

Solutions

2.1

Thirty preferred online booking; forty voluntary online respondents.

2.2

Eight asked for help; twenty logged desk visitors.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: 75% applies to S respondents, not all users/online-only; overlap unknown so 38 distinct people unestablished; help records do not show all users lack access; N supplies neither zero cost nor successful performance.

2.4

Staffing-time concern; no cost/demand/performance estimate; unknown overlap and differing groups prevent a distinct-person sum.

3.1

Conditional online route/assistance evaluation rather than universal online-only conclusion; S supports respondent convenience; L supports investigating assistance among recorded visitors; acknowledges staffing resource objection; demand/time/cost check proposed; source roles and boundaries retained instead of merged.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: bounded convenience/access thesis; accurate S count and source boundary with credit; accurate L count and scope with credit; unknown overlap and no invented distinct-person total; N staffing objection with honest credit; no invented cost or route performance; feasible conditional evaluation retaining priorities and evidence limits; coherent truthful 150–180 word response. Example: “The centre should investigate an online route with accessible assistance before committing to online-only booking. Thirty of forty voluntary online respondents preferred digital booking (S, §1), which suggests convenience for that group but does not establish every user’s preference or access. Separately, eight of twenty logged desk visitors asked for booking help during one week (L, §1). These visitors may overlap with survey respondents, so the counts cannot be added as thirty-eight distinct people.

Together, the sources support considering convenience and access, not declaring that all users can or cannot book online. A fair resource objection is that a telephone route requires staffing time (N, §1). The note supplies no cost estimate, demand count or proven performance, so an alternative cannot be assumed free or successful.

A limited evaluation could record assistance demand, response effort and user difficulties through clear accessible routes. The recommendation should remain conditional on feasible staffing and reviewed evidence, rather than letting a voluntary preference majority settle every access question.”