

NZ Trips & Parking Database Bureau Inc.

PERFORMANCE REPORT ON ANNUAL PLAN 2004/2005

(GST excluded)

	(Last Year) (Actual)	2004/2005 12Month .	
		Original	Actual
Key OBJECTIVE 1.			
To grow the NZTPDB Society Membership			
This is to be achieved over all membership Classes with direct contact and increased levels of knowledge and understanding of Bureau Services.			
Fee for professional time and in contacts		4000	7100
Cost of update and starter kits		1000	500
Prepare send 3 monthly Email letters		<u>1000</u>	<u>500</u>
	(\$7000)	\$ 6000	\$8100
Key OBJECTIVE 2.			
To revise and expand the database.			
This is to be achieved by reviewing the existing Information and introducing other dependent variables (in addition to floor area) as appropriate and the addition of surveyed information available from surveys by members and others.			
Fee for Professional time on Database management		5200	2500
Fee for revision of surveys and variables.		3000	4500
Costs of Data Revision to establish Web Site		<u>5800</u>	<u>500 (1)</u>
	(\$4500)	\$14000	\$7500
Key OBJECTIVE 3.			
To complete and assist with surveys and research.			
Current trips and parking demand research includes			
1. City Centre Survey Review		4000	500(2)
2. Misc Surveys, Industry Bulk Retail,Ret Villg.etc		6000	500
3. Grants to Others in Survey and Analysis		3200	(3)
4. Res. O'Seas UK Trips Parking Rates. LTNZ		<u>0</u>	<u>8500(4)</u>
	(\$6500)	<u>\$13200</u>	<u>\$9500</u>
Key OBJECTIVE 4.			
To maintain the administration of the Society.			
Administrative overhead contract fee		5600	8200 (5)
Office expenses, communication, travel		1200	1800
Acct Fee, GST Tax,		(6)	<u>3000</u>
	(\$9500)	<u>\$6800</u>	<u>\$13000</u>
<u>Total Plan Budget</u>	(\$27500)	<u>\$40000</u>	<u>\$38100(7)</u>

Notes:-

- (1) It became obvious that getting the present CD upgraded was the first priority and that the website proposal would have to await the results of the international comparisons. So work was stopped on this project in the meantime and this budget was re-allocated to Objective 3(4).
- (2) Several cities are working in this area but we have not, in 2004/2005 set up comparative review.
- (3) No grants were made in 2004/05.
- (4) This work became the major thrust of the Bureau's work in the latter half of the year. It had been hoped that a LTNZ research programme would assist but the proposal was not accepted by LTNZ.
- (5) It had been hoped to work on a lesser budget for administration but in order to sustain the whole programme it was found that \$700 a month was the least figure possible.
- (6) This item was not included but it will be a recurring item in the future.
- (7) The original budget assumed was \$40,000 expenditure (excluding GST). The Board chose, at the ½ year revue, to accept the then fees income of of \$38000 and, reduce total expenditure.