

Board Meeting Paper	
Jul 15 BM C 2.1	
Purpose of report	Discussion / debate
Sensitive Information?	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If sensitive, protective marking¹	
Date of Meeting	16 July 2015
Agenda Item	C 2.1
Report Title	National Road User Satisfaction Survey - update
Sponsor	Guy Dangerfield



1. Summary

This paper provides an update to the Board about arrangements for Transport Focus to take responsibility for measuring satisfaction among users of the Strategic Road Network in England from April 2016.

This will happen in two phases. Initially, we will deliver the National Road User Satisfaction Survey (NRUSS), conducted for some years by the Highways Agency, now Highways England, using the existing methodology. At the same time we will continue to pilot our replacement Road User Satisfaction Survey (new RUSS) as recommended in the University of the West of England independent report. When new RUSS is ready to start there will be a period of dual running (primarily to ensure comparability between old and new in relation to measures being used by the Office of Rail and Road), following which NRUSS will be closed down and new RUSS will become the formal measure of satisfaction.

Indications, based on the assumptions listed below, are that we will require the following funding:

For the **interim period** where the old and new surveys run in parallel:

Commissioned research, existing NRUSS	£320,000
Commissioned research, new RUS	£320,000
2 x staff member Band D	£130,000
Publication costs	£20,000
Total each year of parallel running	£790,000

Long-term after NRUSS is discontinued:

Commissioned research, new RUS	£320,000
1 x staff member Band D	£65,000
Publication costs	£10,000
Total per annum	£395,000

The above figures assume:

- NRUSS can be delivered for broadly the same as Highways England currently pay – a contingency of 20% against price inflation has however been assumed
- New RUSS tenders result in costs in line with soundings taken of four agencies and assuming 20,000 completed responses per annum (20,000 being the minimum acceptable

¹ ie **OFFICIAL/SENSITIVE**: plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / MANAGEMENT-STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

number to provide meaningful disaggregated data)

- Two staff members at Band D will be required in the Insight team in the period of dual-running to oversee the contracts and production of research publications, reducing to one after the NRUSS is discontinued
- We agree with Highways England what is a reasonable level of reporting to provide free of charge, with requirements above that being chargeable products

For avoidance of doubt, funding for piloting elements of 'new RUSS' within the 2015/16 financial year will come from the existing road user budget.

2. Recommendations / decision required

The board is asked to note our intention to:

- Hold discussions with DfT as a matter of urgency about confirming a budget of up to £395k for Transport Focus to take responsibility for the existing NRUSS from April 2016 (£320k commissioned research, £65k staffing, £10k publications)
- Prepare tender documentation to procure continuation of the existing NRUSS from April 2016 so that paperwork is 'ready to go' as soon as discussions about the £395k are successfully concluded
- Start discussions about supplementary funding of up to a further £395k per annum (taking the total to £790k) to allow new RUSS to run in parallel with NRUSS until all parties are confident about comparability between them

Would the board please also note that it may be necessary, subject to successful funding discussions, to request your authority to proceed with procurement of a research agency before your next meeting in September. Any papers will be circulated by email. This is to reduce the risk to seamless transfer of NRUSS from Highways England to Transport Focus on 1 April 2016.

3. Further details

The funding that Transport Focus estimates is required to operate 'new RUSS' on the basis outlined is £255,000 less than Highways England currently pays its supplier to deliver the NRUSS and the ARUSS (Area Road User Satisfaction Survey – which will not transfer to us and which Highways England intends to discontinue). However, the sum we estimate will be required for the period of parallel running exceeds what Highways England currently pay their agency by £145,000. Given the expected squeeze on non-capital expenditure by DfT, this may be problematic. Therefore we will explore the potential for efficiencies in the figures assumed, including options to minimise the period of parallel running.

4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing

Although not certain, there are potential TUPE considerations if work moves from Highways England to Transport Focus.

5. Background information

Description	Web Link
2013/14 National Road User Satisfaction Survey	Click here

6. Equalities screen

Sometimes, an equalities impact assessment (EIA) is required for a given report, proposal or project. To help decide whether an EIA is required, a screen must be undertaken based on the information provided above. The screen seeks answers to four questions which are used to determine impact on the protected characteristics – major, minor or none (default). Please choose the correct impact value and, if **major**, link it to an explanation below.

Gender	Age	Sexual orient'n	Disability	Marital status	Political belief	Religious belief	Racial group
1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?							
None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None
4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?							
					None	None	None

Summary of **major** impacts

1	
2	
3	
4	

Conclusion (the board's consideration of this paper may result in a change of conclusion)

Based on the information above, and having regard to the guidance below, the sponsor and author of this paper agree that (✓)	
(a) A full equalities impact assessment is not required	✓
(b) A full equalities impact assessment is not required at this time but the impact values above suggest the matter should be kept under view during the lifetime of the project	
(c) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed during the lifetime of the project	
(d) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed immediately	
Please provide a brief explanation of why you have arrived at this conclusion	
<p><i>The proposal has little no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations and / or is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.</i></p>	

Guidance for reaching conclusions (please delete this page after completing the screen above)

Indicator	Likely conclusion	Explanation of how conclusion derived
-----------	-------------------	---------------------------------------

The overwhelming majority of impact values are 'none'	(a) A full equalities impact assessment is not required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has little no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations. • The proposal is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.
The overwhelming majority of impact values are 'none' or 'minor'	(b) A full equalities impact assessment is not required at this time but the impact values above suggest the matter should be kept under review during the lifetime of the project / proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible; • The proposal, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
There are a good sprinkling of 'major' impact values among the rest	(c) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed during the lifetime of the project / proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible; • The proposal, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures; • Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the proposal are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people; • By amending the proposal there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
There are a significant number of 'major' impact values among the rest	a) A full equalities impact assessment is required and should be completed immediately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is significant in terms of its strategic importance or cost; • Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them; • Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged; • Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities; • The proposal is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;