



Best Value User Satisfaction Survey 2006/07: Consultation

Response from:
(Name & organisation)

**Anna Edgren-Carter (West Yorkshire PTE)
pteg (representing Greater Manchester PTE,
South Yorkshire PTE, Strathclyde PTE, Tyne &
Wear PTE, West Midlands PTE and West
Yorkshire PTE)**

This pro-forma is divided into the following sections:

SECTION ONE	-	QUESTIONS USED FOR CALCULATING BVPIs
SECTION TWO	-	OTHER QUESTIONS
SECTION THREE	-	JOINT COUNTY AND DISTRICT SURVEY
SECTION FOUR	-	RESEARCH METHOD

Please limit comments to the boxes provided
- it will greatly help us in the analysis of responses.



SECTION ONE: QUESTIONS USED FOR CALCULATING BVPIs

General Survey

BV 103	Agree to the inclusion of an indicator on this subject? (Y/N)	y	
The % of respondents satisfied with local provision of public transport information	Agree to the wording of this indicator? (Y/N)	y	
Scope: Metropolitan authorities, London Boroughs, Unitary authorities, County councils, Common Council of the City of London	Satisfied with the scope of this indicator? (Y/N)	n	
Comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the former metropolitan county areas this indicator (and BV104) is collected by the local districts on behalf of their Passenger Transport Authority, which is presently the relevant best value authority required to publish the consolidated results in its annual performance plan. No requirement currently exists for the districts to publish individual results in their own performance plans, although they are used within the districts' CPA assessment process. ▪ <i>pteg</i> would appreciate receiving the consolidated figure for BV103 for 2003/04 from the ODPM and would value the opportunity discuss the matter. <i>pteg</i> requests confirmation for the process of collection, consolidation, weighting and communication of this BVPI as well as the final confirmed figures for 2003/04. ▪ The scope of the indicator should say "Metropolitan authorities (on behalf of their respective PTA)". ▪ <i>pteg</i> believes users should be reminded that the local authority does not have sole responsibility for the provision of information about public transport information. Some responsibility always falls with large bus operators and outside metropolitan areas they will provide the majority of information. ▪ A question on the preferred media for accessing public transport information would be useful. ▪ Users and non-users should be distinguished, to make the indicator as meaningful as possible. 		

General Survey (Cont'd)

BV 104	Agree to the inclusion of an indicator on this subject? (Y/N)	y	
---------------	---	---	--



The % of all respondents satisfied with the local bus service	Agree to the wording of this indicator? (Y/N)	n	
Scope: Metropolitan authorities, London Boroughs, Unitary authorities, County councils, Common Council of the City of London	Satisfied with the scope of this indicator? (Y/N)	n	
Comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ pteg believes this question may be misdirected. An individual respondents' local bus service (outside London) may be operated without any direct public subsidy, so the rating given may be of a private operator rather than the local authority. While a good proportion of authority spending on local public transport nationally is on concessionary travel, there is no question on how well the national minimum scheme is being administered locally. pteg feels an additional question on this aspect may be appropriate, given the levels of public funding involved. ▪ pteg would appreciate receiving the consolidated figure for BV104 for 2003/04 from the ODPM and would value an opportunity to discuss the matter. pteg requests confirmation for the process of collection, consolidation, weighting and communication of this BVPI as well as the final confirmed figures for 2003/04. ▪ The scope of the indicator should say "Metropolitan authorities (on behalf of their respective PTA)". ▪ Users and non-users should be distinguished, to make the indicator as meaningful as possible. 		

	Yes	No
Should a single prescribed research method be specified for the 2006/07 Best Value User Satisfaction Survey?		
Should the single prescribed research method be by postal survey?		
Should stratification continue to be allowed for the General Household Survey?		
Should clustering continue to be allowed for the General Household Survey?		
Should a weighting factor be introduced for county council results to reflect the variable response rates amongst the district councils within their boundaries?		
Comment:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pteg believes the process for the collection, weighting and distribution of BVPIs 103 and 104 should be improved. At present, PTAs receive figures from each district council. , 	



	<p>These can not be published, however, until they have been consolidated by the ODPM - who should then communicate the weighted score to each PTA. pteg requests clarification on this process.</p>
--	---