

| PROJECT PHASE | REPORTING CATEGORY | OWNER | ACTIVITY | PURPOSE | DESIRED OUTPUT | ANALYSIS METHOD | KPIs | TIMESCALE FOR COMPLETION/ OR DATA COLLECTION |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Pre-Trial | Preparation | LBB | Creation of online chargepoint request form | To monitor and collate interest in EV charge points among residents and gather their details. | Formalisation of online EV charge point requests procedure. | Daily automated updates transferred by officers to a working document | 1. Has the survey been created and it work as intended? | Jul-21 |
| | | LBB | Development, closure and summary of pilot recruitment survey | To initiate a cut-off point for and identify potential gully candidates and on-street chargepoint candidates to form part of the trial. | Longlist of gully candidates and on street charge point locations for further investigation. | Resident details from online form transcribed to working document and evaluated by officers. Key features for inclusion are based on whether the resident has off street parking available to them, whether they are in a priority locations, as well as a suite of additional criteria for 'gully locations' e.g. ability to pay for a home charger, or a preference for a gully rather than a chargepoint. | n/a | Dec-21 |
| | | LBB | Compilation of suitable shortlisted survey participants | To identify potential locations for on street charge points | Shortlist of candidates which align with EST mapping analysis and pilot inclusion criteria | Mapping using Earthlight (mapping software) | 2. Most respondents located in a priority location, or within a 6 minute walk of one | Jan-22 |
| | | LBB | Compilation of suitable shortlisted survey participants | To identify potential locations for gully installation | Shortlist of candidates which align with EST mapping analysis and pilot inclusion criteria | Mapping using earthlight, as well as desktop analysis by relevant officers in Traffic, Highways, Arboriculture and Carbon Management | 3. Minimum 5 suitable sites | Jan-22 |
| | | LBB | Formal shortlisting/contact of gully and chargepoint candidates | To notify residents of their inclusion, subject to approval of pilot design by Members, as well as technical and legal feasibility | Confirmed short-list of participants engaged in process | n/a | n/a | Jan-22 |
| | | LBB | To develop and use a 'User Agreement' to bind participants to terms and conditions of inclusion in the pilot | Clarify legal parameters of the scheme and the mandatory feedback we require from participants. | Final list of participants with their formal agreement. | Monitoring of the number of signed (Legal Department approved) agreements. | n/a | Jun-22 |
| | | LBB | Procurement of on street charge points and gullies | Procurement | Lessons learnt and potentially preferred suppliers. | Officer experience and feedback | | July 2022 for chargepoints / As soon as feasible for gullies, latest Sept 2022 |
| | | LBB | To install charging infrastructure | Installation | All short-listed locations with their assigned charging technology | Supplier and Officer dialogue regarding amendments to siting | n/a | Autumn 2022 |
| | Installation | Participant | Provide feedback to understand installation footprint | To track the installation and resident feedback regarding the physical installation | A record of time elapsed from approval to completion of each installation and a record of impacts | Determine fulfillment of supplier contractual obligations and issue survey to participating residents | 4. Supplier keeping to installation timeframe (yes/no) 5. Perceived risk to other highways users (scale low to high) 6. Aesthetic Appeal (low to high) | Bi-monthly |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | All | Provide feedback to understand maintenance, repair and robustness | To record robustness and suitability of equipment. Clarification of maintenance and repair needs and responsibilities. | Full snagging list if required and clarification of unexpected ongoing issues and responsibilities. | Inspection by relevant Officers, supplier feedback and bi-monthly resident feedback via survey to summarise issues | 7. Time out of action. 8. Speed of repair 9. Type and frequency of damage or fault reoccurrence | Bi-monthly Immediate installation inspection by highways officers |
| Trial Reporting | Usage & Performance | Participant | Provide feedback to understand access to the charging infrastructure | To ascertain suitability of the charging option for residents | Record of day-to-day information which informs whether the charging option is suitable for a wide range of residents | Analysis of interaction with residents via survey and/or interview, or workshop | 10. Proximity to resident address < 6minute walk 11. Percentage of the time a resident is able to charge when they want to | Bi-monthly |
| | | Participant | Provide feedback to understand ease of use of the charging infrastructure | To ascertain suitability of the charging option for residents | Record of day-to-day information which informs whether the charging option is suitable for a wide range of residents | Analysis of interaction with residents via survey and/or interview, or workshop | 12. Residents reporting ease of infrastructure use (scale low to high) 13. Frequency of utilisation 14. Customer satisfaction (low to high) | Bi-monthly |
| | | LBB | On-site inspections during trial | To monitor maintenance of gullies | Validation that residents are using the gullies as intended | Highways inspections periodically to monitor changes | 15. Are participants keeping to the terms if usage defined in the user agreement? (yes/ no/ comments) | Monthly |
| | | Supplier | Operators feedback during trial | To share two way feedback with charge point operators to amend issues and determine whether the partnership is scalable | To form a list of operators likely to continue working with the Council | Monthly feedback meeting with operators (financial and practical), or as frequently as necessary to determine who could meet LBB requirements at scale | 16. Utilisation of chargepoints 10%< by end of pilot 17. Gradual increase in total customer base number 18. Meeting commercial obligations (determined in contract) | Monthly |
| | | LBB | Officer log experience during trial | Learn lessons for future projects | Identification of preferred methods and partners | Gather feedback from Officer working group | 19. Overall positive experience with supplier (yes/no/ comments) | Bi-monthly |
| Financial | Participant | Provide feedback to understand price of charging and willingness of residents to pay | To ascertain which options are economically preferable for residents | An appraisal of ongoing cost to the resident and the public's willingness to pay | Analysis of interaction with residents via survey and/or interview, or workshop | 20. Savings due to total cost of charging (£/kWh) compared to fossil fuel alternatives 21. Comparison between user costs of gully and chargepoints | Bi-monthly | |
| | Participant | Provide feedback to understand price of charging and willingness of residents to pay | To ascertain whether the gully is economically preferable for residents | An appraisal of ongoing cost to the resident and the public's willingness to pay | Analysis of interaction with residents via survey and/or interview, or workshop | 22. Total cost of charging (£/kWh) less compared to fossil fuel alternatives 23. Comparison between user costs of gully and chargepoints (are gully users saving more money than on-street chargepoint counterparts) (Additionally, estimated gully pay back period achieved within 5 years based on savings compared to chargepoints) 24. Likely willingness of residents to pay for a gully if expansion extended across borough (low to high) (positive feedback required to scale up) | Bi-monthly | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|------------|
| | | LBB & Suppliers | Assessment of commercial viability be made by Council and suppliers | To assess commercial viability of the business models for adoption across Bromley | A strong business case for scaling up the charging infrastructure | Work with suppliers to fine tune business model(s) used in pilot to suit LBB. Forecast growth in charging infrastructure use, CAPEX, OPEX, pay back periods and profit generation | 25. Target set for annual expansion of charging infrastructure, based on charging type, in alignment with forecasting | Post pilot |
| Environmental / Social Impact | | Participant | Provide input for calculation of carbon savings | LBB to measure emissions reductions incurred by switching from petrol to electric | Net reduction in emissions from road transportation, supporting climate action | Via survey residents to share billing information (kWh) over course of the year, calculate emissions, then compare to petrol/diesel alternatives | 26. 1tCO2- saved annually, per resident (on average) | Bi-monthly |
| | | Participant | Provide feedback to measure driving behaviour | To measure change in driving behaviour | Understanding of whether the switch to electric and availability of charging infrastructure leads to more privately made journeys | Analysis of interaction with residents via survey and/or interview or workshop. Include Officer feedback, as well as neighbour feedback | 27. Resident assessment of changes in driving behaviour (significantly more to significantly less miles driven) 28. Do participants feel they make significantly more journeys now (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) | Bi-monthly |
| | | Other Residents | Feedback to understand impact on local community | To record frequency and type of feedback received from those not participating in the pilot | Receipt of feedback that can support the Council in tailoring the approach to on-street charging at particular locations | Analyse qualitative information received from residents received via letters, or email to the Council. Alternatives may include deliberate LBB communications via Environment Matters and localised surveys, to canvas feedback. | 29. Minimal incidences of negative feedback over the year (unrelated to consultative exercises e.g. traffic regulation orders) | Ad-Hoc |