Consumer Affairs Committee 10 July 2012



Secretariat memorandum

Author: Susan Parham-McCance

Agenda item: 8

CAC037 Drafted: 10.07.12

Casework report

1 Purpose of report

1.1 To record the performance of London TravelWatch's Casework Team in the period April to June 2012.

2 Performance reports

- 2.1 This report covers the period April to June 2012. The number of appeal, direct and initial cases and enquiries have risen. Performance improved over the previous period, operators' performance reduced although outstanding issues were resolved before the end of the quarter.
- 2.2 Part 1 records performance against the turn round targets set in the Business Plan for the period from April to June 2012.
- 2.3 Part 2 analyses issues received by operator for the period from April to June 2012.
- 2.4 Now that we have upgraded our complaints database software and are at the beginning of a new reporting year, we have taken the opportunity to do further analysis of our casework to provide more detailed information.
- 2.5 Members should note the difference in practice with Passenger Focus as outlined in Annex B.

3 Equalities and inclusion implications

3.1 Due account will be taken whenever any such implications arise from cases brought to the attention of London TravelWatch.

4 Legal powers

4.1 Section 248 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 places upon London TravelWatch (as the London Transport Users Committee) a duty to consider – and, where it appears to it to be desirable, to make representations with respect to – any matter affecting the services and facilities provided by Transport for London which relate to transport (other than freight) and which have been the subject of representations made to it by or on behalf of users of those services and facilities. Section 252A of the same Act (as amended by Schedule 6 of the Railways Act 2005) places a similar duty upon it in respect of representations received from users or potential users of railway passenger services provided wholly or partly within the London railway area.

6 Financial implications

6.1 There are no specific financial implications for London TravelWatch arising from this report.

7 Recommendation

7.1 That the report is received for information.

Part 1: Case handling (April to June 2012)

Purpose of report

To record the proficiency of London TravelWatch and of the relevant transport operators in dealing with appeals cases received and referred during the period April to June. The report covers cases received up to and including 30 June 2012.

Target One

This target requires the Casework Team to acknowledge all newly received appeal cases and record them in its database within five working days. Cases which are dealt with directly, as opposed to being referred to an operator, are recorded under Target 5. The exception is those cases which are responses to consultations where we decide to acknowledge the case as a full response cannot be sent prior to the end of the consultation and/or a decision by the Board. The table below shows the performance achieved during the period under review, together with that in the preceding three months.

During the reporting period, 100% of cases were acknowledged within five working days. This is a continuation of the good performance achieved on this target, and affirms our view that we now have robust procedures in place to ensure cases get acknowledged quickly. While emails are automatically acknowledged, we ensure that cases that are in letter or fax form or originate from Passenger Focus are also acknowledged the same day by a Casework Assistant or the Casework Officer allocated to take the case forward.

Working days	April to June 2012		January to March 2012		
Elapsed	No of cases	No of cases	No of cases	% of cases	
Days 0-5	1000	100%	414	100.0%	
Days 6-10	0	0	0	0.0%	
Days 11-20	0	0	0	0.0%	
Days 21+	0	0	0	0.0%	
Total	1000	100.0%	414	100.0%	

We have slightly amended our reporting on new cases. Previously we had only recorded initial cases but will now also record those enquiries which also require a written response of some kind.

Target Two

This target requires the Casework Team to refer 75% of all newly received cases to the relevant operator for attention within five working days, and 100% within 10 working days. The table below shows the performance achieved during the period under review, together with that in the preceding quarter.

During the period, the target for referring cases within five working days to operators was 100%, which is an increase on the previous quarter.

Working days	April to	June 2012	January to March 2012		
Elapsed	No of cases	No of cases % of cases		% of cases	
Days 0-5	379	100%	414	100%	
Days 6-10	0	0	0	0%	
Days 11-20	0	0	0	0%	
Days 21+	0	0	0	0%	
Total	379	100%	414	100%	

Target Three

This target, agreed with the transport operators, requires them to respond to 66% of referrals from London TravelWatch within 10 working days, and to 100% within 20 working days. It is accepted that in some complex cases it may not always be possible to meet these deadlines, and in these cases we expect to receive a holding response from an operator followed by regular updates on progress. Performance to this target relates to the substantive response from the operator rather than the holding response.

The tables show the performance achieved during the period under review.

NATIONAL RAIL					
Working days	April to June 2012		January – I	March 2012	
elapsed	No of cases	% of cases	No of cases	% of cases	
Days 0-10	126 79%		149	75%	
Days 11-20	15	9%	15	13%	
Days 21-40	10	7%	40	8%	
Day 41+	8	5%	7	4%	
Total	159	100%	211	100%	

The majority of cases were dealt with within 20 working days. Some of the longer cases indicated issues now resolved.

TRANSPORT for LONDON					
Working days	April to	June 2012	January –	March 2012	
elapsed	No of cases	% of cases	No of cases	% of cases	
Days 0-10	76	63%	63	38%	
Days 11-20	16	13%	5	20%	
Days 21-40	16	13%	51	31%	
Day 41+	14	11%	4	11%	
Total	122	100%	123	100%	

Both of the above tables show improvement in response times from all operators. However, further interrogation of the data show an increase in response time for those cases taking more than 40 days.

Breakdown of response times by operator

The following table shows the average time taken by each operator to respond to appeal cases. Most operators are responding to cases within 20 working days. For those operators giving rise to relatively few cases, the average response time should be treated with caution, as a delay in responding to a single case may significantly affect the average. This table records only substantive replies and does not include holding responses.

OPERATORS' RESPONSE TIMES					
	April to J	une 2012	January to March 2012		
	Number of appeal	Average number of	Average number of		
Operator ATOC	cases	working days	working days		
	0	-	-		
BTP	0	-	-		
c2c	6	17	-		
Chiltern	4	2	4		
CrossCountry	0	-	-		
Department for Transport	0	-	-		
Deutsche Bahn	0	-	-		
East Coast	14	5	15		
East Midlands Trains	1	17	15		
Eurostar	7	4	7		
First Capital Connect	19	5	9		
First Great Western	4	14	12		
Grand Central	1	44	0		
Gatwick Express	1	4	0		
Greater Anglia	14	5	5		
Heathrow Express	1	0	13		
Hull Trains	0	-	-		
IAS	7	1	0		
IPFAS	7	1	2		
London Midland	1	2	16		
London Overground	9	4	20		
National Express East Anglia	0	0	16		
National Rail Enquiries	0	0	1		
Network Rail	2	-	-		
ORR	0	-	-		
RailEurope	1	29	-		
RPSS	1	1	-		
ScotRail	0	-	-		
Southeastern	32	8	6		
Southern	26	2	7		
South West Trains	41	3	6		
Trainline	1	-	-		
Virgin West Coast	3	1	18		
TfL London Buses	49	25	15		
TfL London Underground	27	15	12		
TfL Roads & Streets	6	15	25		
TfL Dial-a-Ride	2	0	0		
Oyster	63	29	19		
TfL Other (inc DLR, Taxicard)	19	12	3		

Target Four

This target requires 90% of final replies to be written with ten days and 100% within 20 days of receipt of the operators' response. Where there has been more than one response from an operator, the target is based on when the caseworker considers that an acceptable response has been provided.

The table shows the performance achieved during the period under review, with that in the preceding three months.

Working days	April to J	une 2012	January to March 2012		
elapsed	No of cases	% of cases	No of cases	% of cases	
Days 0-10	280	99.7%	333	99.8%	
Days 11-20	1	0.3%	1	0.2%	
Days 21-40	0	0	0	0%	
Days 41+	0	0	0	0%	
Total	281	0	334	100%	

During this period, there was a 31% increase in appeal cases and final responses to 99.71% of cases were sent within 10 working days and 100% of cases within 20 working days.

Target Five

Target 5 applies to cases which are dealt with direct by London TravelWatch, without referral to the operator. These cases are usually those where the facts are clear, our policy is well established, and referral to the operator would add no value.

For those cases which we are able to provide a response at the time of receipt, the target is based upon the number of working days from receipt of the case to final reply. For those cases, which are the subject of a consultation exercise, the target is based upon the number of working days from the end of the consultation period or when a decision has been made by the Board to when a final reply was provided, whichever is the latter. We consider that, in this way, this provides a true reflection of the performance of the casework team on these issues.

The table shows the performance achieved during the period under review, together with that in the preceding three months.

Working days	April to J	une 2012	January to March 2012		
elapsed	No of cases	No of cases	No of cases	% of cases	
Days 0-10	171	100%	246	100%	
Days 11-20	0	0	0	0%	
Days 21-40	0	0	0	0%	
Days 41+	0	0	0	0%	
Total	171	100%	246	100%	

The period saw an increase in the number of cases, and final responses were again sent to 100% of cases within 10 working days.

Part 2: Caseloads by type and operator Purpose of report

To record the volume of casework received during the period April to June 2012. A total of 1,721 cases were opened on the database. It is clear that while the number of enquiries is reducing, the number of appeals is increasing.

A full breakdown of the casework by operator is provided below.

Issues	April to June 2012	January to March 2012
Enquiries	701	742
Initial cases	464	414
Appeal cases	379	334
Consultation cases	4	1
Direct cases	171	246
Member cases	2	3
Officer cases	0	0
Number of complaints	1,721	1,740

Operator	Appeal	Consult	Direct	Enquiry	Initial	Member	Grand Total
ATOC							
Bicycles					2		2
British Transport Police				1			1
Bus Users Uk				2	4		6
C2C	6			11	7		24
Chiltern	4				2		6
Dial a Ride	2			6	2		10
Docklands Light Railway	9			28	9		46
Duetche Bahn							
East Coast	14			14	7		35

Operator	Appeal	Consult	Direct	Enquiry	Initial	Member	Grand Total
East Midlands Trains	1			2	3		6
Eurostar	7			1	3		11
First Capital Connect	19			41	15		75
First Great Western	4				6		10
Gatwick Express	1				2		3
Grand Central	1				1		2
Greater Anglia	14			42	35		91
Heathrow Express	1				2		3
IAS	7			5	6		18
IPFAS	7			1	4		12
LEZ							
Local Government Ombudsman							
London Buses	49			272	177		498
London Authorities				2			2
London Midland	1						1
London Overground	9			1	4		14
London Tramlink	1				1		2
London Underground	27	5		14	35		81
Metroline							
National Express East					_		_
Anglia				1	1		2
National Rail Enquiries	_			52	1		53
Network Rail	2			2	1		5
Oyster	63			29	36		128
Oyster Helpline							
Passenger Focus				4	4		8
Rail in General					1		1
Road - TfL	6			2	10		18
RPSS	1						1
ScotRail							
South West Trains	41			9	19		69
Southeastern Railway	32			14	18	1	65
Southern	26			20	11		57
Taxi - TfL	2				6	1	9
Trainline							
Transport for London	6			98	21		125
Transport for London River Services	2						2
Transport for London Streets	11			2			13
Virgin Trains	3			25	8		36
Grand Total	379	5		701	464	2	1551

Annex A: Case Types and Stages

Case Type	Explanation
Appeals	Cases we take up on behalf of the complainant. We refer these to the appropriate operator(s) and consider the response we receive from them. See note regarding Passenger Focus practice.
Consultation	Cases that are subject to consultation. For example, cases received as part of the proposed changes to booking office hours by First Capital Connect where we would respond once a Board decision has been made.
Direct cases	Cases where we respond directly to a complaint, without going to the operator, either because we know the answer, have already got an agreed policy on the issue or we have no remit e.g. penalty fare cases which have followed the correct procedure. See note regarding Passenger Focus practice.
Enquiries	These are requests for information, and are dealt with primarily by telephone. For many enquiries, we act as a signpost informing complainants who the most appropriate operator is to deal with their complaint or request for information or to register a lost property request.
Initials	Cases which have not yet been dealt with by the appropriate transport company. We pass to the appropriate operator and inform the complainant that we have done so
Members	Cases raised on behalf of London TravelWatch members
Officers	Cases raised on behalf of London TravelWatch officers

Case Stage	Explanation
	Cases which are awaiting a response from
Awaiting operators' response	the operator
Awaiting referral	New cases which await referral
Awaiting response from	A request for further information has been
complainant	sent to the complainant
Case Received	New cases awaiting action.
	Cases which have been escalated to a
	higher level with an operator, to a regulatory
Escalated	body or to a committee
	Direct cases awaiting a response or appeal
	cases where an operators' response has
Under Consideration	been received
Blank	Cases requiring classification

Annex B: Passenger Focus practice regarding directs and appeals

Following a very meeting with Passenger Focus which shared best practice, it became apparent that there was a difference in approach between the two organisations to the recording of certain types of case. Passenger Focus practice is to refer almost all cases to operators as 'appeals', rather than send an immediate 'direct' response where one could be provided. This has the effect of increasing the proportion of 'appeal' cases and reducing the numbers of 'direct' responses. There is also an effect on performance targets such that having more simple cases increases the number with short turnaround times and therefore affects the proportions in each response time band.