

## Project NEXT


### Executive Steering Group

### Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2021-03-01

<b>Date:</b>	<b>16 February 2021</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	8:30am – 10:00am	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Microsoft Teams</b>	
<b>Steering Group</b>	<div> <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> <div>(Chair)</div> </div> <div> <div>Charles Ronaldson</div> <div>Vanessa Ellis (Teams)</div> <div>Roger Jones (Teams)</div> <div>Scott Gallacher</div> <div>Delaney Myers (Teams)</div> <div>Nick Donnelly</div> <div>Stewart Gibbon (Teams)</div> </div> <div> <div>Independent</div> <div>WK-NZTA</div> <div>AT</div> <div>AT</div> <div>GWRC</div> <div>WK-NZTA</div> <div>ORC</div> <div>ECAN</div> </div>	
<b>In Attendance</b>	<div> <div>Graham Alston</div> <div>James Timperley</div> <div>Rachael Turnage (Teams)</div> <div>Andrew McCallin</div> <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> <div>Mark McHugh</div> <div>(Secretariat for this meeting)</div> </div> <div> <div>NEXT</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>AT</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>NEXT</div> </div>	
<b>Apologies</b>	Nick Donnelly Scott Gallacher (from 9.30am)	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
0.	Introduction	All welcomed by <div>section 9(2)(a)</div>  <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> introduced <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> who is the communications representative and will attend the steering group for 6 months to replace Laura Wilmot who will be on maternity leave.	
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 20 January 2021	Minutes are taken as read and <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> asked for comments.  One change was requested by CR on the top of Page 7 of the minutes (NTS Integrated Programme) that be amended to the P2 agreement could be approved by GWRC in April/May period and this will outline the operating model. This agreement will be subject to sign off by all parties at a later date.	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<b>Minutes from 20 January 2021 steering group meeting accepted subject to the above change.</b>	
2.	Actions Status	<p><b>Open Actions from 20 January 2021 minutes</b></p> <p><b>Project Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Summary paper detailing the scope of the financial services to be provided for the next steering group meeting. CLOSED</li> <li>b. Wider communication strategy report to be provided to the next steering group meeting. This will be based on the paper currently being reviewed by Nicol Rosie that will be positioned as a pack for distribution to councillors. CLOSED</li> <li>c. Rachel Turnage to be provided with this report as part of the communications workstream. CLOSED</li> <li>d. Broader messaging required for consistency and clarity of narrative for communities. CLOSED</li> <li>e. Retailer localities will be part of each Authority transition strategy – summary paper in a. above will outline the RNM approach. CLOSED</li> </ul> <p><b>NTS Integrated Programme</b></p> <p><b>Funding Model</b></p> <p>CR to check timing of the ELT meeting and then steering group 16/2 Update – ELT meeting next week with WK Board meeting 23 March 2021. CLOSED</p> <p><b>P2 Agreement</b></p> <p>Working Group to explore merits of scenario 1 and the need to understand the constraints for the Participants, with the fall-back position being scenario 2, not scenario 3. Working Grp (OPEN)</p> <p><b>BAFO Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Separate 2 hour one-off discussion following RSG meeting to be set-up to agree the BAFO approach (Feb 17/18 being looked at). CLOSED</li> <li>b. Working Group, in parallel with the BAFO planning, to develop Transition Discussion Papers for each Authority. 16/2 Update – Progressing, with session after steering group meeting. Requirement will be for the right people to be available. Working Grp (OPEN)</li> </ul> <p><b>Customer Experience Forum</b></p> <p>Workshop held on 15/2. This identified uncertainties between regional and national views and there is uncertainty around the Participation Agreement.</p> <p> agreed that there were uncertainties around funding and the P2 Agreement. AM said that the requirements were being re-litigated and that a top down approach was required to address.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Paper on Customer Experience to be tabled at March 2021 steering group meeting. AM (OPEN)</p> <p><b>Open Actions from 16 December 2020</b></p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<b>Communications Protocol</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The communications protocol is being reconciled with the P2 Agreement.</li> <li>(20/1) Laura working through with Comms group meeting scheduled 20 January</li> </ul>	JT (OPEN)
3.	Project Report (To 31 January 2021)	<b>(Paper No 2021-02-02)</b> Project report presented by GA with project status remaining Green. Report is taken as read.  GA commented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The down-select period is for three months and there is no contingency allowed for dates. There is a risk to these dates with further RFC's impacting the timing of the Risk Costing Report timing. This is being worked through by the teams and combined decision meetings are being explored to mitigate this risk.</li> <li>BAFO planning session is scheduled for 17 February and the Respondents are to be asked for their list of BAFO topics.</li> </ul> Other comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vanessa enquired as to the level of risk around the downselect timing. GA responded that this should be within a week or two of planned dates but he couldn't pre-judge the views of the panels that could impact the timings.</li> <li>section 9(2)(b)(ii) noted that the funding model and transition were on the critical path and required for the briefings to Councils.</li> </ul>	
4.	TTP Establishment Report	<b>(Paper No 2021-02-03)</b> Project report taken as read.  Key points noted by JT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall date to establish TTP is dependent on the wider programme</li> <li>The operating model review with the PTA's is ongoing and tracking to schedule</li> <li>Detailed business case is dependent on the inputs from transition, SSO costs, funding model and risk assessment that are on the critical path and decisions need to be made around all these before the establishment point is reached.</li> </ul>	
5.	Working Group	Next meeting is 16 February. No update	
6.	RFP Evaluation Progress	<b>REP/RSG Panels</b> GA stated that the status has been covered earlier in the meeting. Actions from the REP and RSG meetings are being worked through. section 9(2)(b)(ii)  <b>Action</b>	

[illegible]

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>section 91 asked that Ecan provide resources to help inform the BAFO engagement with the partners.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Stewart to arrange workshop with the project team, having note to section 91 comment that this workshop needs to be before engagement with the councillors with this activity being a part of communications.</li> <li>b. GA acknowledged that it had been 18 months since the requirements had been defined and there had been changes of personnel in this time. Agreed that requirement review sessions be scheduled by the project team pre BAFO.</li> </ul> <p>Stewart Gibbon asked how the evaluation team was aligning the assessment across the Must, Should and Could requirement categories. section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>GA</p>
9.	NTS Communications	<p><b>(Paper No 2021-02-04a)</b></p> <p><b>Discussion on paper on Waka Kotahi ELT-NTS Background and update to Councils and Boards</b></p> <p>Scott asked for clarity on the timelines for engaging with the Boards and Councils, not just for the P2 Agreement but also other narratives. Overall he requested a synchronised approach for the engagement.</p> <p>Furthermore he requested consistency across the comms paper (Paper 2021-02-04) and protocols on where we have come from and where we are moving to. An example was that the options for funding are different from what thought. Consequently he raised what is the decision around funding.</p> <p>CR stated that there is a paper going to the WK Board around principles and then funding will be overlaid. The Board approval is required before this can move forward.</p> <p>Scott asked for approval sequencing and the need to understand what is going through the WK Board. CR responded by stating that any papers for the WK Board around these issues will come through the PSG first.</p> <p>section 91 also agreed that governing principles are required for the P2 Agreement and that PSG approval is required as a precursor to the P2 Agreement.</p> <p>CR agreed that this will also come through the PSG as there is a requirement for the PSG approvals to then go to the respective Councils/Boards for approval.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>Further discussion focussed on understanding the plans and need to have all approvals synchronised (as distinct from piecemeal) and the need to avoid a crush of decisions at the end that forces the stakeholders decisions.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PSG approvals required for Funding, Communications Plans/Protocols, plus P2 Agreement.</li> <li>Approval timeline steps to be detailed by <span>section 9(2)(a)</span>.</li> <li>Options on funding to be taken out of responsibility</li> </ol> <p><b>Update on Communications and Working Group Scope (Paper 2021-02-04)</b></p> <p>Paper presented from the NTS Comms Working Group to seek guidance on agreeing the purpose of the NTS Communications Working Group to deliver the NTS Communications Plan.</p> <p><span>section 9(2)</span> asked for incumbency to be woven into the paper, and asked for feedback from others.</p> <p><span>section 9(2)(a)</span> asked about the decision making role of the Comms Working Group.</p> <p>RJ in response stated that the working group is to advise on strategy, that a centralised group is a good thing and that content needs working on. Also there is no iwi content and this is a requirement.</p> <p>VE asked what comms is managed by the Comms Working Group into their Councils and Boards (Recommendation 4 ).</p> <p>CR said the messaging needs to be consistent and the timing aligned.</p> <p>GA asked that the Project Charter is checked as this is not aligned around the comms working group decision making.</p> <p><span>section 9(2)</span> noted that the Communications Strategy and Plan need to be approved by the PSG. The Comms Working Group need to update their approach to straighten this out.</p> <p>CR noted that the purpose of the paper was a strawman and that it was designed to elicit feedback.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span>section 9(2)(a)</span> to provide by mark-up/annotations for the next version of update on NTS Comms Working Group</li> <li>Iwi content to be included</li> <li>Each PSG representative to put update through their respective comms representative</li> </ol>	<p>PSG</p> <p><span>section 9(2)</span></p> <p><span>section 9(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span>section 9(2)</span></p> <p>PSG</p>

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		d. Check project charter to ensure alignment with proposed Comms Working Group decision role.	GA
10.	General Business	<p><b>Financial Services Scope (Paper No 2021-02-05)</b></p> <p>Scope Summary paper tabled, with GA covering the background and noting there is no change to requirements.</p> <p>section 9(1) asked whether the paper served its purpose and Stewart said that it did and that he now better understood the scale and scope of the retail network. This was further endorsed by GA pointing out that there was flexibility with retail sites, both attended and non-attended. section 9(1) further noted that the transition strategy would be important on the approach to the retail sites.</p> <p><b>Business Case</b></p> <p>Detailed Business Case Pricing Approach memo was released late yesterday and has been jointly developed by the RPAI and NZTA, with support from the Project NEXT team to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide background regarding the update of DBC pricing information</li> <li>• seek Steering Group approval of the proposed approach for the inclusion of RFP pricing information in iteration 2a of the DBC, following the Down-select decision</li> <li>• inform Steering Group of the proposed approach to managing the pricing information shared ahead of the BAFO stage.</li> </ul> <p>This memo only relates to the interim DBC, iteration 2a. This will be updated post the selection of a preferred supplier.</p> <p>section 9(1) stated that the DBC will address the end to end cost and this needs to be in the paper.</p> <p>JT also emphasised that when referencing 'public' this is intended to be a wider distribution with impacted parties, not the public per se.</p> <p>section 9(1) agreed that having a range of costs is still the right approach.</p> <p>GA asked about the input into the mid-range discount to be included.</p> <p>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>GA also noted that there is uncertainty around some costs, notably transition costs.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DBC draft to be tabled at next PSG.</li> <li>b. DBC to address end to end costs</li> </ul>	<p>GA</p> <p>JT</p> <p>JT</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>c. <span style="color: red;">section 9(2)(b)(ii)</span> [REDACTED]</p> <p>d. Feedback on paper to JT by end of week.</p> <p><b>BAFO Workshop</b> Covered earlier in meeting</p>	JT PSG
11.	Meeting Closed 9:53am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 17 March 2021, 8:30am – 10:00am	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982