T1140 Supplier engagement day, 6th October 2017

* Development of seat comfort specification – scope slide 1
	+ Restriction of group standards that may impact the comfort of the seat
	+ The legroom/tables are things which should come in to scope due to the use case and interdependency
	+ Perhaps defining some of those activities and use cases for inclusion in the scope
	+ Consideration of passenger activity was discussed as being included in scope
	+ Comfort specification wouldn’t be a one size fits all – different passenger types and journey types
	+ Legroom is crucial because there are standards regarding templates in office furniture, ageing population, ingress/egress etc.
	+ Challenge is the price vs. comfort. Biggest selling seat is the most uncomfortable in the industry now but it is the cheapest. Manufacturers want to provide this comfortable seating but there is no drive towards this through a specification/standard
	+ Manufacturers point of view, shouldn’t be a substantial cost increase to produce a comfortable seat, it’s in the definition of ‘what is a comfortable seat’ – currently everyone takes their own steer on what is comfortable e.g. price, compliance
	+ In terms of in scope/out of scope - should we be including other sectors to ensure we don’t miss out on crucial knowledge from areas with dynamic factors present
	+ Lack of arm-rest should also be included, impacts upon how close passengers sit next to one another
	+ New international standard for dynamic performance of railway seats\*\*
* Development of seat comfort specification – scope slide 2
	+ Inclusion of passenger activity in scope (from earlier discussion on specification)
	+ Reliability > consistency/replicability
	+ Minimum of 7 years reliability wanted from the manufacture of seats, guarantees are inserted in to franchise planning, TOCs don’t want seat life to expire before franchise, ROSCOs want it to last even longer (same structure but can be refurbished)
	+ Repeatability of the scale/performance rating, rather than the seats themselves
	+ We know that seats will degrade over time, part of life-cycle testing, this is about what fundamentally makes up a comfortable seat
	+ Diverse anthropometric population; guidance
	+ Cushion durability; in scope? Manufacturer would want this
	+ Representation of more than just new seats to give the performance rating scale more opportunity to validate
	+ Discussion around anonymity of seats used for testing. It was considered that a rigorous and transparent methodology would be required.
	+ Discussion around a greater emphasis on the development of a seat comfort scale methodology
* Discussion of challenging timeframe with the number of deliverables stated
* Perhaps we need a discussion around the length of the project (TBC)
* Access to train seats; possible communication from SG
* Thinking about how many seats, different types of trains, different inclusion criteria as well, this is now a bigger project than first projected
* Client group V/V SIC, are their implementation points that are driving the contract length here
* Acquisition of seats ahead of time, and whether SG/RSSB can provide support with this process. Is the cost/time accurate based on that
* Important to get the breadth of seat types, rather than a cross-manufacturer representation to cover the different approaches to seat comfort