



INSECURITY AND THE FEELING OF INSECURITY IN LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Report on the Implementation of the Joint Recommendations from
2003 signed by ETF and UITP, IRU and supported by CER and
CEEP**

**by Tessa NOVA
2011**



With the support of the European Union

INDEX

Prologue

CHAPTER 1 THE QUANTITATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF AGGRESSIONS IN LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT	p. 7
1.1 Verbal attacks	p. 8
1.2 Physical attacks	p. 9
1.3 Vandalism	p. 11
1.4 Verbal and physical attacks against men and women	p. 12
1.5 Reporting Systems	p. 13
1.6 Costs Calculation	p. 13
 CHAPTER 2 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2003 BY LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT COMPANIES	 p. 14
2.1.1 Measures in the Field of Prevention: Human Resources	p. 15
2.1.2 Measures in the Field of Recovery	p. 16
2.1.3 Measures in the Field of Technology	p. 17
2.1.4 Company Collective Agreements on Insecurity and the Feeling of Insecurity in Local Public Transport	p. 19
2.1.5 Classifying Aggressions as a Criminal Act	p. 21
2.1.6 External Relations	p. 21
 CHAPTER 3 THE INITIATIVES OF TRADE UNIONS CONCERNING THE JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2003	 p. 23
 Conclusions and recommendations of the author	 p. 25
 Annexes	
Questionnaire addressed to the urban public transport companies and employers' associations	
Questionnaire addressed to the trade unions	

Prologue

On request of the social partners, more than eight years ago, the problem of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport was in need of an urgent and efficient response. It is precisely this urgency that demands an effective approach. In November 2003 the European social partners decided on a joint approach to this issue. The European social partners jointly agreed on the Joint Recommendations for tackling insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport.¹ It was signed by the ETF and UITP, IRU and supported by CER and CEEP. This report examines the status quo of insecurity in local public transport and the progress made since 2003.

Joint Recommendations 2003

I) *The Social Partners must seek the most indicated resources in the following fields: **human resources, organization, technology and recovery.***

II) *The social dialogue at company level must be established to ensure **the balance between technological devices and human resources.** The first must be at the service of the latter, so the quality of and at work will be improved.*

III) *The **social agreements** in the companies are an essential key to the development of the **civil dialogue**: first of all with the legitimate authorities, [...] and **repression (police and justice institutions)**; secondly, with the associates, the users of public transport, NGOs and all other representatives of **civil society.***

IV) *The European social partners' complementarities and success of social- and civil dialogue can only be guaranteed by **the strength of communication and dialogue between the various social partners and the representative bodies of trade unions and companies in the public transport sector.** [...].*

Ever since, these recommendations point to the need for implementation of measures of safety prevention and regulation. The rapid transformations in society, and the unprecedented political challenges being thrust upon us at the moment bring us to an analysis of the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 so far. Our aim is to provide you with an overview of improvements, shortfalls and numerous examples, which have been the consequential implementation since the signature of the joint UITP/ETF recommendations of November 2003. We need to look beyond the status quo and seek out new possibilities. With this report we hope to contribute to a safer and more secure local public transport, for both its employees and its passengers, across the entire European continent.

¹ UITP: <http://www.uitp.org/eupolicy/positions.cfm> « see : November 2003 »
ETF: <http://www.itfglobal.org/etf/upt-sd.cfm>

Participating Public Transport Companies and
Trade Unions from 19 European Countries

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Czech Republic
Denmark
Finland
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
France
Germany
Hungary
Italy
Latvia
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
Norway
Portugal
Sweden
United Kingdom

Tackling the problem of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport requires a wide range of activities and measures. Central to this research is the next question: ***what has been agreed on, and more importantly, what has been achieved in day-to-day practice in local public transport, in view of the Joint Recommendations of 2003?***

We sent out a questionnaire to 60 public transport companies, affiliated to the UITP, to the urban public transport trade unions, affiliated to the ETF and to employers' associations, affiliated to the UITP. In order to facilitate a quick reply on behalf of the respondents, we have send out a simplified questionnaire with few statistics on the quantitative development of insecurity in local public transport and some general questions about the status quo of insecurity in local public transport. The questions needed to be answered with either *Yes*, *No* or *Do Not Know*. The questions were specified to companies and employers' associations or trade unions. See the Annex for the complete version of the questionnaire.

This report tries to build on both the results of the questionnaire and examples of good practice. We solely focus on the current situation in local public transport. Some of the public transport companies can be considered as integrated public transport companies, providing train, metro, tram and/or bus services. Others are restricted to one specific form of transport. In total a number of eighteen trade unions, nineteen local public transport companies and three employers' associations contributed to this research. Furthermore, a better interpretation is made possible through categorizing the local public transport companies. This size is firstly dependent of the size of the city and the total number of its citizens. The second variable deciding on the size of transport companies is the organisation of the market. We will not go into further detail on this second aspect in this report because that would distract our focus on the implementation of the Joint Recommendations. In this report the total number of employees is the basis for connecting individual results and to possibly draw conclusions.

The background information provided in the next figures is illuminating and offers a sound basis for a better interpretation and understanding of the figures, deprived from the questionnaire. Notice should be taken to the chosen categories for the size of the local public

transport companies. Instead of “large” – “larger” - “largest” we choose to use “small” - “medium” – “large” to make a clear distinguish between the sizes of companies. The denotation of “small” should off course not be understood literally. In fact, companies consisting of 5000 employees and less are quite “large” in reality. As has been said, to avoid confusion about the size of companies we use the terms “small” – “medium” – “large” to have a clear classification.

TRADE UNIONS

Trade Unions (18)	City / Country	Name
	Germany	EVG
	Luxembourg	FNCTTFEL
	France	FGTE-CFDT
	Netherlands	FNV
	Belgium	BTB-UBOT
	Belgium	ACV
	United Kingdom	Unite
	United Kingdom	ASLEF
	Malta	General Workers Union
	Austria	Vida
	Latvia	LAKRS
	Bulgaria	STSB
	Hungary	KSZOSZ
	Norway	Fagforbundet
	Sweden	Kommunal
	Italy	Uiltrasporti
	Italy	FILT CGIL
	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	FSTV

EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS

Employers' Associations (3)	City / Country	Name
	Finland	ALT
	France	UTP
	Italy	ASSTRA

URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT COMPANIES

Companies (19)	City / Country	Name	Total No of Employ ees	Integrated / Non-Integrated
"large" > 10000	Berlin, Germany	BVG	10295	Tram - Metro
	France	Keolis	30800	Tram – Metro - Bus
	Budapest, Hungary	BKV	12745	Tram – Metro – Bus – Trolley Bus
	Finland	Pohjolan Liikenne	12000	Bus
"medium" 5000-10000	Brussels, Belgium	MIVB-STIB	6484	Tram – Metro - Bus
	Flanders, Belgium	De Lijn	8397	Tram – Bus
	Vienna, Austria	Wiener Linien GmbH	8200	Tram
"small" < 5000	Ruhr area, Germany	Bogestra AG	2262	Tram - Bus
	Rotterdam, the Netherlands	RET	3000	Tram – Metro – Bus
	Brno, Czech Republic	PTCB	2848	/
	Czech Republic	Veolia Czech Transport	2605	Bus - Train
Unknown	Lisbon, Portugal	Metropolitano de Lisboa	/	Tram - Metro
	Sofia, Bulgaria	EAD	/	Tram –Bus – Trolleybus - Metro
	Sweden	Västernorrlands Lanstrafik	/	Bus – Train
	Sweden	Varmlandstrafik	/	/
	Sweden	SL	/	/
	Sweden	Västtrafik	/	Tram – Bus – Train – Taxi – Ferry
	Sweden	Waxholms Angfartygs AB	/	Ferry
	Denmark	Movia Trafik	/	/

What to Expect?

This report consists of three major parts: the quantitative development of aggressions in local public transport (Chapter 1), the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 by public transport companies (Chapter 2) and finally the initiatives undertaken by trade unions (Chapter 3). The report ends with a conclusion in which several recommendations will be formulated for future research and improvements on the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport.

Chapter 1 gives a closer look into the quantitative development of aggressive behaviour in local public transport in several European cities since 2003. In close relation to the quantitative development of aggressions in local public transport is the way of measuring and keeping track on figures. In order to identify trends, and to be able to draw any conclusions, we need to gain knowledge about the differences and resemblances of the means of reporting applied by companies. The third and final paragraph refers to costs calculation by companies. Acts of violence do not go without any mental, physical and/or financial consequences. We distinguish costs calculation due to aggressions and costs calculation due to vandalism

In Chapter 2 we start analysing the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 by public transport companies. The first two Joint Recommendations prescribe the implementation of preventive measures in the field of human resources, organisation and

technology. The results on this issue will be outlined in section 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. The third and fourth Joint Recommendations cover more specifically agreements between public transport companies and other stakeholders involved, and the importance of both social- and civil dialogue. In subparagraph 2.4 we focus on the implementation of company/sector collective agreements on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. Company- and sector collective agreements are of first importance to the positioning of employees regarding their legal rights and possibilities when they have been experiencing an act of aggression. The classification of aggressions as a criminal act furthermore could contribute to a better tackling of the problem. Subparagraph 2.5 goes into detail on this aspect of combating insecurity in local public transport, and shows how it is dealt with on a legislative level in different European cities and regions. Finally an overview will be given in section 2.1.6 on public transport companies and their relations to external organisations, such as public authorities (the police and city councils) and representatives of civil society, for instance.

Strong trade unions also play an important role in tackling the problem of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. The activities undertaken by trade unions, regarding the issue of insecurity in local public transport, are of important value. In Chapter 3 we focus on trade unions and their initiatives to develop a broader and better awareness of the problem of insecurity in local public transport. These can be distinguished as activities to address the problem, internal questioning, campaigning awareness and collective bargaining by trade unions.

Besides the analysis of the Joint Recommendations throughout the report you will find interesting and illuminating examples of good practice.

CHAPTER 1 The Quantitative Development of Aggressions in Local Public Transport

The initial problem is that of definition. How are we able to define the scope of aggressions in local public transport? Most of the time it depends on national law and, furthermore, it is a highly personal matter. Thus, we ought to focus on tendencies rather than drawing stark conclusions on the quantitative development of aggressions in local public transport.

The question whether or not aggressions, incivilities and vandalism increased since 2003 is answered by most of the companies in the affirmative. Twelve of eighteen trade unions, fourteen of nineteen companies, and two of three employers' associations, say aggression, incivilities and vandalism in local public transport did increase since 2003. However, there seem to be more positive signals as well. One of the three employers' associations mentions a decrease of aggressions in local public transport. However, an explanation for these remains unknown. Most notably the trade unions from the United Kingdom and Ireland - Unite (Britain and Ireland) and ASLEF (United Kingdom) – could be of particular interest. They also do not report an increase in aggressions since 2003. They succeeded in reducing aggressions there in urban public transport. Both focus on the implementation of technological devices. We will go into detail on this in section 2.3.

In short, from West- to East-European countries and from South- to North-European countries, developments have given rise to an increase in aggressions, incivilities and vandalism in local public transport since 2003.² Please take notice that this is not equivalent to an increase in aggressions, incivilities and violence on the entire mainland Europe. We are

² A list of countries involved in this study: see the figure 'Participating Countries [...]' at p. 4.

focussing specifically on regional and urban areas. Thus, the increase of aggressions in local public transport only accounts for these regions and cities, of which trade unions, transport companies and employers' associations participated to this research.

Before we go further, we should have a more detailed understanding of the figures on aggressions in local public transport. Do numbers of aggressions in local public transport differ much between companies? Is there any difference between physical and verbal attacks? How about the difference in figures on aggressions against male and female employees and passengers? How could we explain these possible differences? What possible cause-and-effect relationships could be attributed to our findings? And, most importantly, is it possible to, and in what way could we reverse this reality of increasing insecurity in local public transport?

1.1 Verbal Attacks

The difficulty of defining aggressive behaviour becomes clear when we start analysing the quantitative development of verbal attacks. The initial problem is that of definition. It is closely linked to national law and highly depends on personal views. The available figures show that there are not many statistics available on verbal attacks. As such, only seven of nineteen of the participating companies report figures on verbal attacks against staff members.

Regarding verbal attacks against staff members and passengers three points of importance have to be made. First of all, three of seven companies reporting on figures demonstrate an increase: AG Bogestra (Germany), RET (Rotterdam, the Netherlands) and MIVB-STIB (Brussels, Belgium). For instance, Bogestra AG (Germany) reports an increase of 14 verbal attacks against staff members in 2003 to 105 in 2010 – more than seven times higher. More or less the same worrying increase of aggressions in public transport applies to the MIVB-STIB in Brussels, Belgium, where numbers on verbal attacks against staff members increased from 149 in 2003 to 716 in 2010 – almost five times as high in seven years. Figures from RET in Rotterdam, the Netherlands almost doubled from 330 in 2003 to 612 in 2010. Companies from Sweden and Denmark, and EAD from Sofia in Bulgaria demonstrate a decrease. The height of decreasing figures is much smaller. Figures from Movia Trafik, Denmark, demonstrate a decrease of 30%, and the decrease reported by two local public transport companies from Sweden also varies between 30% and 40%.

Secondly, the difference between figures is enormous. An explanation for this could be found in the size of individual public transport companies. For instance, MIVB-STIB from Brussels reports 149 in 2003 and 716 in 2010, whereas Movia Trafik from Denmark reports 20 in 2003 and 77 in 2010. The company MIVB-STIB from Brussels has 6484 employees; the latter only few compared to the MIVB-STIB. In this sense the variance in figures could be explained. And in this way the comparison between Bogestra AG (Germany) and RET (Rotterdam, the Netherlands) is even more interesting. Both are considered to be “small” companies, having between 0 to 5000 employees under contract. Bogestra AG counts 2262 employees, and RET counts 3000 employees. In short, the size of the companies is comparable; the figures are not. As has been noted, the figures from Bogestra increased from 14 in 2003 to 105 in 2010. RET from Rotterdam and the Netherlands, reports 330 in 2003 to 612 in 2010. This difference is striking. The same applies to the comparison between MIVB-STIB (Brussels), which is a “medium” size company with 6484 employees, and has smaller figures than RET. We now could question whether the problem of insecurity in local public transport seems to be larger in Rotterdam than as experienced by Bogestra AG, which operates in the Ruhr area, located in the North-West of Germany. Another possible explanation could be a difference in the reporting systems. Which is false, and which is true,

is hard to tell only by analysing these figures. The available data are not sufficient to explain this difference.

Unsurprisingly, even less data is available on figures of aggressions against passengers. Even though, the results seem to be positive. Four of nineteen companies provided figures on this aspect on both 2003 and 2010: Bogestra AG (Germany), MIVB-STIB Brussels, EAD Sofia Bulgaria and Vasttrafik from Sweden. They report a slight decrease of verbal aggressions against passengers since 2003. Only figures from Brussels MIVB-STIB demonstrate an increase from 22 in 2003 to 122 acts of verbal aggressions to passengers in 2010. This is almost six times higher, compared to the figures of 2003. Nonetheless, it is hard to tell what it exactly means in terms of insecurity in local public transport compared to other European cities and regions.

In sum, besides the enormous increase in verbal aggressions against employees we still do not know whether this is due to the size of the company, the specific contextual factors or something else. There is still much to explore in the field of reporting on verbal aggressions against both employees and passengers.

VERBAL ATTACKS

- **PROBLEM OF DEFINITION**
- **3 OF 7 COMPANIES REPORT A HIGH INCREASE IN VERBAL ATTACKS AGAINST STAFF**
- **DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FIGURES IS ENORMOUS**
- **FEW DATA AVAILABLE ON VERBAL ATTACKS AGAINST PASSENGERS**
- **Q: IS THE INCREASE DUE TO SIZE OF THE CITY, CONTEXT OR OTHER EXPLANATIONS?**

1.2 Physical Attacks

A higher number of local transport companies, compared to the number of companies reporting on verbal attacks, are practising reporting systems on physical attacks against staff members and passengers. Nine of twenty companies reported on the total number of physical attacks against staff members in both 2003 and 2010. First of all, the assumption of increasing aggressions in local public transport is – regarding physical attacks against staff members – being confirmed again. According to six of nine companies physical aggressions against staff members increased.

First of all, the differences in numbers are large. Again, the figures show some interesting information when comparing equal sized companies (measured in the total number of employees). What should be of particular concern is the increase as seen in Berlin and Brussels. The BVG is considered as a “large” company with a total number of 10295 employees. In Berlin (BVG) physical attacks against staff members increased from 2003 to 2010 from 338 to 561 – more than 1.6 times higher. Figures on physical attacks against staff members in the urban public transport in Brussels (MIVB-STIB) demonstrate relatively smaller figures. This could be due to its smaller, “medium” size character. Even so, individually the increase is much larger, compared to others. The development of 88 cases of physical attacks against staff members in 2003, and 193 in 2010 – more than two times. That is cause for concern.

From “medium” sized companies we move to “small” sized companies. In the city of Brno in the Czech Republic (PTCB) figures on physical attacks against staff members halved since 2003 to 2010. Comparable numbers are experienced in the German Ruhr area (operated by Bogestra AG), but in this area the situation is reversed: physical aggressions against staff members increased from 26 in 2003 to 35 in 2010 – almost more than 1.5. The same applies to the “small” size, urban public transport company RET in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Figures on physical attacks against staff did not only increase to an amount of almost 1.5 times as high since 2003, but the individual figures are also much higher compared to equal sized companies such as PTCB and Bogestra AG. The RET reports 201 physical attacks against staff in 2003, and 290 in 2010. This comparison seems to be quite alarming.

Only few companies report on physical attacks against passengers: six of nineteen. First of all, only one of six experienced a decrease of physical attacks against passengers. Interestingly this applies to the RET in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, where – as we have seen in the previous section – physical attacks against staff increased. Figures on physical attacks against passengers demonstrate a decrease of 157 in 2003 to 117 in 2010. How did the RET achieve such a decrease of physical attacks against passengers since 2003? Unfortunately there is no additional information left for us to analyse. Secondly, in Sofia, Bulgaria, figures on physical attacks against passengers stagnated since 2003. Annually EAD reports thirty physical attacks against passengers. Thirdly, four of six companies experienced an increase since 2003. Physical attacks against passengers almost doubled in the Ruhr area (Bogestra AG: 6 in 2003, to 11 in 2010). A comparable “small” sized company is the Swedish Västtrafik, which experienced a relatively smaller increase, but has far higher figures: 91 in 2003 and 111 in 2010. What is disturbing then is the unprecedented increase of physical attacks against passengers in the urban public transport in Brussels. From 2003 to 2010, figures on this aspect increased by more than 6 times – from 120 to 773. Even though the problem seemed to be not that alarming in 2003 – compared to figures from the “small” sized company RET in 2003 (x 1.4) – the problem has aggrandized in accelerated pace during the past seven years.

Please take notice of the fact that our findings are an interpretation of the figures on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. Increase of aggressions cannot be understood outside of the contextual environment. For instance, it might be possible that there is much higher awareness of the implementation of reporting systems among some companies than others. Thus, we must be careful how to interpret figures on the quantitative development of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport.

PHYSICAL ATTACKS

- **HIGH INCREASE OF PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST BOTH STAFF AND PASSENGERS IN 6 of 9 CASES**
- **HIGH DIFFERENCES IN FIGURES**
- **HIGH FIGURES ESPECIALLY ON 2010**
- **FEW DATA AVAILABLE ON PHYSICAL ATTACKS AGAINST PASSENGERS**
- **Q: WHAT ARE THE CONTEXTUAL, LOCATION SPECIFIC EXPLANATIONS FOR THE INCREASE OF PHYSICAL ATTACKS?**

1.3 Vandalism

Among the sample of participating local public transport companies, more companies report figures on vandalism. Figures on vandalism are provided by eleven of twenty countries in total. Eight local transport companies reported figures on both 2003 and 2011. The remaining reported only on 2011. The figures are remarkable by three points of importance.

First of all, the development of increasing figures on vandalism illustrates the problem accurately. Five of eight companies are facing a serious increase of vandalism since 2003. Either way, there have been some important steps made in counteracting vandalism since 2003. But the majority still keeps on struggling dealing with these increasing numbers of vandalism in local public transport.

The second point of notice considers the extremely worrying height of individual figures on vandalism. Concerning the “small” size companies, figures vary between 9948 cases of vandalism in Sweden, Västtrafik and 267 in the north western part of Germany (Bogestra AG, Germany) in 2010. This has to be compared to 82 cases of vandalism in 2003, reported by Bogestra AG. Both local transport companies are considered to be “small” size companies with less than 5000 employees. Only in Rotterdam the problem of vandalism reduced since 2003. In addition, figures on vandalism demonstrate a stark increase especially in the area where Västtrafik operates in Sweden. Apart from the fact that the figures are strikingly high, there seems to be no stopping from doubling since 2003. Whereas Västtrafik experienced 4488 cases of vandalism in 2003, it increased to 9948 in 2010. Although the increase since 2003 is slightly smaller, PTCB from Brno, Czech Republic, experienced the same steep rise of numbers on vandalism: 5024 in 2003 to 8208 in 2010. Finally, although the height of figures is much smaller compared to Västtrafik and PTCB, but also in the Ruhr area, vandalism had done nothing but grow since 2003.

Concerning the “medium” sized companies in the cities of Berlin (BVG), Brussels (MIVB-STIB) and Vienna (Wiener Linien), what stands out is the enormous difference in total numbers on vandalism. Although the BVG accomplished impressive results diminishing vandalism, the figures are still extremely high: 78.078 in 2003 and 41.383 in 2010. Vandalism in the Brussels public transport again increased from 1950 in 2003 to 3100 in 2010. Also in Vienna there seems to be no stopping to vandalism. The Wiener Linien experienced a remarkable increase of more than five times on a period of seven years (107 in 2003 and 552 in 2010).

In short, according to the participating local transport companies, vandalism clearly increased since 2003. What is striking is the differing heights in reported figures. This puts questions to the system of reporting. We will go further into detail on the importance and possible improvements in the field of reporting systems in subsection 1.5.

VANDALISM

- MUCH FIGURES AVAILABLE AMONG THE SAMPLE OF PARTICIPATING COMPANIES
- 5 OF 8 REPORT AN INCREASE OF VANDALISM
- EXTREME HIGH FIGURES
- ENORMOUS DIFFERENCE IN INDIVIDUAL FIGURES (ESPECIALLY “MEDIUM” SIZE COMPANIES)
- Q: HOW DOES THE REPORTING SYSTEM OF EACH INDIVIDUAL COMPANY LOOK LIKE? WHAT DOES IT INVOLVE?

1.4 Verbal and Physical Attacks Against Male/Female Staff Members and Passengers

GENDER: MALE/FEMALE

- VERY FEW STATISTICS AVAILABLE
- LACK OF STATISTICS ON RATIO BETWEEN MALE/FEMALE STAFF MEMBERS/PASSENGERS
- Q: MORE INDEPTH RESEARCH IS NEEDED ON THIS ISSUE AND MORE AWARENESS HAS TO BE CREATED AMONG MANY ABOUT THE RELEVANCY OF GENDER ISSUES

Only very few local transport companies recorded verbal and/or physical aggressions against female or male staff members and passengers. The results of figures on quantitative differences distinguished by male and female are therefore rather disappointing. The increase of aggressions in local public transport does not send out a strong signal towards those considering a professional career in local public transport.

The availability of information on this point of issue is guaranteed by only four of seventeen trade unions, four of nineteen companies and one of three associations. Furthermore, note should be taken of the lack of background statistics. Since there is no clearly set out statistical data to permit comparison, in short the ratio between male and female staff, we are not able to draw any comparisons at this moment. Thus, we are obliged to leave conclusions aside.

One could ask the question what would be the added value of distinguishing the quantitative differences between male and female staff members. The case of UNITE also clearly illustrates the importance of benefiting from gender differences in finding solutions to problems of aggressions. Female staff workers work on the tracks with a higher risk of aggressive behaviour and violence, because of women's distressing capacities. The relevance of distinguishing aggressions in local public transport between male and female staff members and passengers is furthermore discussed in the WISE project: *Women Employment in Urban Public Transport Sector*.³ Several indicators show that the gender issue is very relevant for the attractiveness for women working in the public transport sector.

³ <http://www.wise-project.net/pages/index1.html>

On the one hand, one could suggest women are more sensitive to verbal attacks than men, resulting in a more stressed reaction. This of course does not benefit resolving conflict situations. On the other, women prove to have more de-escalating capacities. Women seem to generate more barriers to aggressive behaviour.

Let us take advantage of these opportunities. However, the existing monitoring and assessment indicators do not reveal certain differences and ratio, which are crucial to a better understanding of the gender issue.

1.5 Reporting Systems

A properly functioning report system in itself gives fresh insights into the problem of aggressions in urban public transport. Furthermore, it makes it easier to identify shortfalls early on and find solutions to the problem. According to the figures, all local public transport companies, except FSTV from the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and BKV from Hungary, implemented a system with which staff members regularly report back to the management when aggressions occur. For example, De Lijn from Flanders developed a security monitor that every three months defines the neighbourhoods where the security measures are most needed. Unite explains the absence of figures by pointing to policy choices within the Department of Transport. This has stopped collecting statistics on public transport assaults.

On the other, this widely supported view on the relevance of a reporting system is hardly compatible with the lack of figures on the quantitative development of aggressions in urban public transport. Much of the present monitoring of aggressions in urban public transport is still insufficient since some types of aggressions, such as physical or verbal, are not

monitored everywhere and others are not monitored at all. There seems to be a yawning gap between the evidence collected and the apparently commonly applied report system. Much still remains to be done in order to achieve a practical and affective system for monitoring aggressions and violations in urban public transport.

REPORTING SYSTEMS

- **YAWNING GAP BETWEEN LACK OF EVIDENCE COLLECTED AND THE WIDESPREAD APPLICATION OF REPORTING SYSTEMS**
- **RESEARCH ON DIFFERENT KINDS OF REPORTING SYSTEM IS NEEDED**

1.6 Costs Calculation

Analysing the development of aggressions in urban public transport brings us to the financial character of aggressions. Often aggressive behaviour is accompanied by physical and/or psychological damage, and also by financial costs. We distinguish costs calculation due to aggressions against staff members, and costs calculation due to vandalism. The latter has – compared to the former – a solitary material character. Whereas, aggressions against staff members bring costs, due to physical and/or mental problems as a consequence, such as posttraumatic stress disorders.

The curious point is the difference of results between costs calculation due to aggressions against staff members, and costs calculation due to vandalism. In this area, note should be taken of the imbalance between both. More than half of the total number of companies – twelve of nineteen to be precisely – and two of three employers' associations, calculate the costs due to vandalism. This reality stands in stark contrast to the figures on costs calculation due to aggressions against staff members. They tell us that only few companies apply an internal accountant system that calculates the costs for the company due to aggressions against staff members. More precisely, only seven of nineteen companies, and one of three employers' associations, do have a costs calculation system for aggressions against staff members. Among the number of companies are the BVG (Berlin, Germany), Bogestra AG (Ruhr area, Germany), Keolis (France), MIVB – STIB (Brussels), De Lijn (Flanders, Belgium), PTCB (Brno, Czech Republic), Pohjolan Liikenne (Finland). Finally the French employers' association UTP collects information from member public transport companies. These have their own systems. In short, as to costs calculation due to aggressions against personnel the situation seems to be reversed. It shows that there is given high importance to this issue.

It seems worthy of note that there does not seem to be a relationship between the implementation of an internal costs calculation system (due to aggressions against staff members) and the size of a company (measured in the total number of employees). Since both "small" sized, "medium" sized and "large" sized companies are among those few which apply a costs calculation system due to aggressions against staff, it is hard to say which key factors could be an explanation for calculating the costs due to aggressions against staff members.

COSTS CALCULATION

- **HIGH IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO COSTS CALCULATION DUE TO VANDALISM**
- **LESS IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO COSTS CALCULATION DUE TO PHYSICAL/VERBAL ATTACKS AGAINST STAFF MEMBERS**
- **NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COSTS CALCULATION AND SIZE OF THE COMPANY**

CHAPTER 2 The Implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 by Local Public Transport Companies

In 2003 the social partners jointly decided on the Joint Recommendations to counteract the issue of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in public transport. Analysing the implementation of the Joint Recommendations concerning local public transport, we send out a simplified questionnaire with questions to be answered with *Yes*, *No* or *Do Not Know*. The structure of the analysis of the questionnaire follows the structure of the Joint Recommendations from 2003. The reasons behind certain findings require clarification. But we need to address that there could be other elements attributed to certain development or findings, external to this scope of study. Thus, we are obliged to leave strict conclusions aside. Rather we focus on identifying trends in the field of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport, in order to support positive developments within this field. Furthermore, please not that when the employers' associations are mentioned in the analysis,

this of course does not mean they themselves implemented certain measures. The individual transport companies implemented these.

There has been progress made in the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 by many local public transport companies, which participated in the survey. With only few exceptions, the majority of urban public transport companies introduced preventive measures in the field of prevention, recovery and technology. Only a limited number of local public transport companies did not introduce any measures in the fields mentioned here. In the next sections we will have deeper and wider reflection on these three important aspects.

2.1 Measures in the Field of Prevention: Human Resources

Preventive measures in the field of human resources consist of the next three parts: (1) training of staff in de-escalation strategies, (2) different organisation of work shifts, and (3) more personnel in stations. Overall, the majority of companies implemented these kinds of measures within their organisation.

Training of staff in de-escalation strategies has been commonly applied. More precisely, thirteen of nineteen public transport companies (except companies from Lisbon, Sofia, and Varmlandstrafik and Waxholms from Sweden) and two of three employers' associations - the French UTP and the Italian Asstra - implemented preventive measures by means of training of staff in threatening situations. Concerning the employers' associations; they of course do not have their own measures. Their member companies implemented measures, inspired by the UITP-ETF Joint Recommendations of 2003. This material has been used in de-escalation trainings for employees working in the public transport sector.

The same applies to the second part: changing the organisation of work shifts. Again, thirteen of nineteen local public transport companies confirm that they changed the organisation of work shifts in order to have better results. For instance, De Lijn from Flanders implemented a targeted and flexible deployment of the different groups of security personnel. Among the exceptions again are Sofia, a few "small" Swedish companies and furthermore both Czech companies: Veolia Czech Transport and PTCB from Brno. The majority of public transport companies implementing this measure of changing the organisation of work shifts should be regarded as a positive signal.

Lastly, then there is the question about whether or not companies managed to have more personnel operating. The figures on this aspect are rather mixed, especially compared to the first two parts of the question on preventive measures in human resources. Moreover, the interpretation of the results becomes even more interesting in view of the European monetary and financial crisis since 2008 and the current political stagnation on how to solve the European financial crisis. The financial crisis has casted severe shadows over Europe. In view of this context, the outcome of nine of nineteen companies and two of three employers' associations, answering that they did put more personnel in stations, is very positive. Although mostly "small"- and "medium" sized companies did not introduce more personnel in stations, there seem to be revenues for others, mainly "large" companies, to have more personnel operating in and around the stations. This positive and interesting outcome considers the financial situation of cities of today. From a social dialogue point of view it could be interesting to find explanations for this juxtaposition between an increase in staff members and on the other decreasing public budgets, which have not overlooked the public transport sector. We could indeed think of more personnel in stations, but at the same time we should try to have a deeper understanding of, for instance, the types of employees contracts. For instance, we could think of subcontracting agreements with security services. Furthermore, we do not know whether employees are working on a full- or part-time basis,

and what their competences are, and with what qualifications? The figure on this aspect does not provide the conclusive answer.

MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RESOURCES

- **DE-ESCALATION TRAINING: 13 OF 19 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **DIFFERENT ORGANISATION OF WORK SHIFTS: 13 OF 19 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **MORE PERSONNEL: 9 OF 19 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **Q: HOW DO COMPANIES GIVE PRACTICAL EXPRESSION TO “MORE PERSONNEL”?**

Since we do not have these more in-depth statistics, it is not appropriate to jump to any conclusions right now. It would be premature to anticipate its final conclusions at this stage. What we can do, however, is trying to have a deeper understanding of this very interesting outcome in the nearby future by a more in-depth study on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport.

2.2 Measures in the field of Recovery

The post-character of tackling insecurity in local public transport relates to measures in the field of recovery. Four elements can be distinguished: (1) psychological support after physical damage, (2) psychological support after verbal attacks / psychological damage, (3) days for recovery after physical and/or psychological damage and/or stress, and (4) financial compensation.

Firstly, up to fifteen of nineteen local public transport companies, and two of three employers' associations, offer psychological support after physical damage. Companies such as Veolia Czech Transport from Czech Republic do not offer psychological support after physical damage.

The balance is shifting when reviewing figures on psychological support after verbal attacks. Eleven companies and the French employers' association UTP do offer psychological support after psychological damage, resulting from verbal attacks. Noticeably, the position of the French Keolis stands out. Since it is among the “large” companies with 10.000 employees and more, one would not expect this company to be an outsider on this aspect. Consequently, we will have to pop the question: is it about prioritizing, or will companies have other reasons to do so?

The third point of interest refers to allowing employees days for recovery after physical and/or psychological damage. The result on this one is half-half. There does not appear a pattern. Eight public transport companies do allow days for recovery, and eight companies do not. The remaining few did not answer. Among those who do not allow days for recovery after acts of aggression are Veolia Czech Transport from Czech Republic and EAD Sofia, next to “large” companies such as the German BVG, which counts a total number of 10.295 employees, and French Keolis with a total number of 30.800 employees. An explanation for this could be found in the difference in national health care systems. In Finland for instance it is already part of their normal healthcare system. For those who answered *No* to the question on allowing free days for recovery, it could be very well possible that this is also already a common standard for social security systems of the concerned country.

The final element of measures in the field of recovery contains the aspect of financial compensation. Again there cannot be found any mention of one. The result is half-half. Eight of nineteen companies do provide financial compensation, and eight do not, together with the Finnish employers' association ALT. On both sides we can find "large", "medium" as well as "small" companies. Interestingly, the "large" companies BVG and Keolis France do not offer financial compensation. RET, from Rotterdam in the Netherlands, has set up a special department that takes care of the victim after an incident. This includes also financial compensation.

As has been stressed, the figures on measures in the field of recovery could very well be interpreted in view of the social security system of the concerning countries. We should not commit the mistake of jumping to premature conclusions, without having any deep-grounded knowledge on this aspect.

2.3 Measures in the field of Technology

MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF RECOVERY

- **PSYCHOLOGICAL SUPPORT AFTER PHYSICAL DAMAGE: 15 OF 19 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **PSYCHOLOGICAL SUPPORT AFTER VERBAL ATTACKS: 11 OF 19 / 1 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **DAYS FOR RECOVERY: 8 OF 19 COMPANIES**
- **FINANCIAL COMPENSATION: 8 OF 19 COMPANIES**
- **Q: HOW DOES THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEMS OF EACH COUNTRY LOOK LIKE? WHAT IS ALREADY COMMON STANDARD?**

The final element in analysing the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 refers to measures in the field of technology. It contains four elements: (1) video surveillance in buses, tramways and metro trains (2) video surveillance in bus-, tram- and/or metro stations, (3) no cash policy on board of vehicles and (4) the use of an emergency communication line from the driver to the station.

Overall, most of the companies implemented measures in the field of technology. The majority of companies and associations especially apply video surveillance, both in the carrier and at stations, and the use of an emergency communication line. More specifically, fourteen of nineteen public transport companies, and all employers' associations implemented video surveillance in stations. Unite managed to achieve a decrease in numbers of aggressions in public transport. The reasons, according to Unite, the introduction of CCTV systems since 2005 and the establishment of a new unit, the Workplace Violence Unit (WVU) that deals with the problem of insecurity in public transport. The WCU was introduced in September 2008 and was launched in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Service to investigate assaults on bus staff members especially.

More or less the same number of public transport companies, thirteen of twenty, and all employers' associations implemented video surveillance in bus, tram and/or metro careers. The position of both companies from Czech Republic - PTCB from Brno and Veolia Czech Transport - and EAD Sofia stands out in all sections. All three did not implement video surveillance systems in both stations and careers. Although EAD Sofia did not implement

measures in the field of video surveillance, other technological devices have been applied. All driver cabins are equipped with GPS radio connection, a mobile phone and a panic button.

The case study provided by the trade union Unite discusses the implementation of technological devices in order to tackle the problem of insecurity in public transport. The study focuses on First Leeds, a bus company in the Yorkshire Division. It has 475 buses and 1030 bus drivers. First Leeds is currently implementing a three-year programme of violence prevention. The aim of implementing measures is to prevent aggressions to its bus drivers. The study shows which technological measures in the field of prevention have been successful, and which have not.

Case: Bus Company *First Leeds*, Yorkshire Division, United Kingdom

Technological devices: PRO's and CON's

- **Attack alarms: some drivers are reluctant to use attack alarms in certain location because they actually attract trouble.**
- **Assault screens: there is some concern about reducing drivers' traffic visibility. Besides there is also some concern that drivers may act more aggressively if they feel well protected by the assault screen.**
- **Radio: these are mostly used after an accident has happened. It is difficult to get assistance to a driver en route, so immediate responses are unlikely.**

De Lijn, Flanders, furthermore implemented similar safety measures, such as radio, GPS, alarm systems and closed moneyboxes on buses and trams. This last one relates to the next measure of implementing no-cash-policy.

In the field of technology measures, note should be taken to the no-cash-policy. Some companies do not work any longer with cash on board, for others it is restricted to certain routes or periods of time during the day and evening. For instance, the employers' association from Finland, ALT, points out that the no-cash-policy is followed only in the capital region on local trains during the weekend. Frequently companies answer it is hard to deliver no-cash-policy because of operating circumstances in rural areas. Either way, this does not correspond to the different positions on this subject. It is noticeable that the more urban-oriented companies are also among those who do not implement no-cash-policy: MIVB-STIB Brussels, France Keolis, Wiener Linien Vienna and Sofia. These are both "large" companies operating in capital cities and medium size cities, such as Brussels MIVB-STIB and the French Keolis, as well as "small" companies such as the Swedish Waxholms Angfartygs AB. Shortly, the size of the company is not sufficient for explaining the difficulty for companies to implement no-cash-policy. We need to look for other explanations as well.

MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF TECHNOLOGY

- **VIDEO SURVEILLANCE AT STATIONS: 14 OF 19 COMPANIES**
- **VIDEO SURVEILLANCE IN BUS/METRO/TRAM: 13 OF 19 COMPANIES**
- **NO CASH POLICY: 9 OF 19 COMPANIES**
- **EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION LINE: 16 OF 19**
- **Q: WHICH DEVICES ARE MORE EFFECTIVE? WHICH ARE LESS EFFECTIVE?**

2.4 Company- and Sector Collective Agreements on Insecurity and the Feeling of Insecurity in Local Public Transport

As it has been expressed in the Joint Recommendations of 2003, company collective agreements on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport can be a good means to counteract the problem.

Only few companies reported that they have implemented a with the trade unions negotiated company- or sector collective agreement: five of twenty companies, and two of three associations. This small number should be of concern, since social dialogue is important in the joint approach to fight against aggressive behaviour and violence in local public transport.

The next five companies implemented a company collective agreement to tackle the problem of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. Both Belgium companies - De Lijn (Flanders) and MIVB-STIB (Brussels) - the Dutch RET (Rotterdam), EAD Sofia and Pohjolan Liikenne from Finland agreed on a company collective agreement on the issue of insecurity within public transport. As in Flanders, De Lijn points out that the company collective agreement describes the communication and meeting procedures in case of aggression. The employers' association from Finland, ALT, points out that the national collective agreement also includes regulations on payment during the absence with some medical reason. These regulations are applied also to recovery from mental and physical aggressions. The position of EAD Sofia stands out in particular. An interesting procedure is involved here. Although EAD Sofia does not implement measures such as training of staff in de-escalating strategies, different organisation of work shifts, psychological support after both physical and psychological damage, free days for recovery and the use of video surveillance systems, it did agree on a company collective agreement on prevention and/or compensation measures in case of aggressions. The case of EAD Sofia illustrates that the existing assessment indicators do not reveal certain information, which is crucial to a better understanding of defining and implementing company collective agreements. It would be very interesting to study this element more in-depth.

"Bargaining a collective agreement is equivalent to define a policy for a sector on the treated matter".⁴ The French UTP clearly illustrates the relevancy of sector collective agreements. Since the beginning of the nineties insecurity increased in French society, and in the French public transport in particular. The issue of insecurity has a strong impact on the public transport sector in terms of strikes, absenteeism, decreasing numbers of passengers, rising costs and so on. In order to beat the problem of increasing insecurity in public transport the French urban transport companies, through UTP, took several measures, such as the enhancement of human presence on the transport network, the development of strong partnerships with local- and justice authorities through "security local contracts", fighting fraud, strong enhancements on technological devices and strong actions of lobbying towards the national authorities for a better representation of the problem of insecurity in local public transport on a national level. The French UTP collective agreement consists of three major pillars: (1) the development of the social dialogue on security within companies, (2) the implementation of measures in the field of prevention and (3) the follow-up of employees who have experienced serious threats of aggressions. In short, it implements all measures dedicated to fight insecurity and summarizes all other measures on the subject. It is furthermore compulsory for all French urban transport companies, which agreed on this.

⁴ UTP, *Collective Agreement on Passengers and Employees Security in the French Public Transport* p.6; additional information provided by UTP.

Their task is to bargain a collective agreement on security in local public transport at the local level with their trade unions.

Case: Employers' Association *UTP*, France

The Sector Collective Agreement developed by the French UTP

A. SOCIAL DIALOGUE The UTP has been building bridges between transport companies and public authorities such as police departments, schools, courts and local associations. Through the "local security contracts" the UTP is actively involved in raising awareness among young people and addressing the importance of respectful behaviour in public transport. Furthermore, transport companies are obliged to deliver a report on the problem of insecurity in public transport within their region or city annually. The UTP is exceptionally alert and active in this. Apart from anything else, we need to feed onto this process. Answering questions on insecurity, building these bridges and avoiding the separation of knowledge into different compartments results in a dialogue in which each type of knowledge is inspired and nourished by others.

B. MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF PREVENTION Part of this element has been the creation of a specific job of security manager, financing professional security-training for employees and the establishment of a specific committee, represented by the various trade unions, monitoring and studying both the quantitative and qualitative development of insecurity in local public transport.

Concerning financing professional security training: the provision of professional training strengthens the management of conflict situations. This is guaranteed through an agreement between employers' association UTP and the transport companies on the payment of a specific contribution of 0,3% to the total payment to finance professional training on threatening situations. This resulted in an annual collection of more than €3.000.000 since 2007. This amount allows financing more than 100.000 hours of security training for its employees. Since 1995 more than 1.000.000 hours of security training have been financed by this system.

C. MEASURES IN THE FIELD OF RECOVERY The final element brings us to measures in the field of recovery. The UTP collective agreement on security implements a follow-up for employees who have been attacked. The support of the company is crucially to this point. One should think of administrative assistance, psychological and/or physical assistance by a doctor, and so on.

Follow up after experiencing violence

- Payment of all medical expenses which exceed the legal reimbursement;
- Offering legal assistance by a lawyer;
- Maintenance of the employee's wages during the sick-leave;
- In advance payment of any compensation that the employee may receive by the Courts;

The UTP collective agreement was signed in 1996. Even though it is not easy to provide measurable, clean-cut results of a sectorial policy, some important IMPROVEMENTS can be revealed ten years later. In general, the collective agreement allowed generalising security culture in French urban transport. The security issue has become one of the main subjects of social dialogue in the French urban transport sector.

The Results (2006):

- Annually more than 5000 employees of urban transport companies follow security training;
- The French urban transport companies are involved in 142 local security contracts. 51 of these are specifically dedicated to urban public transport;
- More than 67 companies now have a security manager;
- The security services in the companies represents more than 3.7% of the total of employees;
- 54% of the vehicles have a video surveillance system;

Classifying Aggressions as a Criminal Act

The classification of aggressions as a criminal act is an important means against promoting immoral behaviour. Law-breakers can be effectively confronted with their behaviour only if the time span between the act and the punishment is kept short. In this way law-breakers could possibly have an understanding of what the consequences of their behaviour involves.

In at least eleven countries (of twenty in total), aggressions are being classified as a criminal act. Unite, the trade union from Britain and Ireland, points out to be striving for tougher laws. Alongside ASLEF they have campaigned in calling for tougher laws to protect Scottish transport workers from abuse. Unfortunately plans to bring in a specific offense for assaulting workers who deal with the public have been rejected in Scotland.

Due to inconsistencies in the answers provided by trade unions and companies, it is not sure whether or not the same can be applied to Germany and the Netherlands. According to the BVG aggressions do not have a legal status in Germany; according to Bogestra AG they do. The company from Rotterdam, RET, disagrees with the Dutch trade union FNV about the Dutch status on this. This confusion might result from a different interpretation of the questions because of translation difficulties. Different terms can be used for this. It is important to point this out, as these things can sometimes be misinterpreted. Either way, it is interesting that also companies believe aggressive behaviour should have a legal status in more countries.

Nevertheless, in the next few countries still much has to be achieved to acquire a juridical classification of aggressions as a criminal act: Austria, Portugal, Czech Republic and France. All of them, except the companies from Lisbon, Brno and Czech Republic, are demanding such a legal status.

LEGAL STATUS OF AGGRESSIONS

- **AGGRESSIONS CLASSIFIED AS A CRIMINAL ACT: 11 OF 20 COUNTRIES**
- **MORE COMPANIES SUPPORT THE LEGAL STATUS OF AGGRESSIONS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT**
- **Q: WHAT IS THE LEGAL STATUS OF AGGRESSIONS IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS?**

2.5 External Relations

"In Rotterdam, the issue of social safety is very important. There are a lot of collaborations on this issue [...]. We work on several areas to make the public transport safer. One can think of youth organisations, schools or private security companies in order to increase the feeling of safety for the passengers and the colleagues".

The level of cooperation between local public transport companies and employers' associations, external organisations and institutions such as local parliaments, legislative authorities, police departments and representatives of civil society can be considered as

moderate to high. Most of the companies do have alliances with either one or more of them. For instance, De Lijn from Flanders appeals to the services of local authorities such as municipal police and others in the field of community services. They are committed to coordinated joint actions with the police. But they also started to join forces with the Flemish Youth Council (which is also the official advisory body of the Flemish government), by introducing the project *Trammelant* at schools in Flanders. The Finnish employers' association ALT points out closely cooperating with the Helsinki Public Transport Authority. The Italian employers' association Asstra furthermore works together with private surveillance providers to increase the feeling of safety in local public transport in Italy.

Seven of twenty companies and two of three associations cooperate with elected members of local parliament. More or less the same applies to the cooperation with legal, juridical authorities. Ten of twenty companies and two of three associations relate to juridical authorities. Cooperation with police departments knows few exceptions. Fourteen of twenty companies and two of three associations work closely with police departments. FSTV from the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia points out that they demanded more police help and protection, the procurement of buses with protected driver cabins and finally education in how to handle conflict situations for driver personnel. Also the employers' association Asstra from Italy points out to coordinate joint initiatives with the prefecture, local police and all relevant institutions to assure prompt intervention, dedicated communication devices, greater road control, better infrastructure lightning and increased urban civility around the local public transport stations. In Sofia the Central Dispatch Centre supports simultaneous connection with both the police and staff members working in public transport.

The least represented in the sector is civil society. One should think of Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) such as passenger organisations, youth organisations, community- and sports organisations and other representatives of civil society. Nine of twenty companies and two of three associations relate to NGOs. For instance, the BVG from Germany is very active in raising awareness by developing the campaign called *Deine Waffe Gegen Gewalt* and a prevention campaign called *Zivilcourage*. They also work together with youth organisations. Together they developed the awareness campaigns such as *Stark Ohne Gewalt*. In sum, although only half of the total number of companies works closely with civil society, still much effort has to be made to foster and strengthen cooperation between local public transport companies and civil society.

It may be worth considering the next observation. Time and again Veolia Transport Czech Republic, EAD Sofia, Varmlandstrafik Sweden, Pohjolan Liikenne Finland and the employers' association ALT Finland are among those companies, which do not relate to public authorities and representatives of civil society. Furthermore, Wiener Linien Vienna does relate to representatives of civil society, but does not to public authorities. In other words, for these companies and associations there is still much to achieve in building bridges with external organisations.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

- **LOCAL PARLIAMENTS: 11 OF 20 COMPANIES/ 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **LEGAL AUTHORITIES: 10 OF 20 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **POLICE SYSTEM: 14 OF 20 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**
- **CIVIL SOCIETY: 9 OF 20 COMPANIES / 2 OF 3 ASSOCIATIONS**

CHAPTER 3 Initiatives of Trade Unions Concerning the Joint Recommendations of 2003

The jointly decided Joint Recommendations of 2003 have been evaluated by us by sending out the questionnaire on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. We send out a questionnaire with a specific, small part of questions addressed to the trade unions participating to this evaluation. The possible answers to the questions are *Yes*, *No* or *Do Not Know*. We kindly asked for additional information, if possible. This final chapter consists of an analysis of both the answers given to the questionnaire by the participating trade unions, and the additional information, which should highlight the reality. As we will find out in the next sections, trade unions are moving on different tracks at the same time. They are making serious efforts addressing the problem of aggression and violence against staff members and passengers in local public transport by initiating different activities. We distinguish four important initiatives by trade unions: (1) activities in order to address the problem, (2) internally questioning of staff members about their experiences with aggressions and violence at work, (3) raising awareness among passengers of local public transport and (4) collective bargaining.

First of all, eleven of seventeen trade unions are actively involved in addressing awareness of the problem of insecurity in local public transport among its staff members. In Germany the EVG trade union started a campaign *Sicher Unterwegs* a few years ago. The content and its central message of the campaign were agreed on in close collaboration to the public authorities and public transport companies. The Swedish Municipal Workers' Union – Kommunal – points out that the trade union and the public transport company joined forces and produced a set of training material on how to prevent violence and aggressions in local public transport. ASLEF from the United Kingdom devoted a campaign to the next central message: to classify assaults on transport workers with the same seriousness as an assault on a police officer. The trade union FNCTTFEL from Luxembourg organised public meetings and awareness campaigns in front of the central station of Luxembourg both in 2006 and 2011.

Furthermore the Belgium trade union ACV focuses on the publication of press articles, trade union pamphlets and eye-catching actions. The union T&G, now UNITE, is trying to target the issue by publishing press releases and introducing a standard letter that could be sent to all MPs. Its aim is calling for an urgent round table meeting with all stakeholders involved. UNITE (as T&G) has formulated a five-point plan to put to the meeting: (1) protective measures for bus drivers including radio/alarm systems to be kept in good order and updated, (2) counselling and no loss of earnings for bus workers subjected to assaults, (3) bus operators to carry out regular risk assessments with the trade unions and agree appropriate actions, (4) higher priority and resources for police response to public transport attacks, (5) tougher sentences for those convicted of assaults on bus workers.

The case of the STSB from Bulgaria is a clear illustration of campaigning awareness of the problem of insecurity in local public transport, focussing on different aspects (see box at page 22).

Even more so, all trade unions are actively involved in internally questioning of its staff members about experiences with aggressive behaviour and violence in the work place. As the case of FTTUB demonstrates, organizing summits on specific, security-related topics is raising awareness about the problem of insecurity at the workplace. This means being on the right track. The more people talk about the issue of insecurity in local public transport, the better we can implement the most effective measures. This would stimulate the procedures considerably. Therefore it is a very positive signal that all trade unions, participating to this

research, are actively involved in internal questioning of their staff members. These are important initiatives, which deserve our support.

Thirdly, nine of seventeen trade unions have been campaigning awareness towards passengers in local public transport. This is closely related to the first element of raising awareness and addressing the problem of insecurity in local public transport.

Finally, more or less the same number of trade unions is involved in collective bargaining. Eight of seventeen trade unions include the problem of aggressions and violence in collective bargaining. For instance, ASLEF, among others, raised meetings and negotiations at company level. FSTV, from the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, joined forces with the transport company by signing an agreement on measures to be taken to the problem of insecurity in local public transport. Furthermore the union initiative – *Safety Now* – is being progressed within the transport company. The Italian General Confederation of Labour (FILT CGIL) focuses on sectors in which women are employed in front line activities. Fagforbundet from Norway participates in a special working group, appointed by the government, where issues of insecurity in local public transport have been researched. Furthermore, FILT CGIL developed an action plan that obligates all stakeholders involved: the employers, the county governments and the employees. The same applies to the Dutch trade union, FNV, which developed a taskforce consisting of employers, employees, local governments and public authorities such as police and legal institutions.

FTTUB from Bulgaria proposed a new chapter on *Protection against discrimination and violence at the workplace* to the social partners. It was included in the sectoral CBA for

Case: Trade Union FTTUB, Bulgaria

International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women

On November 25th, 2009, FTTUB initiated a campaign with a strong directive to women's position in public transport sector, regarding the insecurity issue. *The International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women* started with a round table discussion on the subject. In this way FTTUB aimed to raise awareness of the importance of the issue of violence against women working in the transport sector. Besides, it could possibly also encourage female transport workers to report cases of violence. These initiatives of the FTTUB resulted in a signed agreement between the president of the FTTUB and the mayor of Sofia. Its aim is to initiate joint actions on prevention, support and counselling women, who have been experiencing mental and/or physical violence at the workplace within the system of urban transport companies in Sofia. Secondly, FTTUB developed a questionnaire on the subject of violence against women in public transport in Sofia. The information gathered from the questionnaire was analysed and presented to representatives of the municipality of Sofia, transport companies and media. The resulting recommendations on prevention of violence against women working in the transport sector were presented to the social partners. The results of this initiative are impressive. One year later, FTTUB was able to present self-defence courses to women working in the transport sector, strongly supported by the municipality of Sofia, UPT companies and the *International Association of Self-Defence Personal Protection*. Secondly, as a consequence many women now have overcome their fears or feelings of shame. People are not hesitating any longer to talk about the problem of aggressions and violence. This is crucial to finding the right measures in order to prevent violence against women. Finally, the initiatives were widely reflected by the media, social partners and trade union members. Therefore, FTTUB is extending its initiatives to prevent violence against women to other affiliates located in other cities. The agreements for joint actions will be signed on the 25th of November 2011.

transport, and signed in 2010. The employers are obliged to pursue a policy of zero tolerance against violence at the workplace. Procedures must be developed and followed in cases of violence. These must contain at least the next elements: (1) adequate disciplinary measures against the perpetrators to be taken of they are employees in the same establishment, and (2) offering support for the victim and more specifically psychological support on the process of reintegration. Trade union members are encouraged to implement and enlarge the content of the chapter of the sectoral CBA in the CBA's at company level. It means an important and constructive step forward.

In Sweden the issue of violence and aggressions at the work place, third party violence included, is already well covered in the Swedish Work Environment Act and hence not necessary to include in the collective bargaining activities.

In sum, the initiatives of trade unions on raising awareness and taking measures enjoy wide support. Many trade unions are actively involved in dealing with the problem of insecurity in local public transport by encouraging, designing and delivering projects. They have designed tools for moulding people's minds. It is therefore extremely important we continue to feed into this important and constructive process.

INITIATIVES BY TRADE UNIONS

- **AWARENESS RAISING: 11 OF 17 TRADE UNIONS**
- **INTERNALLY QUESTIONNING: ALL TRADE UNIONS**
- **CAMPAIGNING TOWARDS PASSENGERS: 9 OF 17**
- **COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: 8 OF 17**

Conclusion and recommendations by the author

This report provides you with a broad understanding of the results on the implementation of the Joint Recommendations of 2003 on Insecurity and the Feeling of Insecurity in local public transport so far. It demonstrates the important steps that have been taken by public transport companies and trade unions. So what emerges from this? What should be the lessons learned? Firstly it is regarded as an important and positive sign that the majority of public transport companies implemented several measures in the fields of human resources, recovery and technology. Measures in the field of human resources have been widely implemented. Especially offering de-escalation training and changes in the organisation of work shifts are practised by many. Furthermore, concerning the issue of more personnel, it would be very interesting to research this aspect more in-depth on matters of content. The same applies to measures in the field of recovery. Though issues we still need to highlight are measures of financial compensation and allowing days for recovery. Finally the implementation of technological measures is also regarded as vitally important. Many transport companies have conducted primarily the use of video surveillance, both at the station and in the buses, trams and metros. The same applies to the use of emergency communication lines between the driver and the head-office. The no-cash-policy remains a point of discussion, simply because it seems not to be applicable in all situations.

A second reason to be pleased is the active involvement of trade unions initiating activities to address the problem of insecurity in local public transport. As the results demonstrate, many trade unions focus on awareness raising and internally questioning of staff members about their experiences with aggressions at work. Activities concerning

campaigning towards passengers and collective bargaining could be on all our minds a bit more. Either way, the trade unions involved in this research show a high level of dedication to the problem of insecurity in public transport. They are all monitoring the problem of insecurity in local public transport closely.

This article started by raising several question on the quantitative development of insecurity and the feeling of insecurity in local public transport. The lack of figures on the majority of quantitative elements stresses the importance of expanding our knowledge. All individual quantitative elements demonstrate the urgent need for a better understanding of reporting systems. How do companies give practical expression to implementing a reporting system on aggressions and vandalism in local public transport? One of the vital requirements for improving our knowledge of the development of aggressions in public transport is firstly to know exactly what the different systems look like. This lack of information is just as pressing a problem as the need for action.

In sum, even though the evaluation of the implementation of the Joint Recommendations is positive, some improvements can still be made. The evaluation of all elements, both qualitative and quantitative, raises a recurrent question. Our research so far does provide many insights into the issue of insecurity in local public transport, but does not reach the far more deep-seated explanations. For instance, how does the national health system in different countries look like? What is already common standard, and what is not? Which technological devices proved to be successful, and which did not? How do companies taken up in the details of company collective agreements? In short, what are the more specific explanations to our findings?

The Joint Recommendations on insecurity and the feeling of insecurity of 2003 consist of long-term measures. Any initiative to strengthen these is therefore another move in the right direction. We need to feed onto this process and try to look into the deeper causes. This approach will undoubtedly bear more fruit if pursued consistently. We hope that this report will enable us to strengthen relations on a broadly agreed basis and in a coherent manner even more, in order to tackle the problem of insecurity in public transport adequately.

Annexes

- **Questionnaire addressed to the urban public transport companies and employers' associations**
- **Questionnaire addressed to the trade unions**

QUESTIONNAIRE ADDRESSED TO COMPANIES AND EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS

INSECURITY AND THE FEELING OF INSECURITY IN LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Joint recommendations of the European Social Partners signed by ETF and UITP, IRU, supported by CER and CEEP on 13 November 2003

UITP: <http://www.uitp.org/eupolicy/positions.cfm> « Voir : November 2003 »

ETF: <http://www.itfglobal.org/etf/upt-sd.cfm>

Follow-up of the recommendations 2011

This questionnaire tries to be simple and asks questions most of them to be answered quickly with yes or no or don't know.

The problem of aggressions and violence in urban public transport is more complicate and requires a wide range of activities and measures. We ask all participants to send us material about their activities and initiatives in order to identify good practices and getting a better overview of initiatives since the signature of the joint UITP / ETF recommendations in November 2003.

Name of your company / employers' association / trade union:

If you answer as a trade union: for which company(ies) do you report?

Country:

Name of contact person:

Email address:

Phone:

PLEASE SEND THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BACK TO THE UITP jean.dekindt@uitp.org AND THE ETF s.trier@etf-europe.org NOT LATER THAN 5 SEPTEMBER 2011.

1) Did aggressions against staff members and passengers (physical and verbal), incivilities and vandalism increase in your company since 2004?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Please quantify the number of aggressions per year in 2010 and – if possible – the comparison to 2003:

	2003	2010	Do not know
Verbal attacks against staff members			
Verbal attacks against passengers			
Verbal attacks in total			
Physical attacks against staff members			
Physical attacks against passengers			
Physical attacks in total			
Vandalisms on rolling stock and in stations			

Are there quantitative differences between attacks against men and women?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Quantify, if possible:

	2003	2010	Do not know
Verbal attacks against women staff members			
Verbal attacks against male staff members			
Physical attacks against women members			
Physical attacks against male staff members			

2) Do you have a reporting system in your company with which staff members regularly report back to the management when aggressions (physical and verbal) occurred?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

3) Do you have an internal accountant system that calculates the costs for the company due to aggressions against personnel (e.g. lost working days due to physical and psychological health problems; psychological support, compensation for staff etc.)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

4) Do you calculate the costs due to damages and vandalism?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

5) Did you introduce in your company preventive measures in the following fields (see recommendations):

Human resources: Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know ☐

Technology: Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know ☐

Organisational: Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know ☐

6) Measures in the field of human resources and organisation

6.1) Prevention

Training of staff in de-escalation strategies:

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Different organisation of work shifts (more personnel on certain lines, during certain hours):

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

More personnel in stations:

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Others (please explain briefly):

--

6.2) Measures in the field of recovery

Do you offer psychological support to your personnel after a physical aggression?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Do you offer psychological support to the personnel after a verbal attacks / psychological aggression?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Free days for recovery from physical and / or psychological damage / stress

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Financial compensation (e.g. for lost income; when unable to continue the job)

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Others (please explain briefly):

--

7) Measures in the field of technology

Video surveillance in busses, tramways and metro trains

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Video surveillance in bus/tram/metro stations

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

No cash policy on board of vehicles

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Emergency communication line from the driver / the station

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Others (please explain briefly):

--

8) Do you have a company collective agreement on prevention and / or compensation (recovery) measures in the case of aggressions?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If yes, say in general terms what it covers:

9) Due to the seriousness of the problem of aggressions in public transport some countries changed legislation and classify aggressions against staff in public transport (and other public services) as a “criminal” act.

In your country, are those aggressions considered as a “criminal” act?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If no, is your company / trade union demanding such a legal status?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

10) Does your company relate with public authorities in order to tackle the problem of aggressions etc. (see recommendations)?

With elected members of local parliaments

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

With legal (juridical) authorities

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

With the police

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

With others:

If you answer once or several times with yes, please describe shortly.

11) Does your company relate with NGOs (e.g. passenger organisations, youth organisations, other representatives of civil society) in order to tackle the problem of aggressions (see recommendations)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If yes, please describe briefly.

QUESTIONS ADRESSED TO TRADE UNION REPRESENTATIVES:

12) Did your union initiate activities in order to address the problem of aggressions and violence against personnel in urban public transport?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If yes, please give a short description:

13) Did your union question staff members about their experiences with violence and aggressions at the work place?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

14) Did your union organise awareness campaigns in relation to passengers in urban public transport?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

15) Did your union include the problem of aggressions and violence in collective bargaining?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ANSWERS

QUESTIONNAIRE ADDRESSED TO THE TRADE UNIONS

INSECURITY AND THE FEELING OF INSECURITY IN LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Joint recommendations of the European Social Partners signed by ETF and
UITP, IRU, supported by CER and CEEP on 13 November 2003**

UITP: <http://www.uitp.org/eupolicy/positions.cfm> « Voir : November 2003 »

ETF: <http://www.itfglobal.org/etf/upt-sd.cfm>

Follow-up of the Joint Recommendations 2011

Name of your trade union:

Country:

Name of contact person:

E-mail address:

Phone:

PLEASE SEND THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BACK TO THE ETF s.trier@etf-europe.org NOT
LATER THAN

20 October 2011.

1) Did aggressions against staff members and passengers (physical and verbal), incivilities and vandalism increase in your country since 2004?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Are there quantitative differences between attacks against men and women?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

Comments:

2) Due to the seriousness of the problem of aggressions in public transport some countries changed legislation and classify aggressions against staff in public transport (and other public services) as a “criminal” act.

In your country, are those aggressions considered as a “criminal” act?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If no, is your trade union demanding such a legal status?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

3) Did your union initiate activities in order to address the problem of aggressions and violence against personnel in urban public transport?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If yes, please give a short description:

4) Did your union question staff members about their experiences with violence and aggressions at the work place?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

5) Did you union organise awareness campaigns in relation to passengers in urban public transport?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

6) Did your union include the problem of aggressions and violence in collective bargaining?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do not know ☐

If yes, please give a short description:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ANSWERS