1. Introduction

1.1 MP welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were given around the table.

1.2 MP ran through the action points of the previous meeting and gave an update on their progress.
1.3 Action 1 – Transport Scotland to look into the production of LA level rail usage statistics. This has yet to be looked at, however there is data available at station level on the Office of the Rail Regulator website. This includes which Local Authority area a station is in so LA level totals could be calculated.

1.4 Action 2 – Initial work has been done and will be discussed later in the agenda. TS statistics branch plan to publish a paper detailing the content of the NTS and SHS and how these compare later in the year.

1.5 Action 3 – Improve accessibility of data on website. Some work done, for example inclusion of spreadsheet setting out topic areas and publications. More to be done, picked up under agenda item 3.

1.6 Action 4 – Use of footfall data to improve quality of walking statistics. Nothing specific done though work on Travel Diary distances will help.

1.7 Actions 5 and 6 from previous meeting – data can potentially be provided for the 5 largest RTPs, dependant on sub-sample sizes and will be made available on request.

1.8 Action 7 and 8 – distances in the SHS travel diary. Some initial work has been done and will be discussed later in meeting.

1.9 Action 9 – to consult users on changes to publications. This is ongoing.

1.10 Action 10 – seasonal trends in travel to school data. Analysis still to do.

1.11 Action 11 – Capacity to appraise forecasting models. No spare capacity in Transport statistics but some help may be available.

**ACTION 1: TS statistics team to investigate seasonal trends for SHS travel to school data.**

2. Recent & future developments (Paper 1)

2.1 MP introduced the paper and ran through the upcoming work for the team over the next year.

2.2 MP updated the group on the UKSA review. The report was published in October 2010 and is positive. They judged that the statistics are produced using sound methods and managed impartially and objectively in the public interest, subject to five requirements. These are:

1. publish information about user needs
2. estimate under reporting of road casualties (item 4)
3. Explain differences between NS and OS in compendia publications
4. Provide clearer explanations of tables / charts diagrams in STS
5. Include signposting and commentary to National Indicators in MTT.
2.3 The deadline for implementation was Jan 2011 but the report was delayed at UKSA end and some requirements required longer to implement. The UKSA are happy with the TS response to 1, 3, 4 and 5.

2.4 A draft analysis paper on under-reporting of road casualties was discussed at the Liaison Group on Road Accident Statistics meeting and once it has been published the UKSA will give sign off. This work suggested that almost all fatalities become known to the police, around two thirds of serious casualties become known and between two thirds and one thirds of slight injuries are reported. DE questioned if this would mean an increase in the number reported in the statistical publications and MP explained this was only to be used as an indication of the extent of under-reporting to the police and the published figures are still the best source of data on road casualties and accidents.

2.5 JR suggested looking at hospital admission records. MW noted that TS were reluctant to move away from the police records as alternative sources may be no more accurate, however, the trends from all sources should be similar. Analysis against other sources shows this to the case.

2.6 It was agreed that a link to the draft paper would be circulated to the group for views and comments.

ACTION 2: MP to circulate a link to the draft paper on under-reporting of road casualties to TTSAC members. [Secretaries note: Paper can be found at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Transport-Travel/scotstat/LGRASpaper1]

2.7 The UKSA also made 2 suggestions for improvement:
   a. Improve accessibility of data – reviewing publications and website content. Pick these up under agenda item 6 and 8.
   b. Make geographical coverage clear in titles of publications. These will be considered as part of ongoing work.

2.8 MP outlined the dates for the publishing the forthcoming publications. Key 2010 Reported Road Casualties, 20 June 2011, a new publication combining Main Transport Trends and Household Transport to be published at the end of August, Reported Road Casualties in October and Scottish Transport Statistics in December. MP explained that some publications have moved to a web-table format to allow more time for analysis. SC added that this also enabled more frequent updates and that steps were being taken to streamline the publications to avoid duplication of work.

2.9 MP explained there would be a new system for recording road accident information which will be called ‘Crash’.

2.10 KM noted that the 2011 Bus & Coach publication grouped RTP level results together which meant they were of little use – NESTRANS use these to update their bus passenger boardings indicator annually. MP confirmed that these had been combined for commercial confidence and that DfT were initially reluctant to provide any RTP level data. MP explained that TS will be working with DfT.
2.11 DE raised the issue of the timeliness of the data, explaining that the freight industry heavily relies on up to date information. He noted the effort to bring statistical releases forward and encouraged TS to continue to do so. Overall the group were happy with the work plan.

2.12 MP flagged up that DfT are under pressure to reduce spending and are looking for TS to contribute to the collection of Scottish data e.g. through the NTS and Bus operator survey (and potentially others). Where TS are unable to provide funding or do not think this offers value for money, this will result in a loss of Scottish information.

2.13 MW reiterated that TS may not be able to afford everything but will make every effort to keep what is required and will keep users informed. AI noted that TS already contributes to modelling framework projects.

2.14 DC questioned whether a more cost effective solution would be to analyse existing electronic information. MW explained that it’s not the process that costs money but the staff time for interviewing in Scotland.

2.15 JR noted that DfT have an obligation to collect GB information e.g. port statistics, so these will be likely to carry on without requiring TS funding.

3. Transport Statistics website

3.1 MP gave an overview of the TS Webpages which included high level trends, publications, methods and background and committees. MP explained that, following the merger of Transport Directorate with Transport Scotland, work is being done to move the Transport Statistics webpages across to the TS website. MP would ensure that there would be no loss of information or functionality and encouraged users to take this opportunity to provide feedback on potential improvements.

**ACTION 3:** members to consider the content and layout of the current webpages and send any comments or ideas for improvements to the Transport Statistics team.

3.2 DC suggested that links to the Excel version of the tables be provided in the publications. The practicalities of making this accessible through a hard copy were discussed. The HTML web tables were shown to users and were felt to be sufficient.

**ACTION 4:** Transport Statistics to consider whether it is possible to provide links from the publication to the Excel tables.
3.3 NS pointed out that there was nothing specific for cycling on the website. MW explained that this was probably due to the small sample sizes and the limited amount of information available.

3.4 AI questioned how cycling data is collected and MW informed the group that this was through the SHS.

**ACTION 5: Transport Statistics to consider what cycling (trend) information could be added to the website.**

3.5 DE asked how SUSTRANS count the number of cyclists. MW explained this was through roadside counters and some cycle route user surveys. SC noted that work is to be taken forward with SUSTRANS to find a better way of collecting this information.

3.6 JR suggested it would be useful to make links available to other data sources through the website.

**ACTION 6: Transport Statistics to check current links and add any which are missing.**

3.7 AR asked if the time series tables in the Excel spreadsheets could be extended to provide a full time series which obviously couldn’t be included in the hard copy publications where space is limited.

**ACTION 7: Transport Statistics to consider how to expand relevant tables in the Web spreadsheets.**

4. **Scottish Household Survey Review**

4.1 SC summarised the work taken forward by the SG to harmonise the four major Scottish populations surveys and provided a progress update on the procurement of the ‘new’ SHS contract.

4.2 NK joined the meeting and informed the group that Ipsos MORI have been awarded the contract and will be adopting a wholly unclustered sampling design. The importance of income data and RTP level outputs were raised by the group.

4.3 SC detailed the key areas of work that the Transport Statistics will be taking forward with the new contractor.

5. **SHS questionnaire consultation**

5.1 SC provided background information to the consultation, explaining the outcome of last year’s exercise and the decisions, the current position and the requirement for a second round of consultation.

5.2 SC showed the group where to find the consultation document and explained how this should be completed and returned. It was emphasised that users
should detail the geographic level and frequency which they require the data to be made available at and should avoid commenting on the question wording.

**ACTION 8: Transport Statistics to circulate link to SHS consultation.**
[Secretaries note: Link can be found at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Transport-Travel/SHS-Review-Transport]

5.3 DC requested that the question on household bicycle access be retained and that information on actual number would be preferable to a yes/no answer. SC pointed out that the question is proposed for retention and work will be ongoing to decide the final detail of the questions.

5.4 It was requested that an indication be given as to what questions could be sacrificed for those requesting the retention of questions proposed to be dropped or new questions.

6. **Travel Diary (TD) distance calculation**

6.1 SC detailed the work carried out to date on the comparison of TD distances and those as calculated by the GIS team, providing an initial estimate of the result of under-reporting of distance. SC explained the further analysis to be carried out and noted that results will be published later in the year.

6.2 The group were content with this work and suggested that the minimum modelled distance should be used as the best estimate of actual distance. Using the minimum time route built in an extra layer of complexity as it uses an estimate of speed on each section of road.

6.3 AI suggested that it would be useful to compare the TD and ‘minpath’ distances with those generated using the Transport Model for Scotland and it was agreed that this will be considered.

6.4 DC pointed out that minimum distance will be more accurate for longer journeys. He also suggested that a useful outcome of the work would be a correction factor for each data zone which could then be applied to the Travel diary data. Initially the work will produce an analysis of the difference in methodologies which will be circulated to the group for a further opportunity to comment.

7. **National Travel Survey (NTS) consultation**

7.1 MP ensured all attendees had received the NTS consultation link sent prior to the meeting. It was noted that there was an error with the link and the correct one will be re-circulated.

**ACTION 9: Transport Statistics to circulate link to NTS consultation.**
[Secretaries note: The correct link is http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/DfT-2011-16/]
7.2 MP explained DfT were looking to make financial savings by reducing the length of the questionnaire and geographical coverage of the survey. As such, Scotland may be asked to fund the collection of Scottish data.

7.3 MP explained that all of the questions in the NTS are also asked in the SHS, apart from annual mileage, though this is self reported and there are questions over the quality of the data. The NTS has the benefit of a seven day travel diary which enables grossing up to total number of journeys which cannot be done with the SHS. The NTS also enables comparison across GB. The NTS sample in Scotland is small and excludes the islands where as the larger SHS sample covers the whole of Scotland and enables the production of Local Authority results.

7.4 MP explained that a co-ordinated TS response will be submitted. Members of TTSAC who wish to submit a response should do so directly to DfT. TS would be interested to see the returns if respondees are content to share them.

7.5 JR noted the considerable overlap with the SHS TD and pointed out that the main benefit is the 7-day coverage compared to the SHS 1-day. JR queried whether it would be more cost effective to increase the coverage of the SHS diary but MW didn’t think this would be likely.

7.6 DC felt that the other benefit was the inclusion of short journeys, however the SHS TD started including these in 2007 so this is less important.

7.7 MW also pointed out that the scope for analysis is limited with the NTS data given the small sample size for Scotland.

8. Consultation – ceasing to collect data on some penalties for motor vehicle offences

8.1 MP drew attendees attention to the consultation.

8.2 DE asked if HGVs were separated out and MP confirmed that they were not. MP suggested that anyone interested in the data look at the Justice Statistics consultation and respond if relevant.

9. Scotstat Board meeting update

9.1 DC informed the group that he also sits on the NESAC (links to Transport through carbon emissions) and LGRAS Scotstat groups.

9.2 DC notified the group that Rob Wishart, SG Chief Statistician, is retiring.

9.3 The next ScotStat conference will have the theme of health, well-being and the environment.

10. Any other business
10.1 Attendees confirmed that they were content with the format, content, length and frequency of the meetings. It was agreed that the next meeting would take place at a convenient time next year, either at VQ or Napier.

10.2 All participants were thanked and the meeting was drawn to a close.