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Background to Research

This research programme monitors service, quality and compliance with contractual Bus Éireann requirements, through utilising “mystery shopping” surveys to measure key aspects of service delivery (i.e. the driver and the vehicle).

This mystery shopping programme was designed to provide robust and actionable data to the National Transport Authority to measure the overall service performance of Bus Éireann through the eyes of its ‘customers’.

125 mystery shops (plus an additional 8 bus station boosts) were conducted from early January to end March as mystery shoppers acted as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Bus Éireann around the country. Different Bus Éireann services were included such as city services, town services, Dublin Commuter services and long distance interurban services. These were all conducted across different days of the week and times of the day.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot on Dublin Bus and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective interviewing before, when boarding, on board the buses and after alighting.

Quarter 1 2017: 1st January – 25th March 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus the previous quarter i.e. Qtr 4 Sep – Dec 2017 q4 or versus the same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – Mar 2017 q1
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There were no instances of commercial advertising present on bus stops this quarter

Base: IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (42) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

42% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 54% observed a shelter at the stop

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (42)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-MarQ1 – Sep-Dec 2017Q4
Bus Shelters: Just over 3 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; while a third saw signs of moderate damage. Almost all interviewers felt that the bus shelters were in good condition with minimal instances of damage reported.

Base: (61), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (42) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag? (42)

- Good condition: 64%
- Moderate damage: 29%
- Scratches/graffiti: 2%
- Hazardous damage: 7%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter? (61)

- Good condition: 95%
- Moderate damage: 5%
- Hazardous damage: 0%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4
Timetable: Just over half of interviewers noted a printed timetable present, significantly down from last quarter. Scores had been steady in previous quarters suggesting a blip in the data this wave to be monitored going forward.

Base: (42) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (42)

Q4 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar\textsubscript{Q1} – Sep-Dec 2017\textsubscript{Q4}
Information Display: Half of interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop, while 1 in 4 saw a small panel on the pole. Just under 9 in 10 interviewers found the information displays to be fully legible and clean.

Base: (103) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display (103)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28e* Information displayed (88)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar, Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017, Q4

*New for Q1 2018
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Almost all interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus

Base: (100), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*

** Interviewer instructions have been updated for Qtr 3 2016 therefore no YOY comparisons made

*Filter added in Q3

Q50** Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4

Q50  Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance? (question filter changed in Q3)
Timetable: Of the 9 in 10 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, just under 7 in 10 found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, whilst over half saw a printed timetable present, significantly down from last quarter. Over a third were able to observe the operative date on the timetable.

Base: (125)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus (125)

- Yes: 91%
- No: 89%

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (42)

- Yes: 33%
- No: 67%

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (42)

- Yes: 45%
- No: 55%

Q36 Operative Date Present (23)

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar to Qtr 4 2017 Q4

Q28 Q32 Q34 Q36
Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus
Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 4 digit number (6 for Bus Éireann).
Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop pole or bus shelter?
Is there an ‘Operative Date’ (Dublin Bus) or ‘Valid From’ date (Bus Éireann) written on the timetable?
Section 3: Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Interaction: There were no instances of driver disputes recorded this quarter

Base: (125)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users
(125)
%

No 97

Yes - fares -

Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected -

Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue -

Yes - Dispute with other road users/pedestrians -

Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers -

Yes - other -

Could not observe 3 ↑ (-) Q1, (-) Q4

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar, Q4 2017
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation

Base: (125)

Questions to Driver
- How much is it to ____?
- Can I pay with a note?
- Does this bus go to ____?

- Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar to Sep-Dec 2017 Oct
Bus Safety: Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minor instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous.

Base: (125)

Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious discomfort</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious discomfort</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently moved off too early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar to Q4 2017

* Question amended in Q2 2016
When Getting on the Bus: Of the 3 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for boarding passengers, all interviewers noted that this was because another vehicle was parked in the way. On the 1 instance where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for alighting passengers, again this was because another vehicle was parked in the way.

Base: (125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (3) Boarding</th>
<th>Q93 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (1) Alighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar, Q2 2017 Apr-Jun, Q3 2017 Jul-Sep, Q4 2017 Oct-Dec.
Driver Actions: Almost all interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so, the remainder noted that the bus was not requested to stop during their journey.

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(125)

- Yes: 97%
- Could not always stop as bus was full: 3%
- Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping: 3%
- Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop: 3%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar - Sep-Dec 2017 Q4
Driver Actions: All interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (121), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(121)
%

- Yes: 100
- Could not always stop as bus was full
- Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping
- Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar-Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017-Q4
* Question rebased off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers

Q102  So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was very positively regarded overall with very minimal mentions of use of mobile phones (down since last year) or earpieces (up since last quarter). A third of interviewers observed drivers listening to music while driving whilst just over 9 in 10 did not observe the drivers holding any long conversations with others.

**Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (125) %**

- **Use mobile phone while driving**: 1 ↓ (5) _Q1_
- **Wear an earpiece while driving**: 3 ↑ (-) _Q4_
- **Drive the bus in a dangerous manner**: -
- **None of these**: 96 ↓ (100) _Q4_

**Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (125) %**

- **Yes**: 6
- **No**: 32
- **Could not observe**: 62

**Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (125) %**

- **Yes with other staff**: 6
- **Yes with passengers**: 2
- **No**: 92
- **Could not observe**: -

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar _Q1_ – Sep-Dec 2017 _Q4_
Leave Bus Unattended: There were 2 instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter; one was because of a driver change while the other did not know the reason.

Q100 Bus Left Unattended (125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don't know the reason</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar, Q2 – Sep-Dec 2017.
**Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early**

- Yes: 1
- No: 99

**Q109 Passengers Told Reason for Early Termination/Diversion (1)**

- Yes: 100

**Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (1)**

- Announce over PA
- Shout out information
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus)
- Fail to inform passengers

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar vs Q4 2017

**Q107** Did bus terminate early or divert off course?

**Q108** Did driver....?

**Q109** Were passengers told the reason for early termination or diversion off course?
Section 4: Bus Equipment Performance
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Of the 3 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request, all found that it was activated when necessary

Base: (125), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (2)

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (3)

| Yes | 100 |

- No - driver stated it was broken
- No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user
- No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop
- No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present on the bus
- No - other reason - please record details
- No - no reason given

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar vs Q4 2017
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Just under 2 in 5 interviewers observed fully functioning next stop displays whilst on the bus, while nearly 1 in 5 noted displays that were turned off or not working, a significant uplift both quarter on quarter and year on year. Just under 1 in 5 interviewers observed the audio next stop announcer working correctly, while a further 1 in 5 found they weren’t working during their journey.

Base: (125)

- **Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (125)**
  - Yes - working correctly: 37%
  - Working but not providing correct information: 6%
  - Display turned off or not working: 17%
  - Cannot see a display: 40%

- **Q81 Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (125)**
  - Yes - working and volume correct: 18%
  - Yes - working but too loud: 1%
  - Yes - working but too quiet: 4%
  - No - not working: 21%
  - None on the bus: 56%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar vs Q4 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4

Q80 Are the electronic displays on board indicating what the next stop is working correctly?
Q81 Is there an automatic next stop audio announcement working on the bus?
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Of those who saw an electronic next stop display present, 3 in 5 saw that they were working correctly, significantly down from last quarter, while a third found that they were turned off or not working, a significant uplift both versus last quarter and last year. For those who heard an audio next stop announcement, just under half found that it wasn’t working while 2 in 5 noted that it was working but too loud or too quiet.

Base: (75), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (75)

- Yes - working correctly: 61%
- Working but not providing correct information: 11%
- Display turned off or not working: 28%
- Cannot see a display: -

Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (55)

- Yes - working and volume correct: 42%
- Yes - working but too loud: -
- Yes - working but too quiet: -
- No - not working: 47%
- None on the bus: -

* Question rebased off those who could see a display / hear an announcement

\[\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar} \quad \downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar} \quad \uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar} \]
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers reported seeing both route and destination numbers on the front and sides of the bus.

**Q43 Route No. on Front (125)**
- Yes: 97%
- Not displayed: 2%
- Could not clearly see: 2%

**Q45 Route No. on Side (125)**
- Correct route no. displayed: 94%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 1%
- There was no display panel for the route number: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 2%

**Q44 Destination on Front (125)**
- Yes: 98%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 2%

**Q87 Route No. on Back (125)**
- Yes: 94%
- Incorrect route number shown: 6%
- No route number shown: 1%
- Couldn’t see: 3%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 and Qtr Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017.
CCTV: Just under a third of interviewers saw the CCTV screens turned on and working correctly whilst on the bus. As almost half of interviewers were on board single deck buses, they were not in a position to observe any CCTV screens in the stairwell.

Base: (125)

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell (125)

- Turned on and working correctly: 28%
- Turned on, but not working properly: 2%
- Turned off: 16%
- No CCTV display present: 48%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar vs Q4 2017 Q4

Q82 Is there a CCTV screen in stairwell on the bus?
CCTV: The majority of interviewers who saw a CCTV screen in the stairwell noted that it was turned on and working correctly. A third saw that there was no CCTV display present.

Base: (65), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

Q82* CCTV in Stairwell (65) %

- Turned on and working correctly: 54%
- Turned on, but not working properly: 3%
- Turned off: 12%
- No CCTV display present: 31%

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2017 Jan-Mar, Q3 2017 Jan-Mar, Q4 2017 Jan-Mar

Q82 Is there a CCTV screen in stairwell on the bus?
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine & Leap Card readers to be working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change, with minimal instances of receiving incorrect change occurring. 3 in 4 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

Q56 Cash Fare (72)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, printed ticket</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and correct change</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and incorrect change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b* Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q59b* Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don’t know/Couldn’t tell Machine was not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interviewer instructions have been updated in Qtr 2 2016 therefore no YOY comparisons made.

Question amended in Q2 2016
Interior Lighting and Temperature: 3 in 4 interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly, with minimal instances of lights flickering / not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable considering the weather conditions outside; with only 3 interviewers feeling the temperatures on board were unreasonable.

**Q83 Interior Lighting (125)**

- Yes and functioning correctly: 78%
- Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 7%
- No and it is dark outside: 1%
- No but it is daylight outside: 14%

**Q84 Temperature Reasonable (125)**

- Yes: 98%
- No: 2%

**Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable (3)**

- A cold day with the heating turned on: 33%
- A cold day with the heating turned off: -
- A cold day - not sure if heating is on: -
- A warm day with the heating turned on: -
- A warm day with the heating turned off: -
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 – Sep-Dec 2017
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be clean & well maintained; with minor reports of damage/graffiti observed

Base: (17), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A
(4), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %
- No graffiti or defacing: 65 (50)
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 35 (50)
- Heavy defacing
- Offensive graffiti

Q2 Station Seats Damaged %
- No visible damage: 82 (50)
- Minor damage: 18 (50)
- Moderate damage
- Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats (17) %
- Clean: 100 (100)
- Significant dust or crumbs
- Gum or other ingrained dirt
- Wet or soiled

*Caution: Small base size

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4

Q1 What best describes graffiti or other defacing on station seats?
Q2 Were any station seats you observed damaged in any way?
Q3 What best describes level of cleanliness of station seats?
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean, with some instances of minor graffiti and moderate dirt reported.

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures (17)

- No signs: 76% (50)
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 24% (50)
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 0% (50)
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 0% (50)

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures (17)

- No signs of dirt: 71% (50)
- Light dirt: 18% (50)
- Moderately dirty: 12% (50)
- Very dirty: 0% (50)

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (17)

- Generally Clean: 82% (50)
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky): 18% (50)
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 0% (50)

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (17)

- Appeared litter free: 94% (75)
- Some litter: 6% (25)
- A lot of litter: 0% (5)

*Caution: Small base size

() = Busáras

*Busáras deemed moderately dirty

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 \( Q_1 \) – Sep-Dec 2017 \( Q_4 \)
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were though to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers. Outside of the bus station, the majority of interviews reported seeing litter present.

**Q6** Graffiti on Station Windows (17)
- No signs: 88%
- Minor graffiti: 12%
- Heavy graffiti: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 3%

**Q7** What best describes level of etching on station windows? (17)
- No signs: 88%
- Minor etching: 12%
- Heavy etching: 1%
- Offensive etching: 2%

**Q8** Cleanliness of Station Windows (17)
- No signs: 71%
- Light dirt: 18%
- Moderately dirty: 12%
- Very dirty*: 5%

**Q11** Exterior Litter Free (17)
- Appeared litter free: 82%
- Some litter: 12%
- A lot of litter*: 6%

*Caution: Small base size

*Busáras deemed very dirty

*Busáras thought to have a lot of litter

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4

Base: (17), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A, Base: (4), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti and litter free by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly. 1 in 4 saw signs of minor graffiti while 1 in 5 saw minor litter.

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (17)

- No signs: 76%
- Minor graffiti: 24%
- Heavy graffiti: 6%
- Offensive graffiti: 6%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (17)

- Generally clean: 76%
- Minor litter on floors: 18%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 6%
- Very dirty: 6%

Q18 Toilets Blocked (17)

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

Q19 Flush Working (17)

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (17)

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

*Caution: Small base size

Base: (17), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

-> = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 - Sep-Dec 2017
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean but with some instances of dirt and minor graffiti reported. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by the majority of interviewers.

Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (17) %
- Generally clean: 71 (100)
- Some litter: 12
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 18

Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (17) %
- No signs: 82 (100)
- Minor graffiti: 18
- Heavy graffiti: -
- Offensive graffiti: -

Q23 Washroom Taps (17) %
- Yes (both hot and cold): 71 (75)
- Hot only: 12
- Cold only: 18
- Neither: -

Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (17) %
- Yes: 82 (100)
- No: -

Q25 Washroom Dryers (17) %
- Worked: 100 (100)
- Did not work: -
- No washroom dryer: -

Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (17) %
- Yes, with paper towels: 35 (50)
- Yes, but no paper towels: 65
- No paper towel dispenser: -

Q27 Bins Clean (38) %
- Yes: 100
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: -
- No bins present: -

Base: (17), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

Caution: Small base size

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4

() = Busáras
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Almost all interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained with minimal levels of graffiti or damage observed. The number of interviewers reporting clean seats has significantly increased both quarter on quarter and year on year.

Base: (125)

- **Q69 Graffiti on Seats (125)**%
  - No Signs: 92%
  - Minor graffiti or defacing: 8%
  - Heavy defacing: 2%
  - Offensive graffiti: 2%

- **Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (125)**%
  - Clean: 96%
  - Significant dust or crumbs: 2%
  - Gum or other ingrained dirt: 2%
  - Wet or soiled: 2%

- **Q71 Damage to Seats (125)**%
  - No: 92%
  - Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 14%
  - Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 4%
  - Moderate damage: 3%
  - Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 1%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4
**Bus Interior:** The interior of the buses were generally positively regarded with some minor instances of litter & dirt reported. Encouragingly, there have been significant decreases in the number of interviewers reporting a lot of litter on the buses both quarter on quarter and year on year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q75</td>
<td>Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally clean</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt or liquid spills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt or liquid stains</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q76</td>
<td>Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter free</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal level of litter</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some litter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of litter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q77</td>
<td>Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q78</td>
<td>Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2016*

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 to Q1 - Sep-Dec 2017 Q4}\]
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while 1 in 5 observed light dirt. The number of windows seen to be moderately dirty have significantly decreased from last quarter while no windows were deemed very dirty.

Base: (125)

Q72 Graffiti on Windows (125)

- No Signs: 98%
- Minor graffiti: 2%
- Heavy defacing: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q73 Etching on Windows (125)

- No Signs: 98%
- Minor etching: 2%
- Heavy etching: 2%
- Offensive etching: 2%

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (125)

- No Signs: 78%
- Light dirt: 22%
- Moderately dirty: 4%
- Very dirty: 2%

\[\downarrow\] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear. Any dirt observed was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day with minimal instances of heavier dirt reported.

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day's operation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 17 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 6 were able to assess the relevant travel centres. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite and friendly and all found that the information they were given appeared to be correct.

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (17)

- Yes -open: 35%
- Yes - closed*: 12%
- No: 53%

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (6)

- Polite: 50%
- Professional: -
- Friendly: 50%
- Indifferent: -
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (6)

- Information provided and appears to be correct: 100%
- Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date: -
- Information not provided: -

* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017 Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017 Q4