Board Meeting Paper	
Nov 17 BM D 2.2	
Purpose of report	☒ Decision[1] ☐ Discussion / debate ☐ Information only[2]
Sensitive Information?	☐ Yes ☒ No

If sensitive, protective marking[3]	
Date of Meeting	14 November 2017
Agenda Item	D 2.2
Report Title	N80 – Continuous NRPS change request
Sponsor	Ian Wright
Author(s)	Ian Wright

1. Summary

We have been running a continuous NRPS, also including a small mystery shopping exercise, for the EA franchise on behalf of the DfT since the start of the Franchise (Oct. 16). This is a trial for the DfT of a new way of franchise monitoring – as the Board are aware, most franchise monitoring simply uses the existing two waves of NRPS. Given the nature of the survey, it is run by the NRPS supplier, and was included in the new contract with Chime. The project/agreement with DfT was initially set up to run until the end of January 2017 due to the fact we were retendering the NRPS, and so it was uncertain who the NRPS contractor would be from thereon, nor what impact this may have had on costs.

This paper is to update the board on costs for the sake of project governance now that the agency and costs have been confirmed. The board have in effect already agreed to the cost from Chime via approval of the current NRPS contract earlier this year. The original project, due to its short duration, did not meet the threshold for Board approval, whereas the project now does pass that threshold.

BDRC ran the EA boost for 4 rail periods (16 October 2016-4 February 2017) at a total cost to the DfT of £77,940 inc. VAT comprising:

£74,940 agency cost (3 periods of survey, 4 periods of mystery shop)

£3,000 TF management fee (£1000 set up, and 4x £500 fee per period)

The Chime cost for a year is £169, 153 Inc. VAT, to which we shall add £500 fee per rail period (i.e. £6,500 per year).

2. Recommendations / decision required

The Board approve the project change request due to the revised costs.

3. Further details

Due to the long lead in time for the franchise, the details of the project were agreed some time ago when the standard Transport Focus charging mechanism was the management fee, set at £500 per wave/rail period, after the initial set up period.

It is intended that the continuous survey runs for the duration of the Franchise (nine years), and so costs will need to be revisited whenever the NRPS is retendered.

In order that we do not have two NRPS-type surveys running at the same time for EA, the main NRPS data is used for 4 rail periods of the year to monitor the franchise, thus the boost survey

[1] If a decision is required, or you are asking for the paper to be formally noted, please set this out in section 2
[2] If for information only, please make clear in section 1 **why** this information is being provided
[3] ie **OFFICIAL/SENSITIVE**: plus COMMERCIAL / POLICY / MANAGEMENT-STAFF / PERSONAL PROTECT

runs for 9 rail periods of the year. The mystery shop runs for all 13 rail periods per year.
4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing
Financial- direct costs and management fee are covered by the DfT, via a Joint Project Agreement Risk – Damage to our reputation with the DfT if we did not continue run the survey as agreed Legal – covered by contract with Chime and Agreement with DfT Staffing – Managed by NRPS project manager, small amount of time covered by management fee
5. Background information

Description	**Web Link**

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	

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	
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.	