

DIRECTLY MANAGED MOORINGS: PRICING AND VACANCY ALLOCATION

INTERIM PAPER FOR THE CONSULTATION

This interim paper is an incomplete working draft of the consultation document due to be published in mid May. The first six sections are nearly complete, but sections 7-9 are not yet started. We welcome comments on what we've drafted so far and will do our best to take account of them in producing the final version. Please send your comments as soon as possible to consultation@britishwaterways.co.uk. A further working draft will be published in early May in time for its review at the meeting of British Waterways Advisory Forum on 16th May.

1. ABOUT THE CONSULTATION

- 1.1. An outline paper was published on 10 March. This was in two parts: (1) the proposed approach and timetable for consultation; (2) Proposed headings and bullet points for the formal consultation paper. This interim paper is a development of (2). It is work in progress towards the full paper. Some sections are further advanced than others. We are putting it in the public domain to stimulate constructive discussion that will help us to produce the best possible consultation paper.
- 1.2. The **aim of the consultation** is (a) to build stakeholder understanding of the factors that determine BW policy and procedures for the running of its directly managed moorings, and (b) for stakeholders to use this understanding to assess the validity of BW's analysis and conclusions, most notably in the area of customer service.
- 1.3. Some factors are fixed: this consultation is not seeking views on government policy with respect to BW, and there is nothing BW can do to change UK competition law or any other relevant law. The consultation is not about 'how high or low should mooring prices be' but about how the prices for all long term moorings customers should be set, and how vacancies should be allocated given the statutory framework. The scope of the consultation therefore extends beyond a simple assessment of whether the trial of mooring tendering was successful.

2. SETTING THE SCENE

- 2.1. Amongst the already considerable feedback we've had to the moorings tender trial, there have been frequent references to BW's responsibility for ensuring "adequate" supply of moorings at a "reasonable" price. They raise questions about moorings policy generally, i.e. not just about our own directly managed ones. So we felt it would be helpful to include a concise summary of relevant trends and issues relating to moorings as these provide important background to understanding our recent decisions.
- 2.2. BW has no statutory obligation to provide long term moorings, but since a home mooring is a legal requirement for the majority of boaters under the British Waterway Act 1995, we clearly have an interest in the long term moorings market. In line with government policy, BW believes that a vibrant and well functioning market for long

term moorings is the best recipe for ensuring long term value for boat owners. Where markets work well, they attract investment to provide the supply to meet the level of customer demand.

- 2.3. Recent years have seen exceptionally strong growth in the number of boats on our waterways – a net increase of 5,800 (23%) since 2000, bringing the total to 31,000. But the supply of moorings has not kept pace with this demand, and this has caused steep increases in the price of moorings in many locations and by different operators.
- 2.4. With this realisation – and prompted by fair pressure from the British Marine Federation (BMF) – in 2005 BW considered how it could best stimulate the market to increase the supply of moorings. Two key conclusions were that we needed to improve our procedures for working with marina developers to remove unnecessary obstacles to construction of new mooring sites, and that we should take great care to ensure that our directly managed online moorings business (which comprises over 400 sites and some 4,600 customers) was not inadvertently distorting the overall market for moorings.
- 2.5. We also realised that our past practice of simply increasing supply of online moorings on our own property, as a ‘quick fix’ for moorings shortage, was not the best long term solution. As part of our 2006 discussions with the BMF to ensure that our moorings policies were compliant with Fair Trading law, we gave a commitment to start to reduce online moorings by removing one on line berth for every ten new ones created by the private sector¹. We currently implement this policy through a process of natural wastage – i.e. as some berths on our moorings are vacated in the vicinity of a new marina, we do not re-let them.
- 2.6. How we set prices and how we allocate vacancies are of obvious direct concern to any boater interested in mooring along the line of the waterways on a BW managed site. The questions are also of concern to BW licence holders more widely, to other moorings operators and to potential investors.

2.7. Price setting

For the reasons outlined above – and because it is required explicitly to do so by Government² - BW must set its prices at the ‘market’ rate. This is not a matter for consultation. The consultation can however help BW to decide on what will be the most acceptable method for deriving a good estimate of the market price for each of its mooring sites.

In principle, the market price is the one that equates demand with a fixed supply (e.g. of moorings) when there are multiple buyers and perfect information. E-Bay style auctions deliver a good practical approximation to this concept.. By definition any price below the market price results in unsatisfied demand (which may be manifest by waiting lists), and any price above it will result in un-sold supply (e.g. unfilled vacancies).

BW’s current pricing practice involves an annual evaluation by local managers of the market in each area in order to derive an estimate of the market price using data about prices and availability of other moorings in the locality.

2.8. Allocating vacancies

¹ A policy briefing note is published at www.britishwaterways.co.uk/OnlineMooringPol

² DEFRA [Framework Document](#) for British Waterways, para 2.6, Feb. 1999

Prior to the introduction of the tendering trial, we maintained local waiting lists for our mooring sites. Whenever a mooring became vacant, we offered vacancies at the published price (currently being paid by existing moorers at the site) to people on the list. The existence of the waiting list was evidence of potential excess demand and, using the above reasoning, evidence that the price was below the market price.

The motive for introducing the tendering trial for allocation of vacancies was to test whether offering vacant moorings for tender would generate a better guide to the market price (and levels of demand) than our established local assessment process. Its purpose is to further improve the functioning of the moorings market in order to achieve long term benefits to existing and potential customers, such as fair and open access, as well as ensuring that a market was functioning that encouraged other moorings suppliers to enter the market.

3. FEEDBACK ON THE TENDERING TRIAL

We launched the trial on 26 October 2007. Our original proposal had been to test an open auction system, but we modified the approach for two reasons. First, some of the leading boating user groups were opposed to open bidding, fearing it would influence people to increase their bids, and that non-internet users would be excluded. Second, we believed that a tender system would show us the full range of prices that different people in the market were prepared to pay, thus helping in price reviews. (Auctions risk excluding potential bidders from even participating if the current highest bid had exceeded their maximum.)

Consultation before launching the trial included informal discussions with representatives of major boating user groups, a tabled paper and discussion at the national meeting of boating and special interest groups in April 2007. From these, we realised that the move would not be popular with several of these particular groups, but concluded that formal consultation in advance of people seeing at first hand how a tender system would work would not tell us anything to move our understanding forward. We published a 14 page stakeholder briefing document³ during the summer that included our detailed reasons for conducting the trial , and set out the key features of how the system was being designed to work.

The trial appears to have caused record levels of sustained dissent in certain quarters. We acknowledge that it has not been welcomed by the main boating user groups and has caused much negative publicity. On the other hand, some 2,000 people have registered to use the system, the majority, we believe, because they seek a mooring.

In this section we will summarise the feedback we have received from users and the results of the trial so far. More detail is <will be> provided in appendices.

We have noted feedback in various ways:

1. Letters of complaint received by post or email since the initial announcement in April 2007
2. References in the leading waterways magazines and online discussion groups
3. Feedback forms completed on the mooring vacancies website
4. A postal survey of people registered to use the tender system (March 2007)

³ http://www.britishwaterways.co.uk/accountability/moorings_tendering/index.html

5. A telephone interview survey in February 2008 of 470 people drawn from waiting lists
 6. The actual results as reflected in the statistics generated from site registrations, usage of the system, vacancy advertisements, and completed tenders.
- 3.1. Letters of complaint received by post or email since the initial announcement in April 2007

To 31 March 2008 we had received emails or letters from 107 individuals objecting to the mooring tender trial. Of these, 94 were received before the site went live at the end of October. The great majority of objections were that people felt that it would result in moorings becoming more expensive and therefore the system was unfair to people on lower incomes, indicating a belief that BW should need in some way to subsidise these. Appendix 1 groups the comments into categories and shows the frequency with which each category occurred within the responses. We also received a petition from the Inland Waterways Association containing the names of 2480 people, but with no indication of their status as boat owner or BW mooring customer.

- 3.2. References in the leading waterways magazines and online discussion groups

The print and online waterways media have all taken a critical stance, also generally focussing on the theme that it would push moorings prices up and exclude the less wealthy from boating. The only exception is Waterways World's "The Broader View" column, which although also critical of tenders, accepts the value of a more rigorous market-based approach to the pricing of BW's moorings and urges BW to switch to open auction bidding.

- 3.3. Feedback forms completed on the mooring vacancies website

We included a simple feedback form on the mooring tenders website from site launch date. Analysis of the responses will be included in the consultation paper. The questions asked are included here in appendix 2.

- 3.4. A postal survey of people registered to use the tender system (March 2007)

The picture provided from all the above sources is valuable, but as it comes from a self-selecting group it is not necessarily reflective of all boaters looking for a BW mooring. We therefore commissioned a short random sample survey from Andrew Irving Associates, an independent market research agency. The results are expected in mid April and will be included in the consultation paper.

- 3.5. A telephone interview survey in February 2008 of a sample of people drawn from waiting lists

In May 2007 we had approximately 2,700 names on our combined waiting lists for BW mooring sites, but less than 300 of these appear so far to have registered to use the tendering system, either by post or online. This indicates that most people on waiting lists do not like the trial, but we need to understand their specific objections to using the system, how well informed they are about how it works and whether indeed they are still in the market for a mooring.

We therefore surveyed a random sample of people who were on waiting lists for the 18 sites where we had advertised vacancies which received the smallest number of tenders, or none at all. The research was commissioned from Andrew Irving

Associates who were responsible for making all the contacts, interviewing and reporting on the results. They achieved 252 interviews. Headline results are in appendix 3

3.6. Actual results

3.6.1 To 31st March, 135 vacancies were tendered resulting, so far, in 104 mooring contracts. The average annual price of these contracts was approximately £100 per metre, a premium of 19% above the current prices. The new contracts are fixed at this price for 3 years (so are inflation-protected). 26 of the contracts let for below the current price.

3.6.2 With only about a third of all contracts being secured by people who are already boat licence holders and the great majority of registered users not being people on the waiting lists, it appears that the trial is reaching a much wider audience than existing BW boaters.

In general, with the data so far analysed, there appears to be positive correlation between the number of tenders placed for a vacancy and the length of berth (short moorings are much less popular). Sites with moderate facility provision tend to attract more interest than very basic sites, and those with a larger number of people on the waiting list appear to attract slightly more tenders.

Statistics from the system as at 2 April 2008 are in Appendix 4.

3.6.3 Uptake of the postal option

138 people have so far opted to register by post, but only 11 of these have submitted a tender, four of which were successful.

3.6.4 Difficulties encountered

We are pleased with the way that the site has functioned. There have been no major problems and we have been able to resolve most bugs promptly without customers being inconvenienced. As with any new IT system however, we cannot claim perfection. Our main teething difficulties have been with online processing of certain types of payment card, and in designing the system, we did not fully anticipate the implications of offering multiple vacancies for the same sized boat for tender at the same time.

3.6.5 Measuring success of the trial

As described above, the majority issue from the user feedback has been that the tendering system favours better-off boat owners. However, in terms of the success criteria we published in the stakeholder briefing in summer 2007, our assessment can be summarised as follows:

a) Ease of use

The majority of users appear to have no difficulties although improvements could be made.

b) Volume of tenders submitted for each vacancy commensurate with size of local market

The volume of tenders for many vacancies has fallen short of our expectations. We believe the reasons for this include:

- The approach is unusual and relatively demanding for certain customers (although once they have overcome their hesitation, it is relatively simple).
 - People are waiting for the end of the trial and the consultation to see what method will be adopted
 - Universally negative press that deterred many people in the target markets from taking part (even though by doing so, some would have secured the mooring at their preferred site without having to pay a higher price).
 - Reluctance to ‘contribute’ to the feared price increases (although, in fact, prices for some tendered moorings have been below the current price).
 - Shortage of supply of residential moorings means that almost all vacancies advertised so far have been for leisure use only.
 - We did not quantify our expectations in advance in relation to market size, instead assuming that our waiting list data would be an adequate guide to demand. The experience in the trial has highlighted factors that we did not take into account, such as size of berth (obvious, but not captured within our previous management system).
- c) Whether it provides an efficient means of estimating the market price

The system has provided indisputable and transparent data on what individuals are prepared to pay for a three-year mooring agreement for individual tendered vacancies. Subject to technical concerns about the results of tenders as distinct from auctions⁴, we believe that the trial has in principle proved capable of providing an objective and efficient guide to market price. We will discuss this aspect further in section 6. Concerns have been raised about the relative cost of operating the tender system compared with the former waiting lists. These will be addressed in section 8.

4. FUTURE OPTIONS FOR ALLOCATING VACANCIES AT BW MOORING SITES

Comments received from the publication of our outline paper have resulted in some additions and modifications to the previous list of options for analysis. The new list can be summarised as:

1. Return to waiting list system
2. Adopting the mooring tenders system as per the trial
3. Modified tendering
4. Open auction
5. “Estate agency”
6. Allocation by lottery

⁴ See Waterways World, ‘the Broader View’, July 2007, page 51.

For each of these options, we will first present a straight description, where available, giving the perspectives for the customer and for BW. Evaluation of advantages and disadvantages of each option would not be included here, but in section 8.

4.1.1 **Waiting lists**

Until 2006, waiting list systems were designed and managed locally without any central procedures. As a result they followed different formats. In 2006 all waterways adopted a standard procedure that provided consistent terms relating to registration, offers and refusals. Formal complaints from customers about moorings waiting list experiences dropped from 14 (1.7% of all 'level 1' complaints) in 2004 to 5 in 2006 (0.6%).

Key features of the 2006 waiting list system are summarised as:

Waiting lists - customer aspects

- Simple registration form – maximum of three sites per customer per waterway unit
- Customers could find out their place in the queue (although not necessarily a guide to how quickly they'd get a mooring as this depends on the length of berth that becomes available)
- Customers were offered up to three vacancies at a site – if all were refused, they were removed from the list for that site
- Maximum of two weeks to respond to an offer before it was offered to the next person
- Removed from the list if they failed to reply to the annual 'refresh'
- Some customers stayed on the list for many years

BW aspects

- Data recorded against each mooring site; annual mail-out to refresh people's data
- Staff simply worked down the list until they found someone to accept
- Some waiting lists were closed for certain sites with a long waiting list
- No promotion of sites or vacancies (except some London sites)

In May 2007 we assembled the local databases of names on waiting lists into a national list of some 2,700 people. 8% of sites had no waiting list.

4.1.2 **Tendering as per trial**

Key features of the tendering system are as follows.

Tendering - customer aspects

- Detailed information and pictures of all vacancies are published
- Full range of search options across the country
- Automatic notification of vacancies arising which meet the customer's preferences
- 3 year, fixed price contract
- Open to all, not just people on previous waiting lists

- Runs over internet with postal option
- Slightly different terms and conditions from existing customers
- Requires decision on how much to tender
- Not all people on the site pay the same mooring fee

BW aspects

- Staff need to research and prepare more detail for publishing the vacancy; input needed from several staff (subsequent vacancies can copy previous information)
- Initial learning curve and training for staff
- Central coordination
- Many automated processes
- Generates market data not previously captured which is clearly displayed for all to see

4.1.3 Modified tendering

With the trialled system, the highest tenderer pays the price they submitted, regardless of the second highest bid. In some cases there is a substantial difference between the two, which can be a concern. Under this modified approach, the price paid by the highest tenderer would be specified margin (e.g. £50) above the second highest tender. Otherwise key features would remain largely as existing, subject to any other modifications adopted as a result of the consultation process. The postal option is compatible with this option.

4.1.4 Open auction

This option would recognise two important shortcomings of the tendering system – that people find it difficult to decide how much to offer, and that the result is not the best possible estimate of the market price. The bidding system would be converted to an open auction where multiple bids would be permitted and people would be able to see what they need to offer to secure the mooring. In other respects, it would be much the same as the current tendering process, with vacancies advertised online with searchable database etc. We could go further and adopt the E-Bay approach in which allows for ‘auto-bids’ – i.e. people can opt for the system to ‘bid’ on their behalf in increments above the leading bid price, subject to their maximum. Participation by post with this option would be possible, because a maximum bid can be submitted on their behalf, although without internet access, postal users would not be able to watch the auction proceed or change their bid.

4.1.5 “Estate Agency” approach – ‘first come first served’

This approach proposed by the IWA would involve vacancies being advertised at existing price. People would be invited to submit a full application, and the berth would be allocated to first completed application received.

4.1.6 Lottery

Several suggestions for this type of approach came from user groups and individuals responding to the outline paper. There appear to be two variants.

- 1) Vacancies would continue to be advertised online as at present with a closing date for applications. The price at which the mooring would be offered would be the current price as set in the annual price review. On the closing date,

the 'winner' would be drawn by a random number selection process. If the winner did not complete the contract within a specified period, another name would be drawn.

- 2) Boaters would apply for moorings in an area (e.g. all London, or all London residential or all London non-residential) and have their names placed on a list. As a mooring became available, a boater (with the appropriate length of boat to fit the mooring space) would be contacted at random and offered the mooring at the existing price. The boater would then have, say, two weeks to accept or decline the offer; if he/she declined, another name would be drawn out of the hat, and so on. Boaters would have to renew their name on the list every year. They could pay a one-off token charge to ensure that boaters wouldn't add their names to a list on a mere whim

5. FUTURE OPTIONS FOR DETERMINING THE MOORING PRICE FOR ALL CUSTOMERS

The 'in principle' options identified are as follows. We have added two options to our previous list following requests resulting from the outline paper. The best estimate of the market price would of course come from a periodic auction of all mooring berths, not just those becoming vacant, but we have ruled this out as impractical.

In this section we simply describe the options. They are evaluated against the relevant criteria in section 8.

1. The current method (market assessment by local BW offices)
2. Price derived from tender or auction results
3. Valuation based on a new formula using price data from basket of local benchmark private mooring sites
4. Valuation using information from local benchmarks, combined if applicable with tender or auction data
5. Price calculated from BW's costs of providing the site.
6. Return to the 'moorings matrix' system of 1990s.

Key features of each of these are as follows:

5.1. BW local market assessment (status quo)

This method aims to estimate the market price (as defined in para 3.7) through a comprehensive analysis of the market for each site. To do this, local BW managers follow national guidelines that require them to:

1. Define geographically the local market for each mooring site
2. Research the prices charged for moorings by other operators catering for the same market
3. Compare the characteristics and facilities of the various sites
4. Identify changes over the past year within the local market (eg changes in supply of moorings)
5. Analyse demand for the BW mooring site as indicated by occupancy levels and size of waiting list (if any)
6. To draw on the above information to deduce the appropriate price for the BW mooring for the forthcoming year.

Each local manager is responsible for conducting this exercise accurately for an average of over 40 sites.

5.2. Price derived from tender or auction results

There is a variety of ways in which the data from tenders or auctions could be used to inform or formulate the estimate of market price for each site. At its simplest, for example, we could set a rule that says: if contracts have been secured above the current guide price in the past 12 months, then the price for renewals of annual permits should rise. Conversely, if they have been let at a discount, this is likely to suggest that the current price is an overestimate of the market price, so should be reduced.

If vacancies at the site attracted no offers above the reserve price, then demand is zero and the particular berth(s) (not whole site) should be closed, contributing to achievement of BW's online mooring reduction policy.

These simple rules could be elaborated by taking account of the concentration of tenders above/below the guide price to derive a simple formula for setting the price increase or decrease.

Depending on the outcome of the consultation, further work would be done to develop a quantitative long term pricing model using tender or auction data. Implementation would be phased as sufficient data from tenders/auctions at each site is obtained.

5.3. Valuation using local price benchmarks

This would be a modification of the status quo method which would aim to be less onerous and subjective. The method would involve estimating the market price by reference to prices charged by local competitors. A fixed set of benchmark sites for each BW mooring site would be defined, and a statistical model determined to estimate the rate for the BW site from price and attribute data relating to the benchmark sites. It would involve initial investment in professional economic modelling work, but thereafter might generate pricing decisions quite efficiently.

5.4. Valuation using local benchmarks and tender / auction data

This would be a combination of 6.2 and 6.3.

5.5. Cost plus

In principle this sounds simple: to set the price by reference to the marginal (or average) cost of providing the site for mooring with a fixed % profit margin.

5.6. "Mooring Matrix"

This was a national table – a grid of prices determined by the intersection of a 'site facilities score' and a 'location score'. All mooring sites were assigned a 'bollard score' representing the extent of facilities at the site, and – in theory, they were also assigned a 'location score' – a measure from 1 – 10 that was meant to reflect the site's general attractiveness and strength of local demand. In practice, no appropriate scoring guidelines could be agreed for the latter, with the result that local managers would simply select the mooring fee directly from the grid. Prices within the grid were increased each year broadly in line with general price inflation.

6. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING OPTIONS FOR ALLOCATING VACANCIES AND SETTING PRICES

Listed below are the criteria that we believe are appropriate for assessing the different options for allocating vacancies and setting prices. Against each factor, a tick indicates whether it is relevant to the allocation of vacancies question and/or to the mooring price setting question.

Evaluation criteria	Allocating vacancies	Setting mooring price
How objective and transparent is it?	✓	✓
How much does it cost to operate?	✓	✓
Revenue foregone when the mooring remains empty	✓	
Administration	✓	✓
Advertising	✓	
Other costs	✓	✓
How easy and acceptable is it for customers?	✓	✓
Does it help determine market price for the site?	✓	
Does it give good approximation of market price?		✓

The responses to the outline paper included two requests to expand this list to include 'fairness', 'encouragement of newcomers' and 'social inclusiveness'. For the purposes of this consultation, all three of these effectively translate into an objective of 'keeping mooring prices affordable'. It is however very hard to see how we could devise mooring policies to deliver guaranteed low mooring prices while both achieving the long term growth in private sector investment that a strong boating market needs, and remaining within our remit from government. We believe that the best chance of achieving affordable moorings comes from making the market more dynamic so that private investors can see and respond to clear signals of demand for different types of mooring.

We are therefore left with our original list of criteria for assessing the different options for allocating vacancies and setting prices.

7. ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS *[Development of this section will follow early feedback on the interim paper]*

We will evaluate each of the options described in sections 3 and 4 against the criteria contained in section 5. We will present as much cost and other data as is reasonable to draw together and present. A substantial amount of information has already been compiled and supplied under the Freedom of Information Act and we will update and include this as appropriate.

8. CONCLUSION

A summary of the results from section 7 and suggested conclusions.

9. CLOSING SECTION AND INVITATION TO COMMENT

Since the number and complexity of issues is significant, would you like a feedback questionnaire? Questions need to be relevant to the assessment criteria and the overall aims of the consultation described in section 1. Examples of questions could be:

- Based on our criteria and evidence, which option(s) are most acceptable to you? Why?
- Can you suggest other options that satisfy the criteria?

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 (ref para 3.1)

Comments from all spontaneous letters & emails from individuals between announcement of the trial and 31/3/08.

	% of comments	% of people
It just favours the rich	20%	59%
It's unfair	17%	49%
It will drive low income people away from the waterways	12%	35%
I was on a waiting list and find this unfair	9%	25%
It's just BW trying to raise more cash	7%	21%
If the trial is abandoned, those moorings let by tender should be vacated	5%	15%
I object to giving financial details before entering agreement	5%	14%
I don't believe it's legal	5%	13%
BW is disregarding the needs of disabled boaters	5%	13%
It will just create more continuous cruisers	4%	10%
You should have consulted before the trial	3%	9%
It disadvantages non-computer users	3%	9%
Various tongue-in-cheek comments	3%	9%
It's threatening homes & livelihoods	2%	7%
TOTAL NUMBER OF COMMENTS/PEOPLE (to 31/3/08)	309	107

Appendix 2 (ref para 3.3)

Online feedback form - questions asked

How easy in general did you find it to use this website?

Did you find all the information you needed on the site?

If no - What couldn't you find?

Which of the following functions did you use? Registered

Which of the following functions did you use? Search vacancies

Which of the following functions did you use? Tendered

Which of the following functions did you use? Saved searches

Which of the following functions did you use? Requested email notice of new vacancies

Which of the following functions did you use? Watched vacancies

Which of the following functions did you use? Edited personal details

Which of the following functions did you use? None of these

Has your visit to the site helped you in your search for a mooring?

When you entered the site, what type of mooring were you looking for?

What improvements would you like to see to the site? Ability to revise my tender for a vacancy after submitting it

What improvements would you like to see to the site? An online auction (where the leading price and all other bids are displayed)

What improvements would you like to see to the site? Text messaging to tell me when a vacancy arises that matches my preferences (approx cost of 25p)

What improvements would you like to see to the site? Other - please write your suggestions in the comments box below

Other improvements - Please Specify

Any other comments

Appendix 3 (ref para 3.5)

Headline results from 252 telephone interviews with people on waiting lists of 18 sites with few or no tenders for vacancies, Feb/Mar 08

"Site" means the site they were on waiting list; "vacancy" means advertised vacancy at the site

Registered to use the tendering system	40%
Main reasons why registered boaters didn't place tender	
Not aware of the vacancy	25%
Berth not long enough	22%
Not most preferred site	14%
Disagree with principle	8%
Main reasons for not registering	
Disagree with principle	51%

Have got mooring elsewhere	26%
Still interested in obtaining a mooring at this site	55%
Internet users	80%
Aware that vacancy had been advertised during the trial	44%
Understand key features of the tendering system	68%

Appendix 4 (ref para 4.6)

Statistics from the trial to 31 March 2008.

USERS	
Total people registered as users	1935
Percentage of these who were on May 07 waiting list	15%
Average new users registered per week	61
Average visits per week	2841
Average page views per visit	7.5
Average views of vacancy details (per visit)	0.74
Average time spent on site	5.1 mins
% registered users who have placed a tender	12%
VACANCIES	
Total vacancies offered for tender	135
% of total BW sites which have had tendered vacancies	15%
% vacancies attracting no tenders	13%
% vacancies attracting only tenders below reserve price	3%
Average tenders per vacancy	3
SUCCESSFUL TENDERS	
% of contracts below guide price	26%
% of contracts above or at guide price	74%
% of contracts within +/- 10% of guide price	25%
% of contracts more than 20% more than current guide price	42%
% current BW boat licence holders	38%

Appendix 5 (ref para 5.1.1) Waiting lists – terms and conditions