PROJECT WORKBOOK

Click HERE for the guidance

PROJECT TITLE	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
WORKPLAN/BUSINESS PLAN FUNDING CATEGORY	**A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO**
PROJECT CODE	**24B**

PROJECT TITLE	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	2. Making a difference for tomorrow's transport user
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Roads
PROJECT CODE	24B

transportfocus

PROJECT BRIEF FOR APPROVAL

GUIDANCE IS IN GREY

PROJECT INFORMATION

This project represents the mobilisation phase of the Strategic Roads User Survey (SRUS) which will replace the National Road Users' Satisfaction Survey (NRUSS). This follows the development and piloting work completed within seven previous SRUS projects [now under review and/or closed] which were managed by Brigitta Horup [14D, D39, D50, D63, D70, D73] and Jordan Sargeant [B50/D50]. This new project will involve a number of separate activities required to ensure SRUS starts operating on 1 April 2018. Those envisaged at the outset are:

1. Off-line version of the interactive map. The interactive map is an important component of SRUS, due to begin on 1 April 2018. It will be used to identify last journey on the strategic road network and to gain specific geographical data for the purpose of analysis and reporting.

There is a requirement to replicate the online interactive map that was used in the SRUS pilot to an offline format. This is because SRUS will be a bespoke, face-to-face survey for the foreseeable future. The map that was developed for the online survey cannot be used for a face-to-face survey due to the lack of options for connectivity – it would take too long or respondents may refuse to connect to WiFi and connectivity using dongles is unreliable. There is an alternative of paper maps, but the interactive map is a far superior option due to the geographic detail it can capture.

2. Demographic profiling. There is currently no reliable information available relating to the demographic profile other than what Transport Focus have obtained through the SRUS pilot. It is possible to obtain more accurate data via a Random Probability Omnibus, and it has been agreed that this project will cover the investigation via this option - the objective is to inform set quotas on main stage SRUS survey, and this is currently being investigated with two suppliers [Office of National Statistics [ONS] & NatCen] with a view to offering the tender to one.

3. Independent advice. It should also be noted that within the remit of the previous SRUS projects, we have used an expert at Real Research to compile a summary report of the results from all the SRUS pilots, both online and face to face. It is very likely that we will require the services of Real Research once again during the lifecycle of this project. However, we do not foresee this to be for a significant length of time. Note that any additional work we require from this agency will be cited/requested via a project change or one-off spend, whichever is appropriate.

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

B1	A tool to accurately record the last journey taken by respondents on the strategic road network. Last journey is the basis of the survey.
B2	Enables an interviewer to quickly identify last journey. The process needs to be quick to maximise the number of daily interviews and, in turn, overall sample size (a key objective of SRUS is to increase sample size from NRUSS).
B3	Passes details of the journey back to the survey for analysis e.g. the Highways England areas and regions that respondents travelled through and the parts of the SRN they travelled on.
B4	The output from the subject matter expert at Real Research proves to be the expert opinion needed to feed into the project

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

If we do not complete the work required with Real Research, we are at risk of not having our view of SRUS made visable and therefore do not build on Stakeholder confidence in this area.

A SEPARATE COSTINGS WORKBOOK WILL BE PROVIDED FOR ALL NEW PROJECTS. THIS MUST BE COMPLETED AND FORWARDED TO THE CORPORATE SERVICES TEAM ALONGSIDE THE PROJECT BRIEF PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO MT/BOARD FOR APPROVAL

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

Financial year 2017-18	**£178,056**
Financial year 2018-19	
Financial year 2019-20	
Total	**£178,056**

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

DfT	Agree	SGG	Agree		
ORR	Consult	Transport Focus Board	Agree		
Highways England	Consult				
Road User Panel	Consult				

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	**Sep-17**
KS5	Project complete: with PIT/Comms	**Mar-18**
KS6	Project complete: awaiting publication / closure	
KS7	Project published / closed	**Mar-18**

POST-PROJECT		**Date**
KS8	Review awaiting sign-off	**Apr-18**
KS9	Review signed off by MT	
KS10	Outcomes / lessons logged	

H PROJECT RISK ANALYSIS: please ensure project risks are shown within the separate risk assessment worksheet

I IMPACT ANALYSIS: once you have completed your EIA and PIA 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
A: a PIA screen has been completed and a full PIA is not required

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

Team	**Extent of involvement**	**Discussion Checklist**	Date of discussion
Stakeholder Managers	Some	Cross team working has been discussed/is in place for this piece	Aug-17
Insight team	Mission critical-deeply involved	Cross team working has been discussed/is in place for this piece	Aug-17
Communications team	Some	Guy and Sara have discussion pending about what the public-facing outputs will look like	Oct-17
Corporate Services	Some	Corporate Service: Have been made aware, have provided and/or have provided assistance in creating project/costings documentation	Aug-17
Policy Team and/or Advisors	Some	Guy Dangerfield will act as policy advisor for this project	Aug-17

[Pre MT/Board submission for project approval]

Project brief and associated documents created, submitted and reviewed

	Role	**Name**	**Signature**	**Date**
1	Project manager [create and submit]	Brigitta Horup	BH	03-Oct-17
2	Project sponsor [review]	Guy Dangerfield	GD	03-Oct-17

PROJECT TITLE	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	2. Making a difference for tomorrow's transport user
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Roads
PROJECT CODE	24B

All projects require assessment of risk <u>at the outset</u> to identify items which may cause the project to fail

Risk assessment - table A below contains descriptions and accompanying examples for each type of risk.
Please complete table B with risks which are specific to your project

Table A - risk examples

Type	Description	Risk examples
Reputational	Risk that supplier/partner may lose confidence in TF to deliver work on their behalf	Late delivery of results/comms
Operational	Risk of loss due to improper process implementation, loack of resource availability	Priority conflicts, lack of resource availability, lack of training
Time/schedule	Risk key milestones/end date may not be met	Initial level of work underestimated, failure to identify 'drop dead' date in relation to partner/supplier
Budget	Costs exceed agreed budget	Scope expansion
External	Regulatory, market related	New, or changes to existing legislation
Scope	Project not properly defined and/or documented leading to 'scope creep'	Failure to identify Stakeholder requirement
Technical	Potential complexity of a proposed IT-based solution	Solution is too complication for passengers/drivers to use
Supplier/partner	Standard risk where there is involvement from any non-TF bodies	Support/funding reduced/withdrawn

Table B - project risks. Where the project does not hold a risk for a specific category, please enter 'N/A/ within the description field

Type	Description of project risk	Initial RAG	Mitigating measures in place / planned	Resulting RAG
Reputational	Failure to deliver SRUS on 1 April 2018 as promised	High	A clear timeline has been developed setting out what needs to happen when Regular internal project reviews are scheduled involving Brigitta Horup, Guy Dangerfield and Anne Kogan	Medium
Operational	A delay in any individual element of the project plan will impact on the ultimate launch date	High	A clear timeline has been developed setting out what needs to happen when Regular internal project reviews are scheduled involving Brigitta Horup, Guy Dangerfield and Anne Kogan	Medium
External	One of more of DfT, ORR and Highways England are sufficiently dissatisfied with SRUS that procurement must be delayed	Medium	Continue to engage closely with the other parties, in particular the DfT social research team, answering questions and reducing the risk of show-stoppers	Low
Technical	Research agencies are not prepared to install the Transport Focus/Beacon Dodsworth map on their hardware	Medium	Informal enquiries have suggested this will not be a problem, however until we actually tender we will not know	Low
Technical	The Transport Focus/Beacon Dodsworth map does not work/work properly on the successful agency's hardware	Medium	In our invitation to tender we will specify early testing to ensure any problems are identified early giving maximum time to resolve them	Low
Technical	Beacon Dodsworth availability to install the map on the succesful agency's hardware	Medium	Early discussions with Beacon Dodsworth about when this will need to happen and what will be involved	Low
Supplier/partner	Our main supplier does not work effectively with Beacon Dodsworth	Medium	As soon as main supplier appointed we will get the two parties talking and identifying what each needs the other to do	Low
Supplier/partner	Our inexperience of using the UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UKSBS) government-wide procurement framework results in delay in getting a supplier on board	High	Close engagement with UKSBS/Crown Commercial Service	Medium
Supplier/partner	Non-availability of key personnel at Real Research delays the programme	High	Identify when Real Research input will be required and discuss availability with them	Low

If there are any other risks which fall outside the categories above, or you believe there is a scenario which will present a positive future opportunity for Transport Focus, please describe below:

Risk register

The information above will be entered upon a centralised project risk register - note that the owner for the risk will be listed as the project manager, who will be required to review on a regular basis throughout the life of the project via the project progress review

PROJECT TITLE	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	2. Making a difference for tomorrow's transport user
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Roads
PROJECT CODE	24B

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
							LOW
							LOW
							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	

Step 3: Further questions to help determine the scope for privacy breach or data handling failure.
Please review the areas A - J below, and amend the response to 'Yes' where appropriate noting comments where described

			Please comment if the response is Yes
A	Does the project involve IT hardware or software that has substantial potential for privacy intrusion?	No	
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	No	
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?	No	
F	Does the project involve changing the way we handle multiple records of personal data in datasets / databases?	No	
G	Does the project involve new or significantly changed handling of personal data from a large number of people?	No	
H	Does the project involve new or significantly changed configuration of personal data from personal sources?	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	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	2. Making a difference for tomorrow's transport user
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Roads
PROJECT CODE	24B

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 equaity 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 oportunities 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 pusuit 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	SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT SPONSOR	Guy Dangerfield
PROJECT MANAGER	Brigitta Horup
SENSITIVE?	No: the project details / outcomes are publicly disclosable
TRANSPORT FOCUS AIM	2. Making a difference for tomorrow's transport user
WORK/BUS PLAN CATEGORY	A DfT CORE BUDGET MUST DO
WORKSTREAM OR PROGRAMME	Roads
PROJECT CODE	24B

Communications plan [to be completed by the project manager and the comms team, and submitted alongside the project brief]

All projects require assessment of the communications plan required to ensure the right key messages and target audiences are delivered/addressed

1) PROJECT OBJECTIVES [WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?]

This project represents the mobilisation phase of the Strategic Roads User Survey (SRUS) which will replace the National Road Users' Satisfaction Survey (NRUSS). This follows the development and piloting work completed within seven previous SRUS projects [now under review and/or closed] which were managed by Brigitta Horup [14D, D39, D50, D63, D70, D73] and Jordan Sargeant [B50/D50]. This new project will involve a number of separate activities required to ensure SRUS starts operating on 1 April 2018. Those envisaged at the outset are:

1. Off-line version of the interactive map. The interactive map is an important component of SRUS, due to begin on 1 April 2018. It will be used to identify last journey on the strategic road network and to gain specific geographical data for the purpose of analysis and reporting.

There is a requirement to replicate the online interactive map that was used in the SRUS pilot to an offline format. This is because SRUS will be a bespoke, face-to-face survey for the foreseeable future. The map that was developed for the online survey cannot be used for a face-to-face survey due to the lack of options for connectivity – it would take too long or respondents may refuse to connect to WiFi and connectivity using dongles is unreliable. There is an alternative of paper maps, but the interactive map is a far superior option due to the geographic detail it can capture.

2. Demographic profiling. There is currently no reliable information available relating to the demographic profile other than what Transport Focus have obtained through the SRUS pilot. It is possible to obtain more accurate data via a Random Probability Omnibus, and it has been agreed that this project will cover the investigation via this option - the objective is to inform set quotas on main stage SRUS survey, and this is currently being investigated with two suppliers [Office of National Statistics [ONS] & NatCen] with a view to offering the tender to one.

3. Independent advice. It should also be noted that within the remit of the previous SRUS projects, we have used an expert at Real Research to compile a summary report of the results from all the SRUS pilots, both online and face to face. It is very likely that we will require the services of Real Research once again during the lifecycle of this project. However, we do not foresee this to be for a significant length of time. Note that any additional work we require from this agency will be cited/requested via a project change or one-off spend, whichever is appropriate.

2) KEY MESSAGES [WHEN KNOWN]

3) TIMESCALES

4) PARTNERS - this should include requirements both from and on behalf of any partners involved

5) TARGET AUDIENCES

6) OUTPUTS - this can include reports, events, infographics, social media, boards to display the results, etc

7) COMMS ESTIMATE [£] & CODE

8) ADDL POINTS TO NOTE

TRANSPORT FOCUS
PROJECT COST AND FUNDING SUMMARY

PARTNER / CLIENT :
PROJECT NAME : SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT CODE : 24B

SUMMARY OF FUNDING AND COSTS FOR THE PROJECT

There is no funding from partners for this project.
Direct project costs of £178,056, and direct staff costs of £52,180, are funded by Transport Focus
Further comments on costs and funding:

ACTIVITIES FULLY OR PARTLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOCUS

Forecast costs	**Transport Focus £**	**Notes**
Freelance researcher and Other direct costs for project (including any irrecoverable VAT)	178,056	
Direct staff costs for project	52,180	

Proposed funding **Funding from partner(s)**	**Transport Focus £**	**Notes**
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
Total funding from partner(s)	**-**	
Transport Focus funding		
Transport Focus funding to for direct project costs	178,056	
Transport Focus funding for direct staff costs	52,180	
Total funding	**230,236**	

As a result of the additional funding this project will also contribute the following to the unallocated project budget		
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from overheads recovered	-	
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from margin	-	
Total contribution to the Unallocated project budget	-	

ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY PARTNERS

Forecast costs	**Partner(s) £**	**Notes**
Freelance researcher and Other direct costs for project (including any irrecoverable VAT)	-	
Direct staff costs for project	-	

Proposed funding **Funding from partner(s)**	**Partner(s) £**	**Notes**
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
Total funding from partner(s)	**-**	
Transport Focus funding		
Transport Focus funding to for direct project costs	-	
Transport Focus funding for direct staff costs	-	
Total funding	**-**	

As a result of the funding from partner(s) this project will also contribute the following to the unallocated project budget:		
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from overheads recovered	-	
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from margin	-	
Total contribution to the Unallocated project budget	-	

TRANSPORT FOCUS
COSTING SHEET
PARTNER / CLIENT :
PROJECT NAME : SRUS mobilisation
PROJECT CODE : 24B

All costs and funding should exclude VAT

SECTION 1 - PROJECT COSTS **Transport Focus - Staff cost details** **Staff name / Role**	**Role**	**Task or Activity**	**Transport Focus Days No**	**Partner(s) Days No**	**Daily rate £**	**Transport Focus Total costs £**	**Partner(s) Total costs £**	**Total costs £**	**Notes**
Brigitta Horup	Senior insight advisor	Project Manager	149.0		270	40,230	-	40,230	Period 1 Aug 2017-31 Mar 2018 @ 90% [100% approx. 166 days]
Guy Dangerfield	Director	Project Sponsor	10.0		540	5,400	-	5,400	
Ian Wright	Director		10.0		540	5,400	-	5,400	
Kieran Watkins	Executive		5.0		230	1,150	-	1,150	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
					-	-	-	-	
Total Transport Focus staff costs			174.0	-	300	52,180	-	52,180	
Direct cost details (excl VAT) **Freelance researchers**			**Days No**	**Days No**	**Daily rate £**	**Total costs £**	**Total costs £**	**Total costs £**	
						-	-	-	
						-	-	-	
						-	-	-	
						-	-	-	
						-	-	-	
Total freelance researcher costs			-		-	-	-	-	
Other direct cost details (excl VAT)			**Units No**	**Units No**	**Unit Cost £**	**Total costs £**	**Total costs £**	**Total costs £**	
Research agency cost - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
Research agency costs - Partner(s)						-	-	-	
Printing and publication costs - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
Printing and publication costs - Partner(s)						-	-	-	
Panel costs (Confirmit - £1.00 per response) - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
Panel costs (Confirmit - £1.00 per response) - Partner(s)						-	-	-	
User community engagement (Dub - £750.00 set up per community) - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
User community engagement (Dub - £750.00 set up per community) - Partners(s)						-	-	-	
User community engagement (Dub - £80.00 per community participant per annum) - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
User community engagement (Dub - £80.00 per community participant per annum) - Partner(s)						-	-	-	
Panel incentives - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
Panel incentives - Partner(s)						-	-	-	
Travel and subsistence - Transport Focus						-	-	-	
2017/18 SRUS costs - project D68/SRUS pilot review [£7,200 inc.VAT]			1		£5,760	5,760	-	5,760	
2017/18 SRUS costs - project D39/SRUS pilot [£7,370 inc VAT]			1		£5,896	5,896	-	5,896	
2017/18 SRUS costs - project B50/D50/interactive map [£6720 inc.VAT]			1		5,600	5,600	-	5,600	
2017/18 SRUS costs - project D63/alternative test [£6000 inc.VAT]			1		5,000	5,000	-	5,000	
2017/18 SRUS costs - project 14D/parallel pilot of 'whole journey' [£54,080 inc.VAT]			1		43,264	43,264	-	43,264	
One-off spend SDG authorised MT 2 August 2017 [£2625 inc. VAT]			1		2,100	2,100	-	2,100	
One-off spend Beacon Dodsworth authorised MT 6 September 2017 [£88,000 inc VAT]			1		70,400	70,400	-	70,400	
SRUS variation report to be completed by Real Research £8,400 inc. VAT]			1	0	6,720	6,720	-	6,720	
Subtotal of direct costs						144,740	-	144,740	
Irrecoverable VAT on direct costs						27,796	-	27,796	
						172,536	-	172,536	

SECTION 2 - Summary of project charges above and recommended margin	£	£	£	**Notes**
Freelance researcher and Other direct costs for project	172,536	-	172,536	
Direct staff costs for project	52,180	-	52,180	
Minimum charge to partner(s) to recover total direct costs	224,716	-	224,716	
Recommended contribution to fixed overheads from hourly rates		-	-	
Recommended contribution to central services from hourly rates		-	-	
Minimum recommended charge to partner(s) to recover project costs	224,716	-	224,716	
Recommended margin		-	-	
Minimum recommended charge to partner(s) to recover full project costs plus standard margin	**224,716**	**-**	**224,716**	

SECTION 3 - PROJECT INCOME PROPOSED (EXCL VAT) **Partner / Third party**	**Amount £**	**Amount £**		**Notes**
			-	
			-	
			-	
			-	
Total income from partner(s)	-	-	-	

SECTION 4 - The proposed income will mean :				**Notes**
Direct project costs funded by partner(s)	-	-	-	
Direct staff costs funded by partner(s)	-	-	-	
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from overheads recovered	-	-	-	
Contribution by partner(s) to the unallocated project budget from margin	-	-	-	
Funding from Grant in aid required for direct project costs	172,536	-	172,536	
Funding from Grant in aid required for project staff costs	52,180	-	52,180	

Notes

Use drop down lists to select information
Enter information here

One-off spend proposal for	Approval ☒ Information ☐	**All one-off spends within the framework require this form to be completed and forwarded to the CEO team before proceeding**. One-off spends require MT approval. All one-off spends should be aligned with business plan deliverables. Proposals over £95K need Board approval.
Confidential Information?	Yes ☐ No ☒	**Note**: Costs indicated in the proposal should represent actual costs based on fixed prices or formal quotes. The spend should be independent from an existing project, which should have it's own project code and allocated budget.

transportfocus

If sensitive, protective marking*	
Product required	
Work theme or work steam	SRUS programme of works
Sponsor	Guy Dangerfield
Budget	RDS
Budget Holder	Guy Dangerfield
Author	Brigitta Horup
For consideration by and date	MT 2 August 2017

1. Summary

Please provide a max 100 word summary, including any background history if relevant	Following a meeting held on 20 July with Guy Dangerfield, Shahid Mohammed and Brigitta Horup, it was decided that the best approach for managing future aspects of the SRUS programme would be to close down the six existing projects which relate to SRUS, and create a new project entitled 'SRUS mobilisation' with an agreed 2017/18 budget of £326,000 assigned to it. However, it has not been possible to complete full reviews of the six projects in question and raise a new project brief since 20 July, hence the reason for this request. Ian Wright and Guy Dangerfield held a meeting on 21 July in which is was agreed that the following element of work would be covered within the new SRUS mobilisation, and therefore will be covered within the assigned budget: • Steer Davies Gleave – £2,625 [inc VAT] – building a roads usage model comparable with our survey data to inform the evaluation of one road & refine the drivetime groupings to inform sampling approach. This works needs to be commissioned as it feeds into the SRUS pilot evaluation – Transport Focus have a meeting scheduled with DfT, Highways England & ORR on 8 September for which everything has to be ready.

2. Core Information

How does this spend fit into the Workplan objectives and current business plan work themes or priorities?	It will enable decisions to be made on the questionnaire and sampling for the launch of SRUS on 1 April 2018, both being vital components of a successful launch. There are technical aspects to the questionnaire (aggregating one road to an SRN measure) and sampling (sampling according to usage) that can only be made if the appropriate analysis is undertaken.
Measurable outcomes and benefits of the spend	A measureable outcome will be if the analysis enables an informed decision to be reached between key stakeholders on the questionnaire and sampling that is taken forward for the launch of SRUS on 1 April 2018.

3. Cost information

What is the cost and variance?	**Indicative costs by cost type**	**£2,625**
	Printing Costs – quote provided from TUINK for 200 copies	N/A
	Total (including VAT)	**£2,625**

4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing, Equalities

Timeliness – we are launching SRUS on 1 April 2018, there is also an 8 September meeting between Transport Focus, DfT, Highways England and ORR to gain agreement on approach. Insight needs the SDG analysis to be carried out ASAP to meet these deadlines.

Quality – a requirement is for the SDG analysis to reflect our pilot SRUS data as far as possible for it to be usuable. This is a challenge because available SRN count data does not replicate SRUS pilot data. SDG will need to be thoroughly briefed.

5. Background information

Description	Connect Link

One-off spend proposal for	Approval ☒ Information ☐	**All one-off spends within the framework require this form to be completed and forwarded to the CEO team before proceeding**. One-off spends require MT approval. All one-off spends should be aligned with business plan deliverables. Proposals over £95K need Board approval.
Confidential Information?	Yes ☐ No ☒	**Note**: Costs indicated in the proposal should represent actual costs based on fixed prices or formal quotes. The spend should be independent from an existing project, which should have it's own project code and allocated budget.

transportfocus

If sensitive, protective marking*	
Product required	One-off spend application for SRUS mobilisation
Work theme or work steam	SRUS
Sponsor	Guy Dangerfield
Budget	SRUS mobilisation
Budget Holder	Guy Dangerfield
Author	Brigitta Horup
For consideration by and date	MT 6 Sept 2017

1. Summary

Please provide a max 100 word summary, including any background history if relevant	There is a requirement to replicate the online interactive map that was used in the SRUS pilot to an offline format. This is because it has now been agreed with DfT that SRUS will be a face-to-face survey, at least for the next road investment period. The map that was developed for the online survey cannot be used for a face-to-face survey due to the lack of options for connectivity – it would take too long or respondents may refuse to connect to WiFi and connectivity using dongles is unreliable. There is an alternative of paper maps, but the interactive map is a far superior option due to the geographic detail it can capture. We are requesting a one-off spend to use the supplier who built the online interactive map, Beacon Dodsworth. This is because they are reliable specialists who have already proved they are capable of doing the work, we do not have the time to start from scratch with a new supplier (the survey begins on 1 April 2018) and bringing in a new supplier could end up being more costly as they wouldn't have been part of the development that has already been done.

2. Core Information

How does this spend fit into the Workplan objectives and current business plan work themes or priorities?	The interactive map is an important component of SRUS, due to begin on 1 April 2018. It will be used to identify last journey on the strategic road network and to gain specific geographical data for the purpose of analysis and reporting.
Measurable outcomes and benefits of the spend	1. A tool to accurately record the last journey taken by respondents on the strategic road network. Last journey is the basis of the survey. 2. Enables an interviewer to quickly identify last journey. The process needs to be quick to maximise the number of daily interviews and, in turn, overall sample size (a key objective of SRUS is to increase sample size from NRUSS). 3. Passes details of the journey back to the survey for analysis e.g. the Highways England areas and regions that respondents travelled through and the parts of the SRN they travelled on.

3. Cost information

What is the cost and variance?	**Indicative costs by cost type** One-off costs as follows inc VAT = £88,000. This includes a cost for the development of the offline map, as well as annual maintenance for two years. It also includes some contingency: - We have learnt through developing the online map that it is an iterative process through user testing. - It may be possible that the face-to-face survey is followed up with online survey modules and/or a panel of SRN users (depending on stakeholder needs). - An estimate was made on the number of tablets / laptops that the map will be installed onto (the number impacts installation and maintenance costs).	**£**
	Total (including VAT)	**88,000**

4. Implications – Financial, Risk, Legal, Staffing, Equalities

Risk - we are yet to commission a research agency for SRUS, the tender process is due to begin in late October. We therefore currently have no knowledge of the hardware that the appointed research agency will hold and, if it is not suitable for our mapping purposes, we will need to purchase our own laptops. This is fairly unlikely, as the technical specification for the hardware is quite standard e.g. a windows operating system, 4Gb to 8Gb RAM, 30Gb of free disk space and access to the internet and/or a USB connection. But there is still risk, particularly because further to this technical specification the devices that the appointed agency holds will also need to be consistent. We already know that the agency we used for the f2f pilot is able to meet these standards, the interactive map would not be a problem for TNS. But we will be commissioning an agency that is the most suitable for SRUS across all its requirements, not just mapping – this won't necessarily be TNS. In the tender documents we will include a detailed section on the technical requirements for the offline map, so agencies can provide an informed view about whether the hardware they hold is suitable.

Risk – the offline map software will need to be installed and updated onto research agency computers by Beacon Dodsworth. There are a number of options – direct installation by Beacon Dodsworth, remote installation by Beacon Dodsworth or installation by the research agency using instructions. Prior to this happening, Beacon Dodsworth will also need to have access to one machine for testing. It is unlikely that we won't be able to find a way to install and update the software that is suitable for the appointed research agency – again we checked the options with TNS and they would be able to work with us using one of the approaches. TNS have very high IT security because they were a target of the recent cyber attacks and so we expect that other agencies will be able to work with us on installation too. For mitigation, we will make explicit the details of installation and updates in our tender documents for SRUS, as well as in a joint working agreement.

Risk – we are currently reliant upon Beacon Dodsworth for the interactive map, it is intellectual software owned by the supplier. The mitigation is that Transport Focus pay for annual maintainance with Beacon Dodsworth for at least a two year period at a time.

Risk – that there is a system failure during fieldwork. Offline reduces the risk of this happening, it was more likely with online (firewalls etc), and the map will be fully tested on research agency machines. If during testing we think that this could still be a risk, paper maps with Highways England boundaries could be produced as a fall-back option. The paper maps could be used by interviewers until the system failure is solved. On discussion with the project sponsor, we feel that a decision on whether we produce paper maps can be made in early 2018.

5. Background information

Description	Connect Link

Tue 05/09/2017 11:41

Michelle Calvert

Aug 2017 MT - item E6 - additional information

To **Management Team**; Sara Nelson

Cc Anne Kocan; Brigitta Horup

You replied to this message on 05/09/2017 14:55.

Action Items

+ Get more add-ins

Please see below for supporting information regarding the SRUS one-off-spend application:

New identified risk

The usefulness of the interactive map is dependent on sample size, but sample size is something that has not yet been decided upon as it is dependent on budget allocated by DfT. The interactive map becomes useful when the results of SRUS can be looked at lower than road level or to identify sections of the SRN that are problematic. This will be valuable information driving actionable insight to where it is needed. But in order to look at detailed results in this way, a big sample size is necessary. Taking NRUSS as an example with its 2,000 interviews, if responses are spread evenly across the 113 strategic roads included on SRUS, we would only have an annual sample size of 17 or 18 for each road. That is obviously far too small for road analysis, let alone anything more detailed. For a small sample size paper maps will work as they can identify what is necessary for analysis at this level – Highways England regions and areas through overlaying boundaries. Paper maps will also identify roads travelled on. However the smallest sample on SRUS is likely to be bigger – 8,000 interviews can be achieved on SRUS for the same budget as 2,000 on NRUSS – again looking at responses spread evenly over the 113 roads, this would achieve 70-71 responses per road. Ideally we need a minimum of 100 interviews per road to analyse at this level – a total sample of 11,300, but as responses are not going to be evenly spread in this way and the idea of the interactive map is to look at roads in more detail, a safer option would be an annual sample of 15,000-20,000. This is dependent upon budget decisions by DfT.

For further information please contact Brigitta Horup or Guy Dangerfield.

Kind regards,

Michelle Calvert
Business Services Executive
Transport Focus (London office)
The independent transport user watchdog

e: michelle.calvert@transportfocus.org.uk
t: 0300 123 0859
m: 07540747458
w: www.transportfocus.org.uk

Follow us on Twitter @TransportFocus.

You can also call our passenger contact centre on 0300 123 2350 (open 8am - 8pm Monday - Friday and 8am - 4pm at weekends).

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential and may be priviliged. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copy or distribution is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by return email and delete any message and attachments.