

Appendix A: Summary of part two report conclusions (extract from pages 3-6)

The Force has made a genuine effort to improve its operational efficiency. This should continue, taking account of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) view that they have done well in this area but that a more aggressive approach to driving out savings should be possible.

There should be no automatic presumption that options, under which savings achieved by BTP are recycled into additional policing resource, as normally the case in the past, should always be adopted in future. BTPA should consider giving greater visibility to efficiency measures and how they are built into forward budgets.

BTPA should consider giving greater visibility to efficiency measures and how they are built into forward budgets. Relevant papers can take many months to be made accessible on the site and even then may only be found through tenacious searching. The Authority should consider how material on efficiency savings and key cost assumptions can be more easily identified and accessed.

As soon as practicable, the BTPA should work with the BTP on a zero-based review of the Force and its budget rather than continuously relying on applying financial discipline through a formula limiting annual increases. Such a review should address the ongoing need for BTP to carry out all its current functions as well as questions such as the balance between PCs and PCSOs.

Policing and security services are deployed on the railway in a range of ways and by various providers including the rail companies themselves. It is a complex scenario within which the "user pays" principle is applied through charges to companies for BTP's costs of meeting its statutory obligations. Costs don't disappear because necessary work is moved elsewhere. Decisions on where particular responsibilities for railway policing and security fall should be taken on grounds of how the activity in question is best delivered and not on grounds of whether the industry may thereby escape paying.

The fostering by BTPA of a good understanding of the relationship between BTP's costs and the service levels and policing outcomes it delivers is fundamental to the more positive relationship that is developing between BTP/BTPA and stakeholders. The Authority has made good progress in this but further improvement is possible. In particular, its approach to consultation should allow stakeholders to have a better understanding of how the challenge of setting objectives clearly aligned with the costs of delivering them is worked through and addressed.

The railway industry has also improved its ability to respond thoughtfully and coherently to consultation opportunities, particularly through the creation of the Rail Delivery Group. The industry has not, however, always been an easy client for BTP and BTPA to deal with and should continue to develop its ability to take a clear and consistent line.

Industry members are on the Authority for their knowledge and experience, not to represent their organizations. They ensure that the industry's views are well understood but cannot substitute for effective comment and influence by the industry from the outside. There is not a case for major change in the arrangements for the appointment of Board members or the overall composition of the Authority.

The Department and the Authority should in tandem work up a written statement setting out how the latter's commitment to consultation will be delivered and the range of issues which stakeholders could expect to be consulted on. The Department should further consider how the statement can be given appropriate formal status.

Local initiatives to establish integrated railway and policing operations have had success and must be built on. Starting with operational collaboration and taking the lessons into planning and funding may be the best way forward. The intensity of industry dissatisfaction about PSAs needs to be recognized by BTPA. Even though the Act may impose limitations on what can be included in PSAs themselves, and compromise may be needed on both sides, it should be possible to give individual companies more clarity about what they can expect.

While the industry, especially Passenger ToCs can be expected to have a good understanding of the needs and priorities of their customers, it cannot be assumed that passenger and industry interests will always be fully aligned. This review has been asked to focus on matters which reflect the concerns of rail companies, but it will remain important for the Authority to ensure that passenger views are taken fully into account when planning and resource decisions are taken.

Although some of the ToRs imply dissatisfaction with BTPA's stewardship of BTP and its engagement with the industry, many stakeholders are complimentary about the Authority's current leadership and the improving trend in its willingness to act collaboratively and to consult. Broadly this review's conclusions reflect the case for making further progress along a path the Authority and stakeholders have already taken. Nothing in this review detracts from the validity of the recommendations in the Triennial Review that the existing functions of the Authority and its existence as an NDPB should be confirmed.