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Background to Research

This research programme monitors service, quality and compliance with contractual Dublin Bus requirements through “mystery shopping” surveys, to measure key aspects of service delivery. This mystery shopping programme was designed to provide robust and actionable data to the National Transport Authority to measure the overall service performance of Dublin Bus through the eyes of its ‘customers’.

205 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 2 with mystery shoppers acting as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Dublin Bus routes around the city. A broad spread of bus routes were covered across different days of the week and times of the day. 10 Dublin Bus Head Office interviews were also completed and included in Quarter 2 data.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective captures of location, bus and driver details at stops, when boarding, on board and after alighting buses.

Quarter 2 2018: 26th March – 17th June 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 1 Jan– March 2018 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 2 April – June 2017
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: Virtually all interviewers saw no signs of additional commercial advertising present on the bus stop poles or shelters

Base: (63), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (127) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29

27% observed a Bus Shelter
Q37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass
(78) %

Q2 2018

73% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag
Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(127) %

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1

Q37 Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels? (Acceptable advertising must be in a “Case” or Side Panel and not just pasted on shelter)
Q38 Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?
Bus Shelters: Just over 8 in 10 interviewers found the bus stop poles & over 9 out of 10 found bus shelters to be in good condition, with a further just under 2 in 10 reporting signs of moderate damage to the Bus Poles. Bus shelters were thought to be in good condition by almost all interviewers.

Base: (74) IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (127) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q2 2018

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018.
**Information Display:** just over 1 in 4 interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop. Of these, most felt that they were **fully legible and clean with minimal instances of damage reported**.

*Base: (173), IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C*

### Q2 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display</th>
<th>Q28e* Condition of Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(173) %</td>
<td>(125) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New for Q1 2018*

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017\(^{Q_2}\), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018\(^{Q_1}\)
Section 2: Customer Information Performance
Fares: Nearly all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, with no significant movements observed.

Q2 2018

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?

(205) %

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1
Timetable: Almost all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. Over two thirds saw printed timetables and over half saw timetables with operative dates present at the bus stop, a significant decline versus last year.

Base: IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1 OR BUS SHELTER Q30/1, IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q34/1

Q2 2018

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (175)

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (127)

Q36 Operative Date Present (86)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018

Q32: Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 4 digit number
Q34: Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop
Q36: Is there an “Operative Date” (Dublin Bus) or “Valid From” date written on the timetable? Interviewer note: can be very small print
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, half of the interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening, a significant fall versus last year’s quarter; however a third reported that there were no alighting passengers during their journey. 7 in 10 noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus.

Base: (127), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63, (82), EXCLUDING BUSES WITH NO ALIGHTING PASSENGERS

62% assessed buses with centre doors

**Q64 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?**

[Boarding Passengers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 2018

**Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers**

[Alighting Passengers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1

*Interviewer instructions updated in Q2 2018

*Buses with no alighting passengers excluded
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. **Over 8 in 10 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, this is a significant drop versus last quarter**, while those who found the announcement was too quiet are increasing.

Base: (191), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

**Q2 2018**

**Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working**

- Yes - was working correctly: 97%
- Working but was not providing correct information: 1%
- Display was turned off or not working: 2%
- Could not see a display: -%

**Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working**

- Yes - working and volume was correct: 86%
- Yes - working but too loud: -%
- Yes - working but too quiet: 10%
- No - was not working: 2%
- None on the bus: -%

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

\[\uparrow \downarrow \] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 \(_{Q2}\), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 \(_{Q1}\)
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: For those interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, they found that it was activated upon request.

Base: (7) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105/1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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
- No - other reason
- No - no reason given

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018
**Route Number and Destination Visible:** Almost all interviewers found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus.

---

**Q2 2018**

**Q43 Route No. on Front**
- **Yes:** 99%
- **Not displayed:** 1%
- **Could not clearly see:** 0%

**Q44 Destination on Front**
- **Yes:** 99%
- **Not displayed:** 1%
- **Could not clearly see:** 0%

**Q45 Route No. on Side**
- **Correct route no. displayed:** 99%
- **Incorrect route no. displayed:** 0%
- **No route no. displayed:** 0%
- **There was no display panel for route no. could not clearly see:** 1%

**Q87 Route No. on Back**
- **Yes:** 97%
- **Incorrect route number shown:** 3%
- **No route number shown:** 0%
- **Could not clearly see:** 0%

* = Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018.
CCTV: Over 9 in 10 interviewers found the **CCTV screens in the stairwells to be turned on** and functioning correctly.

```
Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but was not working properly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell/single deck</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Base: (127), IF CCTV Camera Present

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018}_Q2, \text{ Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018}_Q1\]
Fare Payment: Ticket machines and leap card readers were found to be present and functioning **correctly** by almost all interviewers. Of those interviewers paying in cash, all received a printed ticket or change receipt where appropriate, whilst 7 in 10 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

### Q2 2018

#### Q56 Cash Fare (99)
- **Ticket Machine Working Correctly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q57a Cash Fare*
- **Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exact Change</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exact Change</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and change receipt</th>
<th>Got handwritten ticket</th>
<th>Was not given a ticket</th>
<th>Machine was not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q58a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q59a Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (55)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>Don’t know/Couldn’t tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Machine was not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Payment Methods were split as they were in Quarter 1 2016:  
| 50% Cash Payments  
| 25% Leap Card Reader at Driver  
| 25% Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader |

* = Question amended in Q2 2018

---

**Exact Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q56</th>
<th>Q57a</th>
<th>Q58a</th>
<th>Q59a</th>
<th>Q60a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the ticket machine working correctly for you?</td>
<td>Were you given a printed ticket and change receipt?</td>
<td>Did the Leap Card reader at the driver appear to be working correctly?</td>
<td>Could you see what fare were you charged?</td>
<td>Did the pole mounted Leap Card reader appear to be working correctly?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018.*
Assessment of Seats: Over 9 out of 10 seats were found free of graffiti and damage on almost all occasions. Nearly 9 in 10 interviewers found that seats were clean, however this is significantly down versus last quarter with reports of dust, crumbs and other ingrained dirt again on the rise this quarter.

Base: (205)

Q2 2018

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

- No Signs: 95%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 5%
- Heavy defacing: -%
- Offensive graffiti: -%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

- Clean: 88%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 9%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 3%
- Wet or soiled: -%

Q71 Damage to Seats

- No: 95%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 4%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: -%
- Moderate damage: -%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: -%

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1
Bus Interior: The majority of interviewers found the bus interiors to be clean and free of graffiti or dirt. Less than 1 in 5 saw minimal levels of litter while just under 1 in 4 saw signs of light dirt, a significant uplift this quarter.

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs

- Generally clean: 89%
- Dirt or liquid spills, Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 3%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs*

- Litter free: 72%
- Minimal level of litter: 19%
- Some litter: 3%
- A lot of litter: 9%

Q77 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs: 96%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 4%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 2%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 1%

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs of dirt: 75%
- Light dirt: 23%
- Moderately dirty: 3%
- Very dirty: 2%

---

*Question amended in Q2 2016

\( \downarrow \uparrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 \( Q_2 \), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 \( Q_1 \)
Bus Windows: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows, but there are reports of minor graffiti increasing versus last quarter. The majority of interviewers found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, although this has dropped significantly year on year.

---

**Q2 2018**

**Q72 Graffiti on Windows**

- No signs: 97%
- Minor graffiti: 3%
- Heavy graffiti: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

**Q73 Etching on Windows**

- No signs: 96%
- Minor etching: 4%
- Heavy etching: 1%

**Q74 Cleanliness of Windows**

- No signs of dirt: 61%
- Light dirt: 30%
- Moderately dirty: 8%
- Very dirty: 7%

---

\(\downarrow\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018
Front/Side of Bus: Again this quarter it is encouraging to see **no interviewers reporting any signs of visible damage to the front/side of the buses.** Over 8 in 10 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean, significantly down from last year, while just under 3 in 4 found the rear of the buses were clean.

**Q2 2018**

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus**

- Yes: 82%
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 18%
- Moderately dirty: 10%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 5%

**Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus**

- No Visible Damage: 97%
- Light paintwork scratches only: 2%
- Minor bodywork damage: 1%
- Serious damage to bodywork: 2%

**Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?**

- Yes: 71%
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation: 26%
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 1%
- Couldn’t see: 2%

\[\uparrow\downarrow\] Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar-Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2018.

---

Q47 Were the front and side of the bus clean?
Q48 Was there visible damage to the front or side of the bus?
Q90 Was the rear of the bus clean?
Section 5:
Bus Driver Performance
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain very **highly regarded by almost all interviewers** in terms of both attitude and presentation year on year.

Base: (205)

Questions to Driver

- How much is it to ____?
- Can I pay with a note?
- Does this bus go to ____?
- What time is the last bus this evening?

### Q51 Helpful
- Yes: 98
- No: 2

### Q52 Polite
- Yes: 0
- No: 100

### Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes: 98
- No: 2

### Q55 Driver Well Presented
- Yes: 99
- No: 1

\[\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017}_{Q2}, \ Qtr 1 \ Jan - Mar 2018_{Q1}\]
Bus Safety: Over 8 out of 10 interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, but there is a significant drop in the number of interviewers reporting drivers braking smoothly versus last year. A drop also in this quarter for those who all felt yes passengers were given enough time to find their seats or hold on.

**Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes, felt comfortable</th>
<th>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</th>
<th>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</th>
<th>Frequently too harsh</th>
<th>Felt it was dangerous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes, felt comfortable</th>
<th>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</th>
<th>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</th>
<th>Frequently too harsh</th>
<th>Felt it was dangerous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Occasionally moved off too early</th>
<th>Frequently moved off too early</th>
<th>Felt it was dangerous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2016

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018} _{Q2}, \text{ Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018} _{Q1}\]
When Getting on the Bus: 4 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus. On 3 of these occasions, there didn’t appear to be any specific reason for the restriction while on the other occasions, another vehicle was parked in the way. Of the 4 interviewers who noted that the bus did not pull up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, all reported that there was no specific reason for the restriction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (4) Boarding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (4) Alighting %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason - Please record details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1
Driver Actions: Almost all interviewers found that buses **always stopped** to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (205), ALL THOSE REQUESTED TO STOP

Q2 2018

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Question rebased off those whose bus was requested to stop*

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018
Driver Behaviour: Positively, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour again this quarter. There was a very low incidence of drivers listening to the radio whilst almost all saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with other passengers or staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mobile phone while driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear an earpiece while driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive the bus in a dangerous manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 2018

Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio

- Yes
- No
- Could not observe

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations

- Yes with other staff
- Yes with passengers
- No
- Could not observe

Q97 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018

Base: (205)
Driver Actions: Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter.

Base: (205)

Q2 2018

Q100 Driver Left Bus Unattended

Yes - because of driver change -

Yes - to go to shops -

Yes - to go to toilet -

Yes - some other reason - Please record details -

Yes – don’t know the reason -

No 100

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2017 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1
Diversion or Terminated Early: No interviews reported any early diversions or terminations this quarter

Base: (205)

Q2 2018

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes
- No

100

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018.