

PROJECT WORKBOOK

[Click HERE for the guidance](#)

PROJECT TITLE	Hinksey blockade research
PROJECT SPONSOR	David Sidebottom
PROJECT MANAGER	Keith Bailey/Nina Howe
WORKPLAN/BUSINESS PLAN CATEGORY	C DfT FUNDED FROM PROGRAMME BUDGETS
PROJECT CODE	R75

[Click HERE for the guidance](#)

PROJECT TITLE	Hinksey blockade research
PROJECT SPONSOR	David Sidebottom
PROJECT MANAGER	Keith Bailey/Nina Howe
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	Not directly related to a Transport Focus Aim
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	C DfT FUNDED FROM PROGRAMME BUDGETS
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Passenger Team/GWR DA budget



PROJECT BRIEF FOR APPROVAL

A PROJECT SUMMARY

The research seeks to monitor changes in passenger behaviour occasioned by major engineering possessions extending over a number of weeks - what do they do during the blockade and what do they do subsequently? Is there any long-term loss of passengers who experience other routes/modes during the work and do not return? The project is also an opportunity to work with 'big data' (derived from mobile phone signals) and explore its potential value to us and the industry. The project outcomes can have substantial benefit to TOCs and NR in understanding the impact of possessions. However, care will have to be taken that Transport Focus does not maintain involvement with any extension of the project to monitor potential abstraction of GWR passengers from Oxford when Chiltern extends its operation through from Oxford Parkway to Oxford.

B MEASURABLE OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT: Please list the top three ONLY. These will be used to assess project performance

B1	The project successfully identifies users of the Oxford-Didcot rail corridor and tracks their travel behaviour during and after the works
B2	The project provides insight into the long-term loss of passengers from disruptive engineering possessions
B3	We gain worthwhile learnings on the benefits, opportunities and considerations in using 'big data'

C OPPORTUNITY COSTS: what are the consequences of not doing the project or not doing it now?

The project has to be conducted in parallel with a planned major possession and Hinksey has so many alternative travel possibilities that a similar opportunity is unlikely to arise for some time. If it goes ahead, the work will use GWR's DA budget which may otherwise be lost. There are limited opportunities to assess 'big data'.

D COST: what is the total cost of the project, including VAT? Costs you provide will be used to assess project performance.

£ 108,000

Please tick the relevant VAT status (Please discuss with a member of the Resources Team for clarification)

☐ This project is subject to accounting for VAT

☒ This project is outside of the scope for VAT accounting. Eg Grant in Aid funded work

Breakdown of Total Project costs

Description	Cost
Telefonica data analysis (exact cost unknown at this stage; tbc)	100,000
Report writing (to present data in a usable format for TF purposes)	5,000
Publication costs	3,000

Funding

Third Parties	Direct payment to supplier	Payment to Transport Focus	Additional Management Fee
GWR (DA budget)	100,000		
Total Third Party Funding	100,000	0	
Grant in aid funded		8,000	

Total Project Cost 108,000

Total Funding 108,000

Total MF 0

Surplus £ -

E COST PROFILE: Please show when costs to be borne by Transport Focus are likely to become due for payment

Financial year 2015-16	8,000.00
Financial year 2016-17	
Financial year 2017-18	
Total	8,000.00

Further and more detailed information regarding costings can be found on the separate Cost Profile tab in the Workbook

F PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS: please indicate which of our stakeholders have an interest in this project, and to what extent

GWR	Agree
Network Rail	Brief
DfT	Gen interest
ORR	Gen interest

Other TOCs	Gen interest
HE	Gen interest

G OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN: Transport Focus projects have ten key stages. Please provide milestone month-end dates for those shown (eg Mar-16 means the end of March 2016). These will be used in assessing project performance

PRE-PROJECT	Date
KS1 Conceptual	
KS2 Workplan priority	

IN-PROJECT	Date
KS3 Project brief in development	
KS4 project brief approved: project live	Jul-16
KS5 Project complete: with PIT/Comms	Nov-16
KS6 Project complete: awaiting publication / closure	
KS7 Project published / closed	Jan-17

POST-PROJECT	Date
KS8 Review awaiting sign-off	Jan-17
KS9 Review signed off by MT	
KS10 Outcomes / lessons logged	

H PROJECT RISKS what are the top 3 project risks and how will you mitigate their potential impact?

#	Description of risk	RAG	Mitigating measures in place / planned	Res RAG
1	Costs obtained from Telefonica are untenable	MEDIUM	Cancel project	LOW
2	Tracking rail users' alternative routes proves unfeasible	MEDIUM	None; is of itself a worthwhile finding	MEDIUM
3	GWR reluctant to publish results	LOW	Agree JWA in advance; avoid any involvement with monitoring Chiltern abstraction once they open to Oxford	LOW

I IMPACT ANALYSIS: once you have completed your impact analysis, please select your conclusions from the drop down list

Equalities impact assessment screen

A: an EIA screen has been completed and a full EIA is not required

Privacy impact assessment screen

B: a full PIA is not required but the matter should be kept under review

Other teams impacted by this project and extent of pre-project planning (KS2) for collaboration:

Team	Extent of involvement	Pre-project cross team work planning	Date of discussion
Chief Executives Team	Not very much	We've had outline discussions about it	17/06/2016
Communications Team	Not very much	We've had outline discussions about it	22/06/2016
Finance Team	Not very much	We've had outline discussions about it	22/06/2016

PROJECT TITLE	Hinksey blockade research
PROJECT SPONSOR	David Sidebottom
PROJECT MANAGER	Keith Bailey/Nina Howe
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	Not directly related to a Transport Focus Aim
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	C DFT FUNDED FROM PROGRAMME BUDGETS
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Passenger Team/GWR DA budget



PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCREEN

Some projects require a privacy impact assessment to assess the possibility of an impact on the privacy of individuals. Most, however, do not.

All projects are therefore screened to check that a full PIA is not required. Where it is, you should raise the matter with the **Senior Information Risk Owner**.

Step 1: Data flow mapping

Data Source	Purpose of flow	Data sensitivity	Frequency	Volume	Key stakeholders involved	Method of flow	Data risk
Industry / operators	Consultation	Sensitive: personal protect	Ad Hoc	High	Telefonica	mail: no protection	LOW

Step 2: Sensitive personal data

Does ANY flow of data include sensitive personal data as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998?	No
If you have answered yes, probably or possibly to the previous question please confirm you have the informed consent of the data subject to use their sensitive personal data	No

Step 3: Further questions to help determine the scope for privacy breach or data handling failure

			Please comment if you are unable to answer 'no'
A	Does the project involve IT hardware or software that has substantial potential for privacy intrusion?	Yes	Mobile phone signal data tracking data subjects movements
B	Does the project involve the intrusive identification of individuals or 'data subjects'?	No	
C	Might the project have the effect of changing current personal anonymity arrangements	Yes	Data subject's identity is unknown but his/her movements/behaviours are tracked
D	Does the project involve multiple, complex, organisations where data protection might be problematic?	No	
E	Does the project involve new or significantly changed methods of data handling?	Yes	Data subject's identity is unknown but his/her movements/behaviours are tracked
F	Does the project involve changing the way we handle multiple records of personal data in datasets / datab	No	
G	Does the project involve new or significantly changed handling of personal data from a large number of pe	No	
H	Does the project involve new or significantly changed configuration of personal data from personal source	No	
I	Is the project likely to impact on public security measures?	No	
J	Does the project involve the systematic disclosure of personal data to, or access by, third parties that are not subject to any kind of privacy regulation? Regulation may include, but is not limited to, The MRS Code of Conduct or a Data Sharing Agreement concluded with Transport Focus.	No	

Step 4: Conclusion

Based on the information you have thought through above, you now need to determine where there is a need for a privacy impact assessment for this project.

Select the most appropriate statement on your project brief. Remember, on considering the brief for approval, Management Team may change your statement!

PROJECT TITLE	Hinksey blockade research
PROJECT SPONSOR	David Sidebottom
PROJECT MANAGER	Keith Bailey/Nina Howe
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	Not directly related to a Transport Focus Aim
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	C DfT FUNDED FROM PROGRAMME BUDGETS
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Passenger Team/GWR DA budget



EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCREEN

Step 1: please complete the following screen by selecting options from the drop down list. It is very easy just to select 'no' but please think carefully. Your answers may be scrutinised in the event of any audit of our compliance with the Equalities Act. All answers are **mandatory**.

Gender	Age	Sexuality	Disability	Marital status	Political belief	Religion	Racial group
--------	-----	-----------	------------	----------------	------------------	----------	--------------

1. Is there likely to be an impact on opportunity for those groups of people who may be affected by this project?

No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equity of opportunity among people of these groups?

No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

3. Is the project likely to impact on good relations between people of the following groups?

					No	No	No
--	--	--	--	--	----	----	----

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of the following groups?

					No	No	No
--	--	--	--	--	----	----	----

If you have answered 'yes' or 'probably' in response to any of the above, please provide details below of what you might do in pursuit of our duty to do *something*

Step 2: Conclusion

Based on the information you have thought through above, you now need to determine where there is a need for an equalities impact assessment for this project.

Select the most appropriate statement on your project brief. Remember, on considering the brief for approval, Management Team may change your statement!

PROJECT TITLE	Hinksey blockade research
PROJECT SPONSOR	David Sidebottom
PROJECT MANAGER	Keith Bailey/Nina Howe
SENSITIVE?	No: the contents of this brief are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	Not directly related to a Transport Focus Aim
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	C DfT FUNDED FROM PROGRAMME BUDGETS
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Passenger Team/GWR DA budget



FROM MICHELLE CALVERT, BUSINESS SERVICES EXECUTIVE

PROJECT AUTHORISATION NOTIFICATION (PAN)

1 Management Team considered this project brief on

27/06/2016

2 Management Team's consideration of this project was

Approved subject to the qualifications set out below

QUALIFICATIONS OR REASONS FOR NON APPROVAL

This project brief must now go to the Board for further approval due to the total budget cost being over £75,000.

3 Costs are reconfirmed as follows

Breakdown of Total Project costs

Description	Cost
Telefonica data analysis (exact cost unknown at this stage; tbc)	100,000
Report writing (to present data in a usable format for TF purposes)	5,000
Publication costs	3,000

Total Project Cost **108,000**

Funding

Third Parties	Direct payment to supplier	Payment to Transport Focus	Additional Management Fee
GWR (DA budget)	100,000		
Total Third Party Funding	100,000	0	
Grant in aid funded		8,000	

Total Funding **108,000**

Total MF **0**

Surplus **£ -**

4 Management team reviewed the **risks** you identified and made any comments as follows:

5 Management team reviewed your **impact assessments** and has either reconfirmed them or changed them as follows:

Equalities impact assessment screen

A: an EIA screen has been completed and a full EIA is not required

Privacy impact assessment screen

B: a full PIA is not required but the matter should be kept under review

6 **Regular in-project reviews are required** by this framework as approved by Audit & Risk Assurance Committee.

Based on the estimated life cycle of this project you are **required** to report project progress to me **Monthly**

Where project progress reports are monthly or less often, your report must be completed (and I must be notified) **no later than the Monday before the monthly MT meeting**

7 **Project code:** I have assigned the following project code to this project **R75**

This code will be used by the Resources team to allocate budget and record costs, and you should use this code in all communications with the team.

8 **Board approval:** The value of this project (or otherwise the extent to which it may be regarded as novel or contentious) means it **must now be** sent to the board for final approval

9 This PAN is made under the authority of Management Team based on its delegated authority from the Board e-signed by:

X

Michelle Calvert
Business Services Executive

Michelle Calvert 29/06/2016