

Board
Record of approval
If confidential, protective marking¹
Out of meeting paper reference
When circulated
Circulated by
Report Title
Sponsor
Author(s)



BRD1617-13
27/01/2017
Michelle Calvert
R97 - Surface access to airports
Ian Wright
Louise Coward

Responses by Board Members

From	Reference	Comments, if any
Jeff Halliwell		
Philip Mendelsohn	D	<p>First overall this is a much better standard submission than many we have seen lately, however there remains some room for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the main document (p3) the costs are shown "bare" however in the costing sheet includes add ins for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to overheads £2,060 Contributions to central services £2,640 Margin £10,935 Why the difference and as this is discretionary core funded can make these recoveries? As this is core funded we are not charging anyone VAT, but we still pay VAT to our suppliers. In the workbook it is not clear that VAT to suppliers is included. Suggest that VAT on third party work is shown explicitly in breakdown in Section D and that the heading of Section D is revised to say something like: "what is the total cost of the project, including VAT on third party supplies?" The risks seem to me to miss some key ones, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership working (as opposed to the listed "disagreement about ownership"); The fact that ~90% of the project is subcontracted so are we sure we can manage it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On this point are our resources adequate? As to the risks listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is "1" really a risk, if we think it is important and use the results to either praise or challenge industry is that not enough given our role and responsibilities? To my mind none of the mitigation measures are actually mitigations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the case of Risk 3 – surely we must have a written agreement in place before we start work.

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Impact Analysis the “not very much” against the Communications team is at odds with the ongoing message about the need from comms to do a lot of work on our publications. This is especially true if we think we are trying to market a new product. Is the comms team budget adequate?
Marian Lauder	D	
Bob Linnard	C	<p>C from me as I do have some questions.</p> <p>The project brief says that we want to do some research on coach passengers and it appears to be that which has inspired this proposal. But the project seems to be about all surface access to airports. I'm not clear what the objective is. If we want to know about coach passengers, this is not the way to do it, as airports are a peculiar destination. We'd need a much broader sample.</p> <p>Elsewhere, the brief says that we want to understand why people travel to airports in the way they do. Why does TF need to understand that? What use are we likely to make of the information?</p> <p>The expansion proposals by Heathrow and Gatwick airports, and the Airports Commission's interim and final reports, contained a lot of material on surface access. Has someone reviewed that material to make sure that we are not going over old ground?</p> <p>Finally, I note that this was approved by the Management Team on 28 November and has then, two months later, come for Board approval with a view to trying to spend some of the money this financial year. I'm afraid that adds to my unease.</p>
Paul Rowen	C	<p>Mine would be a C – I think it is very timely to look at transport to airport building on the work of others but I do think the project brief needs to be sharpened building on the comments made by colleagues made earlier.</p> <p>I have wanted us to do a proper “coach survey “ for some time and have been disappointed at the industries unwillingness to contribute. If this acts as a push for them then I would welcome it.</p>
Isabel Liu	D	
Theo de Pencier	D	<p>It's a D from me I am afraid.</p> <p>I cannot get my head around spending £100k+ of anyone's money on Coach passenger access to Airports.</p> <p>The points are well made by Bob and Stephen around the plethora of data available on modal access to airports in different reports. Access to airports is an old chestnut (as is access to Ports for road users at least) and if the management team feel that a look at the existing data to decide whether there is something here that fits in with our existing remit or could be a potential extension of our remit I can understand the motivation. Surely though a desk exercise to look at existing material would be the sensible start point and at a fraction of the cost proposed here however you undertook it.</p>
Stuart Burgess	B	<p>B from me</p> <p>I share some of Bob's concerns and also how the research is carried out and how it adds value to TF</p>

Diane McCrea	A	Thank you, this looks very interesting.
Stephen Locke	C	<p>I'm afraid it's a C from me too, borderline D. I agree with all Bob's concerns. I seriously doubt how useful it would be to look at coach access to airports in isolation. For many travellers, access to airports is a matter of choices between different modes. We would be much more constructive looking at all the options for accessing Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton, Manchester etc from different points of the compass, and identifying obvious gaps and shortcomings.</p> <p>I assume, further, that access from destinations within and around London is excluded from our proposed study. This raises very different issues which as you may recall were analysed in some detail in London TravelWatch's September 2014 report:</p> <p>http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3894&filed=file</p> <p>At very least this should be referenced in any proposal on this topic, and London TravelWatch should be consulted on the research design. The CAA have since been looking at a number of surface access issues from a competition standpoint, and they too will have an interest.</p> <p>Finally, I think there are some big, and sufficiently strategic, issues here that would warrant Board discussion.</p>

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

Business Services record

Responses recorded by	Michelle Calvert
Decision reached	Not Approved
Feedback to sponsor and author (date)	08/02/2017
Date this record complete and uploaded to Connect	08/02/2017
Signature	