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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’.

206 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 3 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 3 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 3 2019: 17th June – 10th September 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 2 March – June 2019 Q2 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 2 June – Sep 2018 Q3
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising at Bus Stops: very low level of third party advertising on bus shelter glass and bus stop poles

Q14 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)

Q15 Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?

Q3 2019
68% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag

Q14 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Shelter glass
(86) %

Yes: 6%
No: 94%

Q15 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(134) %

Yes: 3%
No: 97%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
**Bus Shelters:** the vast majority found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, with only one mention of hazardous damage with a temporary shelter under construction.

Base: (86) IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q4/2, (134) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q7/1

### Q3 2019

**Q8 Condition of the Bus Pole**
- **(134) %**
  - Good condition: 93%
  - Moderate damage: 6%
  - Hazardous damage: 1%

**Q9 Condition of the Bus Shelter**
- **(86) %**
  - Good condition: 88%
  - Moderate damage: 10%
  - Hazardous damage: 1%

**“Temporary shelter. Under reconstruction”**

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
Information Display: similar to last quarter, there has been a significant increase year on year in those seeing information displays, over half of these being a small panel on the pole; minimal incidences of being obscured.

Q3 2019

Q5* Information Display (197)

- Small Panel on Pole: 43↑ (28) Q3
- Long panel on pole: 8
- Information panel on shelter: 32
- TFI Pole with information panel: 3
- None: 15↓ (38) Q3

Q6* Condition of Display (167)

- Fully legible and clean: 98
- Obscured by condensation: -
- Damaged or torn: -
- Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /:
- Not mounted correctly: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
Section 2: Customer Information Performance
Fares: Virtually all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus.

Base: (206)

Q3 2019

Q26 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?
(206)
%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019.
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
On Board Displays/Announcements: All bar one found the electronic displays were working correctly. Positive to see there has been a significant decline year on year in next stop announcements not working.

Base: (205), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Q59* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes - was working correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Working but was not providing correct information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Display was turned off or not working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q60* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes - working and volume was correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No - was not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>None on the bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[ \downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019} \]
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: All five observed requests for a wheelchair ramp were activated

| No - driver stated it was broken | 100 |
| 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 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019.
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus

Base: (206)

Q20 Route No. on Front

- Correct route number displayed: 99%
- Incorrect route number displayed: -
- No route number displayed: -
- There was no display panel for route no.: -
- Could not clearly see: -

Q21 Destination on Front

- Correct destination displayed: 100%
- Incorrect destination displayed: -
- No destination shown: -
- Could not clearly see: -

Q22 Route No. on Side

- Correct route number displayed: 98%
- Incorrect route number displayed: -
- No route number displayed: -
- There was no display panel for route no.: -
- Could not clearly see: 1%

Q66 Route No. on Back

- Correct route number displayed: 100%
- Incorrect route number shown: -
- No route number shown: -
- Couldn’t see: -

Q20 Route No. on Front: 99%
Q21 Destination on Front: 100%
Q22 Route No. on Side: 98%
Q66 Route No. on Back: 100%

* = Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
CCTV: In the vast majority of buses that had CCTV cameras present the CCTV screens in the stairwells were turned on and functioning correctly, minor report of no CCTV display present or turned off

Base: (160), IF CCTV Camera Present

Q3 2019

Q61 CCTV in Stairwell

- Turned on and working correctly: 97%
- Turned on, but was not working properly: 1%
- Turned off: 2%
- No CCTV display present: 1%
- No stairwell/single deck: 2%

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
Fare Payment: All ticket machines and leap card readers were found to be functioning correctly. Over four in five Leap Card users could see the fare charged when using the reader at the driver.

Q3 2019

Q32 Cash Fare (106)
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

Q33 Cash Fare*
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

Q34 Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (50)*

Q35 Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (50)*

Q37 Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (50)*

Payment Methods were split as follows:
- 50% Cash exact change
- 25% Cash not exact change
- 25% Leap Card Reader at Driver
- 25% Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
Section 4: Cleanliness Performance
**Assessment of Seats:** All bus seats were found free of graffiti and damage on all occasions, a significant improvement year on year. Over 9 in 10 found that seats were clean, with minor incidences of dust, crumbs and dirt.

**Q3 2019**

- **Q46 Graffiti on Seats:**
  - No Signs: 100%
  - Minor graffiti or defacing: (8)%
  - Heavy defacing: (2)%
  - Offensive graffiti: (2)%

- **Q47 Cleanliness of Seats:**
  - Clean: 92%
  - Significant dust or crumbs: 5%
  - Gum or other ingrained dirt: 2%
  - Wet or soiled: 0%

- **Q48 Damage to Seats:**
  - No: 100%
  - Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: (7)%
  - Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: (2)%
  - Moderate damage: (5)%
  - Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: (2)%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019.
Bus Interior: There have been significant improvements year on year with inside buses and a significant increase in litter free since last quarter. Only minor mentions of dried dirt of liquid stain on floors or stairs, down year on year. A fifth saw minimal levels of litter on seats/floors and minor mentions of some or a lot of litter.

Q3 2019

Q52 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs

- Generally clean: 90%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 4%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 6%

(72) Q3

Q53 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs

- Litter free: 73%
- Minimal level of litter: 22%
- Some litter: 4%

(63) Q3 (64) Q2

Q54 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs: 99%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 8%

(92) Q3

Q55 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs of dirt: 77%
- Light dirt: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 21%
- Very dirty: 1%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019.
Bus Windows: No signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows, both measures show a significant improvement on last year. Nearly two thirds found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, a significant uplift vs the same time last year.

Base: (206)

Q3 2019

Q49 Graffiti on Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q50 Etching on Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor etching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q51 Cleanliness of Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs of dirt</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Hosepipe ban in effect over the summer of 2018

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
Front/Side of Bus: Minimal reporting of any signs of visible damage, such as light scratches, to the front/side of the buses. 9 out of 10 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean a significant increase on this time last year and and 8 out of 10 said the back of the bus was clean, significantly up from last year and last quarter.

Base: (206)

### Q3 2019

#### Q23 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q24 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Visible Damage</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light paintwork scratches only</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor bodywork damage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious damage to bodywork</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q69 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t see</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Hosepipe ban in effect over the summer of 2018

\[\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018}_Q3,\ Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019_Q2\]
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, marginal changes in terms of being well presented.

Base: (206)

**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?

**Q3 2019**

- **Q27 Helpful**
  - Yes: 1
  - No: 99

- **Q28 Polite**
  - Yes: 0
  - No: 100

- **Q30 Driver Wearing Uniform**
  - Yes: 4
  - No: 96

- **Q31 Driver Well Presented**
  - Yes: 4
  - No: 96

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
**Driver Interaction:** On the two occasions when a driver dispute was observed, one driver was thought to handle the situation in a rude or sarcastic manner and the other one professionally.

**Q3 2019**

Q86 How did driver handle situation? (2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent or ignored passenger</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude or sarcastic</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 (Q3), Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 (Q2)*

Base: (2), If yes to DRIVER DISPUTE Q85
Bus Safety: The majority felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly and gave people adequate time to find a seat or hold on; these are significant improvements compared to this time last year.

Q3 2019

Q75 Driver Accelerated Smoothly*  
%  
Yes, felt comfortable 90  
Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort∗ 4  
Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort∗ 8  
Frequently too harsh 1  
Felt it was dangerous

Q76 Driver Braking Smoothly*  
%  
Yes, felt comfortable 87  
Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort∗ 5  
Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort 13  
Frequently too harsh 3  
Felt it was dangerous

Q77 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?  
%  
Yes 90  
Occasionally moved off too early 5  
Frequently moved off too early 15  
Felt it was dangerous

-= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
Pulling up to kerb: In total there were only five incidents of the bus not pulling up to the kerb and in only one case was a vehicle in the way, there didn’t appear to be any reasons in the four other cases.

Base: (4), IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q37/2, (1) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q71/2

Q3 2019

Q38 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (4)* Boarding

- Another vehicle was parked in the way: 25%
- There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop: -
- No footpath kerb was present: -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction: 75%

Q72 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (1)* Alighting

- Other bus was in the way: -
- Other vehicles were parked in the way: -
- There were other obstructions: -
- There was no kerb at my destination stop: -
- Other reason - Please record details: -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction: 100%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
Driver Actions: The buses stopped to pick up passengers on all occasions when requested.

**Q3 2019**

**Q84 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 100</td>
<td>Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could not always stop as bus was full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question rebased off those whose bus was requested to stop

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019 Q2
Driver Behaviour: There were no reports of a driver issues. Only about one in ten said a driver listened to radio/music and very limited mentions of holding long conversations.
Driver Actions: No report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended

Base: (206)

Q3 2019

Q81 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 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019
Diversion or Terminated Early: No reports of buses diverted or terminated early this quarter

Base: (206)

Q3 2019

Q87 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2019

Q87 Did bus terminate early or divert off course?
Q88 Did driver do any of the following
Q89 Were passengers told the reason for early termination or diversion off course?