison reported that the audit of South West Trains (SWT) had originally taken place in 2008. A subsequent audit had occurred last year. The audit report was delayed due to staff absences. The report has been accepted by South West Trains and the Passenger Focus Link Manager had discussed it with them. He would check what the formal response from SWT had been and report back.

Action: Director, Public Liaison

5 Meeting Review

Members felt having the demographics paper in public session was a risk to the organisation.

A member believed that the time the casework review had taken, 15 months, was a risk and if it slipped further then it could prove a risk to external funders.

The Chair of London TravelWatch felt that the reputation of casework is related to the relationship with the Assembly. Progress continues to be made.

Members discussed future agenda items. A member said that Passenger Focus had carried out an internal casework review. He would send a one page summary to the Chief Executive and the Chair of London TravelWatch. A member felt that the work plan for 2010/11 needed to have a better plan for audits. The Chief Executive replied that the plan would not state the number of audits. She further noted that the audits would improve the performance of the operators.

6 Glossary

BSI	British Standards Institute
EHRC	Equalities and Human Rights Commission
LOROL	London Overground
SWT	South West Trains
TfL	Transport for London