



Final Performance Indicator Set for Merseyside LTP3

April 2011

Merseyside Transport Partnership

Final Performance Indicator Set for Merseyside LTP3

April 2011

Merseyside Transport Partnership

Issue and revision record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
A	24/04/11	RH	RB	EM	First Issue for LTP3 Appendix.

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

Content

Chapter	Title	Page
1.	Context: Performance Indicators for LTP1 & LTP2	1
2.	The Need for Performance Indicators for LTP3	2
3.	Developing the Indicator Set	3
4.	Final Agreed Performance Indicator Set	4
5.	The Process for Monitoring	7

1. Context: Performance Indicators for LTP1 & LTP2

Merseyside's first Local Transport Plan (LTP) had approximately 100 performance indicators. For LTP2 this number was reduced to 44. These were comprised of 20 indicators mandated by central government and a further 24 developed specifically for the Merseyside LTP (and grouped into categories of: Congestion, Accessibility, Quality Air/Life & Other).

Of the 44 LTP2 indicators, 10 were identified as Merseyside 'core' indicators:

- Access to jobs
- Access to education
- Total KSI's
- Child KSI's
- Pollutant concentrations with AQMA's
- Person delay indicator
- Peak period flows to urban centres
- Mode share to school
- Mode share indicators
- % New developments with SPD

The LTP2 indicator set was taken as the starting point for the development of indicators for LTP3.

2. The Need for Performance Indicators for LTP3

LTP2 was developed and delivered under very specific guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT). In contrast to this, for LTP3 there has been no directive guidance on indicator development and monitoring, beyond that it is a “local matter” and should therefore be organised at the local level.

In broad terms, the national precedent is the abandonment of existing indicator sets, although some new streamlined sets of indicators have been re-introduced (e.g. in the DfT Business Plan). Furthermore there will be no national assessment of LTP3 performance indicators and no requirement to report back to the DfT on an annual basis via Annual Performance Reports as was the case for LTP2.

However, the Merseyside Transport Partnership has determined that there remain good and sound management reasons for maintaining a meaningful set of performance indicators for the Merseyside Local Transport Plan. The ability to measure performance in order to identify both successes and shortcomings and therefore being able to address these issues throughout the lifetime of LTP3 is of clear value. A set of focused, clear and measurable indicators provides accountability and incentives for improved performance and can help deliver better value for money as interventions are sought to maximise performance.

Maintaining a continuity with LTP2 is also valuable. The Merseyside Transport Partnership are in some instances only now starting to see the full value of some of the indicator programmes from LTP2, and to halt these now could prove to be short sighted.

3. Developing the Indicator Set

The Merseyside Transport Partnership have therefore developed a slimmed down, locally relevant performance indicator set. A series of workshops were held wherein partners discussed which of the existing LTP2 indicators should be retained and what new indicators should be developed.

Partners were asked to bear in mind the following considerations:

- Is the indicator measuring a priority area of strategy (links to the importance of targeting of capital programme to agreed strategy)?
- Is sufficient data going to be available to report the indicator?
- What would be the cost of any additional data collection?
- Is a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time based) target possible with the indicator?
- Is the indicator cross cutting (i.e. supporting more than one priority area)?
- Does the indicator provide any perverse incentives?

A cross reference was also undertaken against the indicators identified for monitoring the LTP3 SEA objectives (of which there were 15) to ensure that any recommendations for indicators in the SEA were sufficiently covered by the final LTP3 indicator set.

Indicators were sorted into three categories, based on the specific purpose they would serve:

- **Target Performance Indicators** are those where the partnership feel an outcome is within direct influence and/or where firm numerical targets will be a driver for performance.
- **Non-Target Performance Indicators** are those where measuring progress is important, but a numerical target is considered too specific to be a meaningful measure, or where an outcome would be difficult for the partnership to influence. It is proposed that these be measured using a 'traffic light' system.
- **Monitoring Indicators** are those which lie outside of the partnership's influence and were not felt to be fair measures of performance, or data quality is insufficient to accurately measure performance. However, they were felt to be useful data sets and in most cases the data is already collected for other purposes.

4. Final Agreed Performance Indicator Set

Table 4.1 contains the final agreed list of Performance Indicators for LTP3. The final indicator set reflects the partnerships goals for LTP3 and will provide a firm basis to monitor performance against priorities.

LTP3 Ref No / LTP2 Ref No	Description	Notes
Target Indicators		
A1 / LTP3	Cycling – Index of Usage	Cycling and active travel are central to LTP3 and this indicator has a vital role in demonstrating progress in this area. The indicator is currently based on a robust data set which, subject to ongoing review of cost implications, will continue to be collected.
A2 / BVPI 223 (96)	Principal Road Condition	Road condition is a robust dataset which will continue to be collected. These Indicators chime with the emphasis on delivering maintenance of the core network in LTP3.
A3 / BVPI 224a (97a)	Non-Principal Classified Road Condition	As above
A4 / BVPI 99x	Total KSI Casualties	Road safety is a robust dataset which will continue to be collected. These indicators are important headline road safety measures and targets have been found to be particularly effective in driving performance in this area.
A5 / BVPI 99y	Child KSI Casualties	As above
A6 / New Indicator	Public Transport Customer Satisfaction	New indicator in order to have a numerical measure monitoring perception of Public Transport performance.
A7 / 3	Limit current number of car parking spaces available in Liverpool City Centre	Although this is not outcome based or Merseyside wide in the strictest sense, levels of parking in Liverpool, as the major centre, do have an impact on the wider region.
Non-Target Indicators		
B1 / 13/14	National Accessibility Indicator (previously 'Economic Impact' 'Education' indicators)	A combined and expanded version of the LTP2 accessibility indicator definition to monitor several accessibility sub-sets under an overall access indicator: Economic/employment Health Education
B2 / LTP6	Traffic Flows into Centres	A retained 'flows into centres' indicator in order to monitor economic regeneration and smarter choices.
B3 / LTP4	Mode Share of Journeys to School	This indicator is desirable but is subject to a good quality data source being made available – either nationally or locally.
B4 / 16	Estimated Transport Related Emissions	Indicator is the most valuable of the 'Air Quality' indicators to take forward to LTP3, though we do not consider it possible to set a meaningful numerical target. Data collection for this indicator is subject to funding of wider MAEI programme post 2012.
B5 / BVPI 102a	PT Patronage – Bus	Patronage is a core measure of transport performance and data on this is already collected. We do not propose to set a target given concerns over the ability of the Partnership to exert direct influence.
B6 / BVPI 102b	PT Patronage – Rail	As above

LTP3 Ref No / LTP2 Ref No	Description	Notes
B7 / 2	Journey Times on Designated Routes (previously 'HGV journey times' indicators)	DfT provide a useful Journey time dataset in the form of Trafficmaster data so we propose to continue to monitor journey time in some form. We propose to expand upon the LTP2 definition to cover journey times on other strategic networks: Freight Wider 'core' network Specific corridors (such as but perhaps not specifically the 11 'congestion' corridors) These routes need to be defined and the indicator is subject to the availability of the national data set / the cost implications of data processing. It was not proposed to set a target given concerns over ability of the Partnership to exert direct influence.
Monitoring Indicators		
C1 / LTP2	Change in area wide road traffic	This indicator is easy to report from national data release.
C2 / BVPI 224b (97b)	Unclassified Road condition.	Data for this indicator will be collected anyway so it is worth monitoring if not setting as a 'performance indicator'.
C3 / LTP7	Congestion (Person Delay) New economy/transport measures	Indicator definition to be developed to better address the economy/travel relationship.
C4 / LTP5	Bus Punctuality	Data is collected by Merseytravel as part of lost mileage reimbursement calculations so will be available – though we do not consider this suitable as a 'performance indicator'.
C5 / BVPI 99z	Total slight casualties.	Data will be collected anyway so worth monitoring though not as 'headline' as the KSI figures.
C6 / 12	Affordability - Index of transport usage costs	Data will be collected anyway and this is an important issue so worth monitoring – if not setting as a 'performance indicator' due to partnership's lack of direct influence.
C7 / 18	Environmental Standard of Bus Fleet (Euro V or equivalent)	Data will be collected anyway and this is a reasonable proxy measure of overall fleet quality, though we do not see this as a direct measure of performance. Updated definition from Euro III to Euro V.
C8 / 20	Travel to Work Modal Share indicator	Data is collected via the Countywide Household Travel Survey and the Labour Force Survey – this indicator is worth retaining for monitoring purposes.
C9 / 19	Physical Activity Indicator	Sport England Active People Survey is being expanded to include better data on cycling. Subject to the quality of this data, we propose to retain a version of this indicator which will be valuable background, given the focus on active travel and health in the LTP.

Further considerations

Further to the above indicators there was substantive discussion over the potential for further 'new' indicators to be developed as a result of new and emerging trends. The growth in light goods vehicles and taxi patronage are examples of recent trends which were considered. In addition Public Health Outcomes and indicators, developed by the NHS, are currently out for consultation and some of these may be useful in performance monitoring of LTP3. There was also some discussion around retaining a strategic development performance Indicator (in line with the LTP2 indicator 22 – “% of new developments meeting min. standards for all transport modes as defined by SPD”). For this indicator it was felt that there was currently no meaningful Merseyside wide data to enable useful monitoring of this indicator, but it was agreed that once that was in place, this could potentially be worth including.

As a result of these considerations, it is proposed that the above set of indicators remains flexible with potential to change over the life of the LTP3.

5. The Process for Monitoring

The partnership propose to continue the process of monitoring which was developed for LTP2.

A system of designated “indicator owners” will be adopted to provide a central point of responsibility for documentation, data collection, monitoring and review of progress for each performance indicator. “Control forms” will provide formal documentation of indicator objectives, definitions, baseline year and methodology for data collection and aggregation.

For those indicators with targets, “target forms” will be completed which will set out a reasoned justification for the target set reflecting an ambitious yet realistic level. Where relevant, targets are required to be set for the lifetime of the implementation plan (i.e. to 2014/15), though it was agreed that should owners/working groups wish to set more long term aspirational targets for the lifetime of the strategy (i.e. to 2024), there was no reason not to do so.

Control forms and target forms for all indicators will be maintained on file by the partnership, and performance review will be undertaken at a minimum on an annual basis.