

## Project NEXT

### Executive Steering Group

### Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2020-07-01

<b>Date:</b>	<b>17 June 2020</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	9:00am – 10:00am	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Zoom</b>	
<b>Steering Group</b>	Wayne Hastie (Chair)                      GWRC Charles Ronaldson                          NZTA Vanessa Ellis                                  AT Roger Jones                                   AT Andrew McCallin                           NZTA Nick Donnelly                                ORC Stewart Gibbon                              ECAN All Zoom	
<b>In Attendance</b>	Graham Alston                                NEXT section 9(2)(a)                                NZTA James Timperley                              NZTA Rebekah Duffin                                NZTA Mark McHugh                                 NEXT <i>(Secretariat for this meeting)</i>	
<b>Apologies</b>		

Item	Description	Action	Resp
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 20, 22 May 2020	<b>Minutes from 20 May and 22 May 2020 steering group meeting accepted</b>	
2.	Actions Status	<b>Open Actions from 20/22 May 2020 minutes</b> TTP establishment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Overall governance structure across programme required with work responsibilities being clear</li> <li>b. Collaborative management teams (incl PTA's) are required as capability needs to be stood up in 6 months</li> </ul>	WH/JT JT

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>Handbook and Guidelines</p> <p>a. Provide draft handbooks for key process steps and functions together with one evaluation team handbook including small number of example questions. This needs to flow through to guidance around handling risk adjustments, TTSC and added value premium calculations (including traceability)</p> <p>Presentation Approach</p> <p>a. Steering Group member attendance at presentations – decision to be held over</p> <p>b. Make-up of evaluation teams required before decisions on presentation attendance can be decided</p> <p>nValuate Evaluation Tool</p> <p>a. Agency/AT to test nValuate product (fit for purpose testing including functional/security/data) and if passes then approved for use.</p> <p><b>All other actions Closed</b></p> <p><b>Open Actions from 21 February 2020 minutes</b></p> <p>Procurement Plan</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <p>1. Need to define the evaluation team members</p>	<p>GA</p> <p>St Grp</p> <p>St Grp</p> <p>MM</p> <p>St Grp – Open</p>
3.	Project Report (To 31 May 2020)	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-06-02)</b></p> <p>Project report presented by GA with project status remaining Green.</p> <p>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>Overall the nature of the requests is seen as light in number and the requests are generally simple. There has been some requests around pricing and additional feedback has been provided including supplementary information on pricing is able to be provided.</p> <p>Overall there are no matters for escalation.</p> <p>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>GA stated that the selection of the evaluation team structure is now becoming critical.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>The Probity Auditor has reviewed the RFC response process to date and the assessment is that the content, process and responses to all, where required, is good and fair.</p> <p><u>RFT Negotiations</u> MSA Status</p> <p>The MSA's for the three preferred suppliers will need to be approved by the steering group before being passed through to the Agency for sign-off. Reporting on progress still continues to the steering group.</p> <p>Detailed Business Case VE asked that the detailed business case remains as a project deliverable. CR stated that this responsibility will be covered off by JT later in the meeting.</p>	GA
4.	TTP Update	<p><b>TTP Functional Areas (Paper No 2020-06-03a)</b> JT provided another update on progress with the TTP establishment.</p> <p>Good progress is being made with mapping out the engagement forums, terms of reference and governance framework.</p> <p>The functional map is in progress, with mapping of the joint responsibility matrix (JRM) back to the functional areas. This leads to the organisational structure required to support the functions.</p> <p>GA asked whether there were any gaps identified in the JRM. JT noted that there were no material gaps although there needs to be some clarification around roles and there is also a dependency on the responses from the respondents that could impact this.</p> <p>R noted that there continued to be a gap around cybersecurity and information management</p> <p>CR stated that the Agency security resource is currently looking at this.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Include cyber security and information management in the TTP functional map</p>	JT
5.	TTP Status Report	<p><b>(Paper 2020-06-3a)</b> JT presented the TTP status report with the overall status being green.</p> <p>WH enquired as to what standardisation was being folded into the BAFO stage. AM explained that the standardisation areas identified were around journey revenue apportionment, elements in customer</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>experience messaging and back office fares implementation. This will be covered in both the BAFO stage and design stage.</p> <p>WH said he was looking for a timeline on how to get engaged with standardisation. Confirmed by AM that the Agency is looking as to how to engage with PTA's.</p> <p><b>Action</b> Update on engagement with PTA's will be provided at the next steering group meeting.</p> <p>VE asked that this is built into the critical path, into the design authority and the JRM.</p> <p>AM stated that this was a TTP responsibility and at the next steering group meeting he will update what is important for the PTA's.</p> <p>WH asked that where PTA approval is required for changes then this needs to be captured in the timeline.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Standardisation changes that require PTA approvals to be included in timeline</li> <li>b. Past steering group paper on standardisation to be reviewed and aligned with the dates.</li> <li>c. Report to be developed that provides granularity around when PTA's will become involved.</li> </ul> <p>GA supported this saying that getting the TTP up and running is essential and the steering group needs visibility of all work-streams with all milestones identified.</p>	<p>AM</p> <p>JT</p> <p>AM</p> <p>GA/JT</p> <p>JT</p>
6.	Business Case Approach and Schedule	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-05-03b)</b> JT provided an update on the business case development.</p> <p>ND confirmed that there had been no further discussion on whether the RITS members would be represented as a consortium or separate.</p> <p>GA said that in alignment with the prior steering group direction, the business case should reflect the 4 regions – AT/GW/ECAN/RITS and when transitioning then we need all the RITS members separated.</p> <p>CR asked that ND talk to the RITS related partners.</p> <p>ND noted that the only discussion with these partners had been with the P1 agreement and that the P2 agreement will be subject to</p>	<p>ND</p>

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>agreement with all the separate councils. The discussion on how they will be input into the DBC hadn't been held.</p> <p>CR asked that all PTA's need to identify each of their principal contact is for the development of the DBC.</p> <p>GA noted that the simple model developed in the appendix breaks out the costs at each council level.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Template for PTA costs to be developed and agreed</li> <li>b. Templates to be populated as much as possible now</li> <li>c. Named leads from each PTA to engage with provision of data and development of the overall case</li> </ul> <p>There were no comments on the business case report.</p> <p>SG stated that with the new system the councils may restructure processes and roles and the time involved in this will need to be factored in with the operational costs – Noted</p> <p>Recommendations with approach and named leads agreed. [add in appropriate governance oversight]</p>	<p>JT JT St Grp</p>
7.	Decision Matrix	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-06-04)</b></p> <p>GA explained that the decision matrix does not include the contract approvals for the RFT and does not include The DBC iteration 3 approval</p> <p>GA asked that the DBC iteration 3 needs to be in a fit for purpose state at the pre- BADFO stage before proceeding with BAFO. The expectation is that MPGG and the steering group need to be across the DBC, having reviewed this rather than this be an approval point.</p> <p>VE stated that the P1 agreement covers this as there needs to be an approval. Also noted that the risk profile and cyber security needs to be understood.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DBC Decision point is at the steering group. Steering group members to confirm that their organisations are ok with DBC – line to be added between line 6 and line 8 of decision matrix</li> <li>b. BAFO engagement plan approval to be added into matrix</li> <li>c. Approval to proceed to BAFO is dependent on update to the Economic and Finance cases based on the pricing of the down-selected parties.</li> <li>d. Line 9 to be added for CE approval</li> <li>e. Step 10 needs narration</li> </ul>	<p>GA  GA GA GA GA</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		f. Decision table to be updated and re-circulated	GA
8.	General Business	<b>Steering Group workshop</b> Agreed that there were a number of decisions that the steering group needed to make especially around the evaluation process and teams and a full day workshop was appropriate to address these decisions. Dates were discussed and agreement reached that Tuesday 30 June 2020 workshop to be held in Auckland.	GA
9.	Meeting Closed 10:00am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 15 July 2020, 9:00am – 10:00am	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982