

| |
|---------------------------|
| Board |
| Record of approval |



| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| If confidential, protective marking¹ | Official/Sensitive: Commercial |
| Out of meeting paper reference | BRD1617-07 |
| When circulated | 27 July 2016 |
| Circulated by | Michelle Calvert |
| Report Title | E78 – Nexus research project |
| Sponsor | Ian Wright |
| Author(s) | Louise Coward |

Responses by Board Members

| From | Reference | Comments, if any |
|-------------------|------------------|---|
| Jeff Halliwell | A | |
| Philip Mendelsohn | A/L | |
| Marian Lauder | B | <p>It's still a B from me as I wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>Given that we have had to seek clarification of the funding position on a number of recent projects I think some thought should be given to reviewing the project book format to make it more intuitive to complete as this seems to have been a hurdle for a number of staff. Similarly, we should consider providing staff with internal training sessions on how to complete the documentation when seeking project approvals. That would be preferable to each member of staff having a separate briefing from Shahid.</p> |
| Bob Linnard | B | I agree with others' comments so B. |
| Paul Rowen | B | Mine is now a B and I totally agree with Marions suggestion re training for staff on completing the relevant information. |
| Isabel Liu | B | Mine is a B, agreeing with Marian and Stephen's comments. I realise we've been moving the goal posts with each pass of each project proposal. Each one has prompted more thinking among staff, BIG and the board on how our labour time should be costed and priced and more work toward standardised tables which will be |

¹ ie RESTRICTED plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|
| | | consistent and easier for staff and approvers. A project like this is also an opportunity to give substantive consideration to risks and mitigants and equality / accessibility impacts. The nature of the project and client is very good for Transport Focus and I'm pleased to see the Nexus' enthusiasm. |
| Theo de Pencier | A | I can now get my head around this very worthwhile project. Slightly ramshackle documentation but as Michelle says we are getting used to a new approach. Once I understood the margin detail it seems clear to me that this is not only a worthwhile project but should be able to deliver a solid return. So it is an A from me. |
| Stuart Burgess | A | |
| Diane McCrea | A/L | |
| Stephen Locke | B | With the benefit of the extra information, I am happy to give this a B. I agree with Marion that more thought needs to be given from the outset about how these pro format are completed. The issues may be familiar to staff but we as non-exec Board members are often seeing proposals for the first time. Any training could usefully include risk assessments and mitigations, as well as key financials and equalities impacts. |

Key to references

A: Yes, I am content

B: Yes, I am content but would like to make one or more points for the record (please set these out in your email)

C: I need more information to reach a decision (please indicate what further information you require)

D: No, I am not content (please explain why not)

A/L: annual leave or otherwise no response

S: project or paper sponsor

Business Services record

| | |
|--|--|
| Responses recorded by | Michelle Calvert |
| Decision reached | Approved |
| Feedback to sponsor and author (date) | 03/08/2016 |
| Date this record complete and uploaded to Connect | 03/08/2016 |
| Signature |  |

Signed

_____ J Halliwell

Jeff Halliwell, Chair of Transport Focus

_____ 9/8/16

Date