Stakeholders Identification Table for Tirana Public Transportation Management System

Stakeholder	Stakeholder Role/Responsibility	Importance	Influence	Interests/ Positive Impacts	Concerns
Job Title	Are they using the product directly? How do they use the product?	*Low/Medium/High* Do they provide knowledge and expertise necessary to identify business requirements? Do they provide knowledge and expertise necessary to identify technical and business constraints?	*Low/Medium/High* Are they decision makers? Are they part of operational, tactical or strategic management?	What are their interests in the product? How important is the product for them in order to do their job or accomplish some purpose? What difference the product is going to make for what they need to accomplish?	Is the product going to have some negative impact on anything/anyone? Do they have any worries/concerns related to the product?
Passengers	Primary end users who interact with the app directly to plan journeys, track vehicles, and purchase tickets.	**High** – They are the **primary users** of the system. Their adoption is critical to meeting the goals of increased public transport usage and sustainability.	**Medium** – While they don't design or fund the system, passenger feedback, ridership patterns, and satisfaction levels **influence policy decisions** and service improvements.	- Faster and more reliable commutes. - Easier route planning and real-time updates. - Cashless ticketing. - Improved accessibility and comfort. - Environmental improvement through reduced traffic and air pollution.	- **Fear of increased fares** or **complex digital systems**. - Digital exclusion for the elderly or those without smartphones. - Concerns about data privacy (location, personal data). - Initial confusion during transition from paper to digital systems. - **Poor app performance** (e.g., inaccurate real-time data or crashes) could erode trust.
Municipality of Tirana (Mayor & Council)	Strategic decision-maker and project sponsor; provides funding, policy direction, and oversight of PTMS	**High** – Their **political sponsorship and funding decisions** are essential to the system's implementation and sustainability.	**High** – They are final decision-makers on budgets, regulations, and long-term transport policy.	- Achieves smart city goals. - Reduces traffic, pollution, and citizen complaints. - Demonstrates innovation and transparency.	- Political risk if the project fails or receives negative media. - Budget overruns. - Public backlash during rollout or disruption.

Tirana Transport Directorate	They are **direct users** of back-end dashboards, planning modules, and fleet monitoring tools.	**High** – Their operational expertise shapes the system's real-world use, scheduling, and integration.	**High** – They provide the data, logic, and rules that define routes, fleets, and performance.	- Real-time decision-making tools. - Easier schedule updates. - Data-driven planning.	- Resistance to change from legacy systems. - Staff training burdens. - System bugs may disrupt citywide services.
Ministry of Infrastructure & Energy	They are **indirect beneficiaries**, receiving reports and setting policies.	**High** – Their regulations and funding streams are critical to national transport projects.	**High** – They set legal and operational frameworks that guide implementation.	- Fulfilment of sustainable development goals. - Data for national planning. - Coordination across cities and regions.	- Incompatibility with national standards. - Lack of scalability. - Poor coordination with other municipalities.
National Agency for Information Society (AKSHI / e-Albania)	Indirect users – They enable **back-end integrations** like e-ID or secure APIs.	**Medium** – Integration with digital services improves the citizen experience and boosts project legitimacy.	**Medium** – They enforce standards and oversee security and data interoperability.	- Increased citizen engagement. - Broader use of e-services. - Seamless integration into the digital public ecosystem.	- Technical debt if APIs are unstable. - Risk of cyber vulnerabilities. - Complex legal/technical compliance burdens.
Bus Drivers	Direct users - Operate vehicles and interact with on-board systems; provide passenger service	**Medium** – Their compliance and feedback affect the **day-to-day reliability** and user satisfaction of the service.	**Low** – They typically have limited influence on system design, but may affect adoption success through unions or informal feedback loops.	- Clearer routing and schedule info; - Improved safety and communication - Potentially less downtime due to better traffic management	- Training burden for new systems - Increased monitoring and enforcement - Reliability concerns of new tech
IT Providers and System Integrators	Yes – They use development environments, admin dashboards, API layers, and monitoring tools.	**High** – Technical success depends on their code, architecture, and support.	**High** – They can shape feasibility, timelines, and innovation.	- Long-term contracts. - Reference project for other cities. - Opportunities to scale with government tech strategy.	- Integration delays. - Infrastructure limitations (connectivity, budget). - Need for ongoing support beyond initial deployment.

Private Car Drivers	No – They are **indirect stakeholders**, and sometimes competitors, to the public transport system.	**High** – Modal shift from private cars to public transport is a central goal of the project.	**Medium** – They may resist or support the project depending on traffic, parking, or cost changes.	- Less traffic congestion. - Shorter commutes if others switch to buses. - Better air quality.	- Reduced road space (bus lanes). - New parking restrictions. - Perceived inconvenience or loss of independence.
Traffic Control Center	No – They are **indirect users**, relying on the system's data and integrations for traffic management and coordination with transit services.	**Medium** – Their support is essential for implementing and enforcing bus lanes, traffic signal priority, and managing incidents.	**Medium** – They can affect how effectively transit-prioritization measures are enforced and how well PTMS data integrates with citywide control.	- Better traffic management through real-time transit and congestion data. - Faster incident response coordination. - Safer and more predictable traffic patterns.	- Added complexity in enforcement. - Tension with private drivers over new traffic rules (e.g., bus lane compliance). - System dependency for decision-making.
Tourists and Foreign Visitors	Yes – They are **direct users** of the mobile app to navigate the city, buy tickets, and understand the local transit system.	**Low** – While not the main user group, they contribute to the app's reputation and usability for non-native speakers.	**Low** – Their feedback may be gathered through app stores or tourism platforms, but has minimal impact on system design.	- Multilingual UI and real-time trip info. - Easy ticket purchasing without needing local cash. - Access to tourist attractions via transit.	Language barriers. - Confusing interfaces or payment systems. - Limited offline access if not using local SIMs.
Banks / Payment Service Providers	No – They are **indirect beneficiaries** by facilitating the financial infrastructure behind ticketing systems.	**Medium** – They are critical for enabling secure, fast, and reliable payment processing, and regulatory compliance.	**Medium** – They can shape technical specifications (API standards, compliance requirements) and may negotiate terms for integration.	- New transaction revenue streams. - Greater public adoption of digital payment services. - Visibility through public infrastructure.	- Integration complexity. - Fraud risks and compliance with financial and cybersecurity regulations. - Liability for transaction issues.