**ANNEX: FURTHER INFORMATION ON VARIOUS TOPICS DISCUSSED AT THE TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE HEARING ON 19 APRIL 2023**

*This Annex provides further detail on a number of topics on which I committed to provide further information when I appeared at the Transport Select Committee’s hearing on 19 April 2023, “Work of the Secretary of State for Transport”.*

*At Transport Oral Questions on 20 April, in response to a question from Gavin Newlands MP, I committed to placing information about Zero Emission Buses in the Library of the House. This document fulfils that commitment.*
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**Corrections**

1. Opening of Old Oak Common

**Further details**

* + - 1. **HS2**
				1. **HS2 Phase 1 completion progress**

It is difficult to calculate a percentage for Phase 1 completion without relying on financial calculations, and as these are subject to change as estimates are refined, delivery progresses or price bases are updated, they may not always give a transparent representation of delivery progress. Additionally, as was discussed during the oral evidence session, a completion metric based on spending to date would be inherently input- rather than output- based.

It may be more useful to focus on metrics of progress of activities that support construction, and of construction itself. All scheme design for the main work civils and stations (excluding Euston) is complete, and asset-specific design continues to support ongoing construction. Six years after starting, all early work contractors are now off-site and Main Work Civils Contractors are active on over 300 sites. Construction itself on Phase 1 has entered peak effort this year. Five giant tunnel boring machines on Phase 1 are currently driving, with the Chiltern Tunnels over halfway bored and the Long Itchington Wood tunnel completed. By the end of this year, the Colne Valley Viaduct will have installed 50% of the segments that form the basis for the track to be laid. At Old Oak Common station, construction of the underground box which will house the subterranean HS2 platforms continues. The diaphragm wall around the station is complete, and the mass excavation of the east and central boxes continues, whilst concrete pour has commenced in the west box.

Given these observations, I will refrain from providing a financial completion metric that could prove misleading to members of the Committee. Nonetheless, I remain committed to using my six-monthly updates to Parliament to report on the progress of the programme, whether that is in terms of input (spending to date), output (works started and completed to date) or forecasting delivery-into-service range estimates for each Phase.

* 1. **Modelling of demand at HS2 Old Oak Common station**

We do not anticipate the rephasing of Euston to impact passenger demand at the point Old Oak Common services commence. My officials are continuing to work with HS2 Ltd, Network Rail and Transport for London to update and validate the models and to understand future levels of passenger demand and capacity requirements both at Old Oak Common, with a focus on Elizabeth Line capacity, and throughout the wider transport network as HS2 services are introduced.

* 1. **HS2 Phases 2a and 2b**

*Re-evaluation of designs for both Phase 2a and b*

As I set out during my appearance before the Committee, I remain comfortable with and committed to our existing plans for Phases 1 and 2a of HS2, and we continue to take the High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill through Parliament.

*Update on Crewe station designs*

We are investing around £700 million (in 2019 prices) into works at Crewe station, which covers rail systems – track, signals, points, platforms etc. – and improvements to passenger accessibility and environs around the station, such as new lifts, improvements to the stairs, and replacing the failing roof.

We recognise that to unlock the full potential of regeneration at Crewe, it might need more – therefore, we are spending £100,000 to conduct a quick study into future passenger demands and regeneration opportunities, such as a new entrance and transfer deck midway along the station. Following the study, we have committed to fund the passive provision design work of what is recommended as part of the study. We will continue to support Cheshire East Council in their aspirations to deliver the new entrance and transfer deck and look at funding options, including the development of a taskforce to bring departments across Government and the local authority together.

*Changes to Crewe station design (‘Neutral Core’ and Crewe South Connection) and amendments to the HS2 Phase 2a Act*

The changes we are making at Crewe station, to respond to feedback from stakeholders including the local authority and to comply with an Undertaking and Assurance of the Phase 2a Act, do not require an amendment to the Phase 2a Act. All required land is within the Act, and powers are part of the Act or Network Rail’s permitted development rights. Some of the proposed wider enhancement works, such as a new entrance on Western Road, may require the local planning authority to approve. This would not require amending the Phase 2a Act.

* 1. **HS2 capacity and services**

The Committee asked which stations on the West Coast Mainline north of Birmingham would receive more services through HS2. I should note that no decisions have yet been taken on the train services that will operate when HS2 opens. These decisions will be taken nearer the time, drawing on advice from the West Coast Partnership and Network Rail, and will be subject to public consultation.

The Department has appointed West Coast Partnership Development (WCPD) as the Shadow Operator for HS2 Phase 1/2a. In this role, WCPD is producing advice and recommendations for the Department around all aspects of HS2, including the services that should run on HS2 and the conventional rail network when HS2 infrastructure becomes operational.

* 1. **HS2 and roads**

The Committee also asked about the road safety audit process for road schemes that HS2 Ltd is delivering as part of the project. The process can be summarised as follows:

* HS2 Ltd follows the national Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (document GG 119 ‘Road safety audit’) which is used by National Highways and almost all local highway authorities for their own schemes.
* The established procedure uses technically qualified auditors who are independent of the design team and the client. Highway authorities are invited to attend site visits at each stage of the audit process, and are provided with relevant Road Safety Audit Reports (and Response Reports where applicable). Highway authorities may raise safety concerns at any stage of the pre-application discussions leading up to the approval stage.
* Copies of the road safety audit reports are provided alongside the designs when they are submitted for consent, so that highway authorities can have confidence that any problems raised by the auditors have been satisfactorily addressed.
* HS2 Ltd’s contractors cannot start construction of the works until that consent has been obtained from the highway authority. At the end of the process, the highway authority certifies that the consented design been completed to its reasonable satisfaction (or withholds that certification until that has been achieved).

I hope that the above allays any concerns that HS2 Ltd is ‘marking its own homework’ on these matters.

**f. Benefit-cost ratios (BCR) for HS2 Phases**

In your letter of 28 April, you raised the issue of BCR analyses for HS2 phases, in light of Jack Brereton MP’s Q559. The latest BCR for the full HS2 Western Leg Network (Phase 1, Phase 2a and Phase 2b) is set out in the HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg Crewe - Manchester Supplement to the Update on the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) published in June 2022.

Updated economic analysis will be published as the HS2 programme is further developed, and we intend to provide updated economic assessments including BCRs at key decision points for the individual HS2 phases, in line with the processes set out in the Green Book. As we have done in the past, we would expect these economic assessments to include BCRs for HS2 as a whole.

The changes announced in my written ministerial statement on 9 March clearly require us to work through adjustments for certain elements of the programme and to work through the impacts of rephasing. However, as the Permanent Secretary explained at the hearing, this is a detailed and complex task. We are of course progressing this work as rapidly as we can, and I remain committed to keeping the public, and Parliament, closely informed on the progress of all aspects of HS2, including through six-monthly parliamentary reports.

**2. Active Travel**

**a. Active travel spending per head in England**

The Committee asked about active travel spending per head in England. There is an important distinction between dedicated active travel funding (such as, for example, schemes funded through the Active Travel Fund) and wider funding from other funding streams such as the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlements (CRSTS) and the funding settlements that the Department has provided to Transport for London. It is the total figure that is more relevant here, and the Department projects that around £3 billion will be invested into active travel schemes across England over the five years of this Parliament, with spending from dedicated funds making up around a third of this total.

In terms of spending per head per annum across England, this gives a figure of around £10, with spending from dedicated funds making up around a third of this. The actual amount will, of course, vary considerably from one year to the next and from one part of the country to another.

Spending per head is an important measure of progress, but Active Travel England will also have an important role in looking at the safety and accessibility of active travel schemes as well as the effectiveness of active travel policies, using a variety of metrics to determine success and where best to allot future funding.

**b. Cycle paths and ‘mini-Hollands’**

The Committee was interested to learn how many miles of new cycle lanes and how many “mini-Holland” schemes would be delivered over the current Parliament. Since 2020, the Department’s dedicated active travel funding has paid for over 400 miles of new cycling and walking paths and around 350 miles of improvements to make existing walking and cycling routes safer.

Active Travel England will be announcing details shortly of the location and nature of schemes that will be funded as part of its latest round of funding (ATF4). Additional walking and cycling routes are also being delivered through wider transport and growth funds, such as the CRSTS and the Levelling Up Fund.

**c. Funding and the 2025 and 2030 active travel objectives**

In your letter of 28 April, you asked about the total amount of funding needed to meet the Government’s 2025 and 2030 active travel objectives. This will depend on a very wide variety of factors, including, in particular, the types of active travel and other complementary measures that local authorities introduce. Any estimate is also subject to a high degree of uncertainty given that the long-term impacts of the pandemic on people’s travel choices are still not clear.

**3. Rail operator dividends**

Under the emergency measures agreements (that took effect in April 2020), emergency recovery measures agreements (that followed in September 2020) and National Rail Contracts (which succeeded these previous agreements), DfT receives revenue collected and pays most operating costs incurred by Train Operating Companies (TOCs) through a regular franchise payment. These contractual agreements made with privately owned franchised TOCs were made to mitigate the financial impacts resulting from the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic and ensured that rail services could continue to operate. As a result, franchise payments are entirely to fund the ongoing provision of passenger rail services by these operators. None of this money is passed to shareholders.

Separately, TOCs can also earn management and performance-based fees. These fees are payable retrospectively on receipt of audited statutory accounts covering the period to which the fees relate. TOCs may apply annually to DfT for permission to distribute the: value of any fees they have earnt (adjusted for tax) under National Rail Contracts or; retained earnings such as from previous profit-sharing regimes that predate the emergency agreement, to their shareholders. DfT considers requests for dividend payments to parent companies on a case-by-case basis to ensure certain conditions are met and the TOC’s compliance with certain financial contractual requirements.

Since 1 January 2020, DfT has approved around £180m of dividends from TOCs to their relevant Owning Groups, of which £41m has been approved during my time as Secretary of State. This is a small amount in the context of the operational support which we have provided to TOCs in recent years. For comparison, in the period 1 March 2020 to 11 December 2022, we provided around £15.4bn of operational support to TOCs.[[1]](#footnote-2)

**4. Zero Emission Bus Numbers**

The Committee asked about Zero Emission Bus Numbers. The commitment to support 4,000 zero emission buses was made by the former Prime Minister in February 2020 and was subsequently reaffirmed in the National Bus Strategy. As I mentioned during the oral evidence session, there has been some confusion about the scope of this commitment. We have previously clarified that the commitment covers the UK as a whole, including to Parliament through a letter to Gavin Newlands MP, which was sent in August 2022 and deposited in the House Library (ref DEP2022-0709). This is a different scope from the specific funding scheme, Zero Emission Bus Regional Areas (ZEBRA), which was only open to local authorities in England (outside London).

Our commitment reflects that we want to work with all parts of the UK to decarbonise our transport system and transition to a zero emission bus fleet. This supports the UK bus manufacturing jobs right across the country including in Scotland, Northern Ireland and the North of England. I am pleased that the Devolved Administrations and Transport for London have been able to invest in zero emission buses thanks to ongoing funding provided by the UK Government since 2020.

I wrote to the Committee on 20 December 2022 setting out progress on the 4,000 zero emission buses commitment. Table 1 presents updated information on the estimated number of zero emission buses that have been funded across the United Kingdom. The numbers in Table 1 are not official statistics; they are based on the latest information available and are therefore indicative and subject to change. Where available, information has been provided on the status of the buses and the name of the bus manufacturer has been included.

In addition, following a consultation last year, we expect to announce an end sale date for diesel buses shortly. This will set out the last date by which it is possible to purchase a new diesel bus and will therefore further aid the introduction of zero emission vehicles to bus fleets.

**Table 1 – Progress on 4,000 ZEBs commitment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Funding scheme** | **Local Transport Authority** | **Number of buses**  | **Status**  | **Bus manufacturer**  |
| ZEBRA  | Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority  | 30  | 30 ordered  | Volvo |
| ZEBRA  | Kent County Council  | 33  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.  |
| ZEBRA  | Leicester City Council   | 114  | 108 ordered6 on the road  | 108 – Wrightbus 6 – Yutong    |
| ZEBRA  | Warrington Borough Council  | 105  | Funded  |  |
| ZEBRA  | South Yorkshire Combined Authority   | 27  | 4 ordered23 funded  | 4 – Alexander Dennis Ltd Bus manufacturer for remaining buses subject to outcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator. |
| ZEBRA  | Norfolk County Council  | 70  | 70 ordered  | Wrightbus  |
| ZEBRA  | North Yorkshire County Council  | 39  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.  |
| ZEBRA  | Portsmouth City Council & Hampshire County Council  | 62  | 62 ordered  | Wrightbus  |
| ZEBRA  | Blackpool Council  | 115  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.  |
| ZEBRA  | Nottingham City Council  | 78  | 12 ordered66 funded | 12 - Yutong Bus manufacturer for remaining buses subject to outcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator. |
| ZEBRA  | Greater Manchester Combined Authority  | 170  | 170 ordered   | Volvo  |
| ZEBRA  | Hertfordshire County Council\*  | 27  | Funded  | Following the operator's withdrawal of support, the Department is working closely with the local transport authority to determine next steps.    |
| ZEBRA  | West Midlands Combined Authority  | 124  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.  |
| ZEBRA  | City of York Council  | 53  | 53 ordered  | Wrightbus   |
| ZEBRA  | West Yorkshire Combined Authority   | 136  | 57 ordered  | 57 – Wrightbus Bus manufacturer for remaining buses subject to outcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator. |
| ZEBRA  | Oxfordshire County Council  | 159  | 159 ordered  | 104 - Wrightbus 55 – Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| **ZEBRA total\*\*** | **1,342** |  |  |
|  |
| All Electric Bus Town or City Scheme\*\*\*  | West Midlands Combined Authority  | 275  | 130 ordered  | 130 - Alexander Dennis Ltd Bus manufacturer for remaining buses subject to outcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator. |
| Transforming Cities Fund   | Leicester City Council   | 18  | On the road    | Yutong  |
| Transforming Cities Fund   | Liverpool City Region Combined Authority  | 20  | Ordered  | Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| Transforming Cities Fund   | West Yorkshire Combined Authority   | 8  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.   |
| City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement  | Greater Manchester Combined Authority  | 100  | Ordered  | Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| Levelling Up Fund  | North East Combined Authority  | 52  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.   |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | West Sussex (funding awarded to Brighton & Hove Buses)    | 20  | Ordered    | Wrightbus  |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | West Yorkshire Combined Authority (funding awarded to First West Yorkshire)    | 9  | On the road    | Yutong   |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | Transport North East (funding awarded to Go North East)  | 9  | On the road    | Yutong  |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | Nottinghamshire County Council    | 4  | On the road    | Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | Greater Manchester Combined Authority (funding awarded to Stagecoach Manchester)    | 32  | On the road    | Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | Brighton & Hove City Council (funding awarded to The Big Lemon)  | 3  | On the road    | Higer   |
| Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme  | West Yorkshire Combined Authority    | 5  | On the road    | Alexander Dennis Ltd  |
| Local transport authority funding  | Surrey County Council  | 34  | Funded  | Bus manufacturer subject tooutcome of procurement process by local transport authority or bus operator.    |
| Local transport authority funding  | Hertfordshire County Council  | 1  | On the road    | Switch Mobility   |
| **England (outside London (non-ZEBRA) total** | **590** |  |  |
|  |
| **England (outside London**) **total** | **1,932**  |   |   |
| **London**  | **617** |   |   |
| **England** **total** | **2,549**  |   |   |
|  |
| UK Government funding for Wales through the Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme | 68 |  |  |
| Welsh Government funding | 16 |  |  |
| Scottish Ultra Low Emission Bus Scheme | 272 |  |  |
| Scottish Government Funding | 10 |  |  |
| Scottish Zero Emission Bus challenge fund | 276 |  |  |
| Northern Ireland Executive Funding FY 2020-21 | 100 |  |  |
| Northern Ireland Executive Funding FY 2021-22 | 38 |  |  |
| Northern Ireland Executive Funding FY 2021-23 | 100 |  |  |
| **Devolved Administrations total** | **880** |  |  |
|  |
| **UK TOTAL** | **3,429** |  |  |

\*In March 2022 the Government announced that Hertfordshire County Council had received funding from the ZEBRA scheme to introduce 27 electric buses and charging infrastructure. The buses were due to be operated by bus operator Arriva. In March 2023 Arriva informed Hertfordshire County Council that they could no longer support the ZEBRA proposal. Since then, Department officials have been working with Hertfordshire County Council on alternative proposals.

\*\*In October 2021 the Government announced that Milton Keynes Council had been awarded funding from the ZEBRA scheme to introduce 56 electric buses and charging infrastructure. The buses were due to be operated by bus operator Arriva and were to be part-funded by private finance through a Special Purpose Vehicle. My predecessors decided to wait for the details of the financing arrangements to be complete before releasing ZEBRA funding to Milton Keynes Council. In November 2022 Arriva informed Milton Keynes Council that they could no longer support the ZEBRA proposal in its current form. Arriva and Milton Keynes Council then worked to develop revised proposals for the Department to consider. After reviewing the revised proposals I have decided not to provide funding to Milton Keynes Council for the project.

\*\*\*The West Midlands Combined Authority was awarded funding from the All Electric Bus Town or City Scheme to replace all diesel buses operating in Coventry with electric buses and charging infrastructure. When announced the project would support up to 300 electric buses. Since funding has been awarded, the number of buses that are estimated to be needed to operate all of Coventry’s bus services has reduced. 275 is the latest estimate for how many electric buses will be supported through this scheme.

**5. Sustainable Aviation Fuels**

The Committee asked about funding for the Advanced Fuels Fund. When the Advanced Fuels Fund was first launched on 19 July 2022, £165 million was made available to support UK sustainable aviation fuel projects through to commercial scale construction. The funding period runs over three financial years (2022-25), with specific budget related to individual years. In December, £82.5 million was allocated to five projects across the three financial years. The second application round is taking place after the end of the 2022/23 financial year so the remaining £55.8 million budget for the second and third financial year (2023-25) will be allocated. The remaining funds represents the budget from the first financial year that was not allocated. The amount for each window is an upper limit, with the actual spend determined by the cost of the bids submitted and their yearly spend profile. It is important that we strike a balance between supporting as many projects as possible and making sure we allocate funds to high quality applicants that offer value for money.

**6. Smart Motorways**

The Committee asked about Smart Motorways and the numbers of breakdowns and collisions in live lanes. Millions of drivers use the Strategic Road Network (SRN) every day and only a very small proportion of total journeys on any road result in live lane breakdowns, of which even fewer result in collisions.

Stopped vehicle collisions are a small proportion of all collisions across all roads (5.26% for All Lane Running (ALR) motorways). When considering the safety metric of Fatal and Weighted Injuries (FWI), which gives greater weighting to fatalities, and based on the latest safety data (2016 to 2020), ALR and Dynamic Hard Shoulder (DHS) have a FWI rate for stopped vehicle collisions of 0.05 per hundred million vehicle miles (hmvm), which compares to 0.03 for conventional motorways. When considering the safety metric of Killed and Serious Injuries (KSI), which weights fatalities and serious injuries the same, ALR and DHS have KSI rates for stopped vehicle collisions of 0.19 and 0.17 respectively, which compares to 0.09 for conventional motorways. The actions taken in the 2020 stocktake are designed to reduce the risk of a collision between a moving and a stopped vehicle, but it remains too early to see the impact of the actions delivered, as they were largely completed in 2022.

The majority of all collisions on the SRN are between moving vehicles. When considering the latest data (2016-2020) for all collisions (stopped and moving), smart motorways are overall the safest roads on the SRN, in terms of serious or fatal casualties. When considering the safety metric of FWI, ALR and DHS have a FWI rate of 0.33 and 0.32 respectively, which is better than the rate of 0.37 reported for conventional motorways. When considering the safety metric of KSI, ALR and DHS have KSI rates of 1.38 and 1.17 respectively, which is again better than the rate of 1.45 reported for conventional motorways.

1. **Departmental responses to consultations, calls for evidence and policy announcements**

The Committee asked about the number of consultations and calls for evidence (together referred to as “consultations” hereon) published by my Department for which we have not yet published a response or outcome. In your letter of 28 April, you also listed 19 consultations and other policy commitments and announcements that are awaiting an outcome or response.

The Department’s open and closed consultations are listed on gov.uk (as they are for other Government Departments). Each consultation page notes the status of that consultation (i.e., open/closed, analysing feedback, concluded). This status gives an indication of the progress of a consultation. Depending on the topic or relevant sector, some consultations for which the Department is a joint lead may also be hosted on external websites. A summary of responses is often published following the closing of a consultation. However, the status will remain as ‘analysing feedback’ until an outcome or government response is published.

I have asked my officials to update me on the status of the 19 consultations, calls for evidence and other announcements that you listed in your letter. Officials have also undertaken an internal review of active, closed and concluded consultations since the last General Election. The number of consultations published since the last General Election (12 December 2019), for which the central Department is listed as a lead organisation, totals 101. Of this number, 35 are listed as ‘analysing feedback’, with 66 listed as ‘concluded’. The Cabinet Office’s consultation principles (2018) make clear that Government responses to consultations should be published in a timely fashion. While 12 weeks is considered best practice for a response, it is broadly acknowledged that sometimes analysis and policy development will take longer.

Many factors contribute to the time taken to respond fully to consultations, and the format which responses take. These include the complexity of the issue, the number and type of responses, collaboration with other Departments and organisations and changing external contexts.

Some consultations are part of a set, which all feed into much larger publications that take longer to develop and publish. Others might not require a full government response, for example because they are superseded by other changes to government policy, or have follow-up consultations.

Over the past few years external factors such as the Covid-19 pandemic, the war in Ukraine and government changes over the course of 2022 have resulted in temporary reprioritisation of Departmental resource and the need for new Ministers to take time to understand important decisions. This has resulted in the Department being slower to respond to consultations than I would like.

As a result of the internal review mentioned above, we have already improved oversight of our consultations and announcements, and our processes for responding to them in a timely fashion. My officials are considering what further measures or processes may be needed to improve this oversight further, so that we are completing work in a timely way, and communicating our progress to those who have kindly given their time to respond to consultations.

I am determined to press on with responding to outstanding consultations as quickly as possible, while ensuring the correct processes are followed and that policy decisions are thoroughly tested and backed up with evidence. I expect many of the responses in your list to be published in the coming months. I am also committing to providing status updates on all outstanding consultations on gov.uk before the summer recess.

1. **Retained EU Law**

During the session, the Committee asked about the resource within the Department working on Retained EU Law (REUL). We have estimated that, at present, around 45 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff across policy and analytical teams are currently working on this area in the Department, in addition to 12 FTE staff in the central REUL team. This figure is an estimate and the actual FTE may be different due to differences in actual time spent by staff across the Department on REUL, for instance where it is a minor part of a role.  It also does not include the Department's agencies or the Government Legal Department.

1. **Zero Emission Vehicle Mandate**

The Committee asked about the Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Mandate and the use of tailpipe emissions versus measuring a vehicle’s whole life cycle emissions.

To meet the UK’s climate change obligations, the Government is committed to decarbonising transport and transitioning our entire road vehicle fleet to become fully zero emission. Measuring a vehicle’s whole life cycle emissions during type approval would need confirmation from the vehicle manufacturer of all the vehicles emissions related to fuel production, processing, distribution, and its use.

At the current time there is not an internationally agreed test standard to do this and changes in assumptions can significantly change the outcomes. The Worldwide Harmonised Light Vehicle Test Procedure (WLTP) is a global laboratory test cycle across different world regions, to measure the pollutant and CO2 emissions from a vehicle during operation, as well as fuel consumption values. The benefit of a standardised test is that these data are comparable worldwide.

We think that using this test standard for the ZEV mandate and CO2 emissions regulation for new cars and vans is the right approach.

But we do care about the whole life emissions of vehicles. In 2021, the Department commissioned Ricardo Energy & Environment to produce UK specific lifecycle analysis of GHG emissions from road vehicles. The analysis concluded that, by 2050, lifecycle (manufacture, use and end-of-life) emissions from battery electric vehicles will further decrease in comparison to other vehicles. This is due to improving battery technology, manufacturing processes, end-of-life treatment, and a further decarbonised UK electricity grid. By 2050, a battery electric vehicle will emit about 81% less GHG emissions across its entire life cycle compared to a petrol car. This compares to 65% less today.

1. **DVLA**

During the session, the Committee asked if the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) is working in the interests of the classic car sector. The DVLA continues to work with the Historic Vehicles User Group (HVUG), which includes representation from the Federation of British and Historic Vehicles Clubs, the Historic and Classic Vehicle Alliance, the Chairman of the Royal Automobile Club and others.

The meetings of the HVUG are an opportunity for the DVLA to work collaboratively with representatives of the historic and classic vehicle sector in relation to DVLA’s services, policies, and initiatives.

**Correction**

**11. Opening of Old Oak Common**

During the evidence session, in response to Q556, the Permanent Secretary stated “it was always anticipated that Old Oak Common would open in advance of Euston”. Whilst it is correct that this has been the plan in recent years, the decision on a phased opening for Euston was taken after the Oakervee Review in 2020. We therefore wish to correct this as follows.

For several years It has been our plan, as set out in the Phase One business case, for Old Oak Common to open before Euston. The decision to make Old Oak Common the temporary London terminus of HS2 was confirmed in the Oakervee Review (in February 2020), when it became clear that the design of Euston would need more time, which meant the delivery of Euston was moved to a later date than the rest of Phase One.

1. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dft-payments-to-passenger-rail-operators-under-emergency-agreements](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.gov.uk%2Fgovernment%2Fpublications%2Fdft-payments-to-passenger-rail-operators-under-emergency-agreements&data=05%7C01%7CLaurence.Atchison%40dft.gov.uk%7C8d38e9ba97654d695ee508db55604a20%7C28b782fb41e148eabfc3ad7558ce7136%7C0%7C0%7C638197644275683601%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=ywmu%2FbbdMOqHZxQH9uha756U8be8Oi9%2FJ43ey7rRGHw%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)