


Board	
Record of approval	
	
If confidential, protective marking¹	
Out of meeting paper reference	BRD1617-05
When circulated	05/07/2016
Circulated by	Jon Carter
Report Title	81R Tram Passenger Survey (TPS) – Wave 4: Autumn 2016
Sponsor	David Sidebottom
Author(s)	Robert Pain

Responses by Board Members

From	Reference	Comments, if any
Jeff Halliwell	A/L	
Philip Mendelsohn	B	<p>1. The clear need to identify, somewhere in our work plan, the excellent forward looking work that David is leading to enable the TPS to exist in some form in the future.</p> <p>2. Whilst it is appreciated staff are busy coming back to the Board at such short notice puts any board member minded to not approve in an invidious position.</p> <p>3. I believe that SPT may also be interested in the Emotional Tracker for the Glasgow Subway and this too could be part of any makeover (as with the T&W Metro). I think Robert and Douglas are pursuing.</p>
Marian Lauder	B	It's a B from me as well, reflecting Stephen's point about the need for our future discussions on the TPS.
Bob Linnard	B	I agree with Stephen's comments, so B from me too.
Paul Rowen	A	David has done an excellent job in making the outcomes and the risks much clearer.
Isabel Liu	B	<p>I have some information points which do not affect my B response:</p> <p>1. I just realised that I'd been mis-reading the total project cost, thinking we have £55,500 in costs and £70,500 in funding. Actually we have £55,500 + £70,500 = £126,000 in project costs and we receive an inflow of £1,000 management fee from Edinburgh. I think we should be thinking about this, and all our projects, as Sources and Uses of funding for the project, capturing flows for the project both within and outside our financial accounts. This will also make it clear how much funding is coming from Transport Focus' own coffers (and which) and where uses can be cut back or expanded if there are shortfalls or additions to sources of funding. (Also unless the £43,000 from TfGM, Centro and Blackpool is coming all-or-nothing in one lump sum, we should break out each client individually.)</p>

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

		SOURCES		USES	
		Edinburgh – mgmt fee		Edinburgh	
		Edinburgh – agency funding			
		TfGM – agency funding		TfGM	
		Centro – agency funding		Centro	
		Blackpool – agency funding		Blackpool	
		Nottingham – agency funding?		Nottingham	
		SYPTe – agency funding?		SYPTe	
		DfT Core grant		Agency fees	
				Comms design	
				Briefing event	
				Contingency – 5%	
		TOTAL SOURCES	£XX,XXX	TOTAL USES	£XX,XXX
				NET SURPLUS / SHORTFALL	(there may or may not be, as the £1,000 management fee may or may not cover our time and resource costs)
		<p>2. I recognise there has been a tradition of co-funding from our supporting clients coming in the form of direct payment to the research agency, and perhaps for financial control /payment processing reasons this has been the easiest way for local authorities. However, we should endeavour to have co-funders pay Transport Focus as the supplier, and Transport Focus be the procurer/ prime contractor / quality controller / message maker / value adder of the underlying works done by research agencies or other sub-contractors. We at Transport Focus have the relationship with local transport authority / operator stakeholders. We're the ones (eg people like David and Douglas) doing the very hard work of business development generating contracts for the research agencies. We're the ones with research specification and quality control experience. We don't want to make it easy for agencies to work directly with our clients without us.</p>			

		3. We have to face whether we can afford the "free loading" by Sheffield & Nottingham and how to address it with a mutually satisfactory solution or dropping them if they do not co-fund. What is the timing for this, ie how far into the project would we be before we conclude whether Sheffield & Nottingham are included or not?
Theo de Pencier	B	I just feel we need to make time to really discuss the value of TPS to Transport Focus and to tram users and operators in advance of 2017/18. I particular I feel that we should have an agreed approach to " free loading " - by such as Sheffield and Nottingham to date - that weighs up the merits of wider participation against funding and reputation issues with other participants.
Stuart Burgess	B	B for me for reasons already mentioned
Diane McCrea	B	I agree with comments supporting option B.
Stephen Locke	B	My main concern is a governance one. The best option, including the one-year OJEU tender , seems pretty clear in this case. In particular I strongly support continuation of the TPS as part of our multi-modal suite of research - so it has a value as an input to general transport policy as well as to tram users and operators. But we need to be careful to ensure that future decisions of this kind are open to effective scrutiny and challenge. I agree with Philip that a one day email turnaround is not ideal. It is likely that any future waves of TPS research will require some significant strategic decisions by Transport Focus. We need to ensure that there is adequate and timeous collective discussion when the time comes.

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)	08/07/2016
Date this record complete and uploaded to Connect	08/07/2016
Signature	

Signed

Jeff Halliwell, Chair of Transport Focus

Date