

CONFIDENTIAL

Project NEXT
Executive Steering Group
Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2021-04-01

Date:	17 March 2021	
Time:	8:30am – 10:00am	
Location:	Microsoft Teams	
Steering Group	<div>section 9(2)(a)</div> (Chair) Charles Ronaldson Vanessa Ellis (Teams) Roger Jones (Teams) Scott Gallacher (Teams) Delaney Myers (Teams) Nick Donnelly (Teams) Stewart Gibbon (Teams)	Independent WK-NZTA AT AT GWRC WK-NZTA ORC ECAN
In Attendance	Graham Alston James Timperley Rachael Turnage (Teams) Andrew McCallin <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> Mark McHugh (Secretariat for this meeting)	NEXT Waka Kotahi AT Waka Kotahi Waka Kotahi NEXT
Apologies	Nick Donnelly Delaney Myers Vanessa Ellis Rachael Turnage	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
0.	Introduction	All welcomed by section	
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 16 February 2021	Minutes are taken as read and section asked for comments. Minutes from 16 February 2021 steering group meeting accepted.	
2.	Action Status	Open Actions from 16 February 2021 minutes RFP Evaluation Progress <u>Down-select Communications</u>	

CONFIDENTIAL

[illegible]

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>d. Check project charter to ensure alignment with proposed Comms Working Group decision role. 17/3 – to be checked against next version.</p> <p>Business Case</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>a. DBC draft to be tabled at next PSG.</p> <p>b. DBC to address end to end costs</p> <p>c. <u>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</u></p> <p>d. Feedback on paper to JT by end of week.</p> <p>Open Actions from 20 January 2021 minutes</p> <p>NTS Integrated Programme</p> <p>P2 Agreement</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.</p> <p>BAFO Planning</p> <p>a. Working Group, in parallel with the BAFO planning, to develop Transition Discussion Papers for each Authority.</p> <p>16/2 Update – Progressing, with session after steering group meeting. Requirement will be for the right people to be available. On agenda for 17 March.</p> <p>Customer Experience Forum</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Paper on Customer Experience to be tabled at March 2021 steering group meeting. On agenda for 17 March.</p> <p>Open Actions from 16 December 2020</p> <p>Communications Protocol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The communications protocol is being reconciled with the P2 Agreement. (20/1) Laura working through with Comms group meeting scheduled 20 January 	<p>JT</p> <p>JT</p> <p>JT</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>Working Grp (On Eiv)</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p>
3.	Project Report (To 28 February 2021)	<p>(Paper No 2021-03-02)</p> <p>Project report presented by GA with project status remaining Green. Report is taken as read.</p> <p>Project Status: Green</p> <p>GA commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is progressing towards the timeline for Down-select. The time between meetings is tight with the lead-time to complete the documents within the timeframes being an issue. However the target date of Thursday 25 March for the RSG meeting is on target 	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Down-select report is scheduled to be discussed by the REP on Monday 22 March prior to the RSG meeting on the following Thursday. It is to be noted that most inputs into the Down-select report have been pre-agreed. BAFO work is ramping up and there is a good structure in place for the BAFO planning. The BAFO documents have not been tabled at the PSG as they are currently not in a fit state. Transition workshops have now been held with AT, GW and Ecan with positive feedback. The output from these workshops will provide a set of transition requirements for the BAFO process. Project resources are being stretched due to the number of competing activities required to be completed. There are pressures on sharing RFP information and this is not in conformance with the T&C's. However, we need to be practical and guidelines are being worked through for a wider group so that people can understand what information can be shared. Useful feedback on this has also been received from Wayne Powell. All risks are being actively managed by the project although the schedule remains at amber. Overall there are no material issues. <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On request by the chair, both Stewart and Scott confirmed that the transition workshops were useful. Scott noted that they have highlighted a number of synergies between the PTA's who have a range of similar and not similar issues. Overall they are in a good place. R also confirmed that there was good engagement with AT and everyone was happy. 	
4.	TTP Establishment Report	<p>(Paper No 2021-03-03) Project report taken as read.</p> <p>Project status: Amber</p> <p>Key points:</p> <p><u>P2 Agreement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dependency on P2 Agreement needs to be broken. The resourcing of TTP has been conditional on the P2 Agreement being executed. section noted that the target is for the P2 Agreement to be conditionally approved before the end of BAFO. GA noted that before BAFO would be preferable, if this is not possible than the next key date would be with the appointment of the preferred supplier. section stated that this needs to be done as we need to be on good ground for the P2 Agreement. The strategy for establishing TTP is to get this underway with WK taking on risk. The sooner the P2 Agreement can be signed the sooner the risk is mitigated. 	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section has discussed this with Matthew Walker who is committed to making this work. This needs to be turned into an action plan to establish the TTP. The downside is that this will trip us up if this is not attended to quickly. • Scott said it would be useful if the relevant PTA's receive expectations on P2 from WK in writing as there is currently uncertainties around timeframes with staff and governance. Scott did state that the GWRC councillors are in a good headspace on P2 agreement and the timing of the agreement is unknown. The safeguards around the DBC and funding are understood. • section agreed that clarity is required, noting that the MPGG has agreed the governance and this is in process with CR to close out with the MPGG. The alignment with the operating model is coming along as is the DBC. This whole set will be updated heading into BAFO. • GA stated that following notification to the Down-selected parties that we have a two week window before the workshops to work with. • section agreed that the financial case needs to stack up and the funding needs to be sorted. Scott agreed and pointed out that there was a need to have a common script for the Boards and Councils to be aligned. <p>Action Clarity on expectations and timeframes around the P2 Agreement required to be documented back to the Participants in the next two weeks, noting that it may take longer.</p> <p><u>Detailed Business Case</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JT agreed that the actions align with his reports. JT also confirmed that the section 9(2)(b)(ii) will be developed by PwC. These will include SSO costs, transition costs and will have capex/opex identified for each supplier. The funding approach will be overlaid outlining what is a central cost and what is a local authority cost. • GA enquired as to how the section 9(2)(b)(ii) will be combined into the Detailed Business case. JT confirmed that this has not yet been decided, the section 9(2)(b)(ii) This decision will be made after the model outcomes are known. • JT stated that the TCO models will be shared with the PSG and they will be able to question what goes into the detailed business case. • section noted that the TCO needs to inform the confidence of the steering group and provide comfort to the CE's for the Councils and Boards that the solution is economically viable and the cashflow consequences meet expectations. Therefore this must be done before BAFO rather than having an issue after BAFO. The key issue is affordability and the 	JT

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>issue is whether we have enough horsepower to get this done in the timeframe and have the TCO model in the comfort zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section further noted that PwC/section 9(2)(a) need to provide confidence to AT/ECan/GW that the TCO is populated right. • JT confirmed that the TTP horsepower is there and the risk is getting the right inputs from the PTA's. AT are currently doing work and ECan/GW not so much. • section asked how do we add horsepower, particularly with the gap being the 3 PTA's having people on the ground to get this sorted. • Suggested that section 9(2)(a) should be engaged, given his past experience with the project or for Rachael Turnage to have a new person assigned. The requirement is to have someone to carry out this work across AT/Ecan/GW. • RJ expressed concern that if the number is too big then this will be a hit. Good progress has been made and by the end of the week the numbers will be shared with the project team. RJ is to look at the financial model as at present this is not consistent. • section stated that a resource is needed that understands PTA language so that they can consistently complete the cost model in Ecan and GW. <p>Action</p> <p>JT to liaise with RJ to determine if more horsepower is required to join up across the other PTAs. (noted that RJ is meeting with the AT team at 11am this morning and will discuss how to get the other regions information)</p>	RJ/JT
5.	MPGG update	<p><u>P2 Agreement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CR stated that the CES are clear that this agreement should be based on a partnership basis and it needs to be figured out how to make this work. • The agreement has now been amended to remove the Waka Kotahi decision over-rider clause and the litigation right has also been removed. • The CES are coming back next week and their agreement will reflect in the amended P2 Agreement to enable close-out. • section also stated that the funding position from Waka Kotahi will also help to close this out. 	
6.	Working Group	<p>Key elements being looked at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated position for BAFO Requirements and documents for the Down-selected respondents. An example is transition clarifications. • Roadmap update clarification to assist with Down-select • Networks/Communications – clarity on the buyer position required. 	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated position will result in Parts1-4 documentation set being updated for the Down-selected parties. 	
7.	RFP Evaluation Progress	<p>Evaluation position covered earlier in meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GA outlined the process at the next RSG meeting (18 March). This will include the redacted Pricing Assessment Report and will include an understanding that the process to assess pricing has delivered an accurate outcome. The RCAT Report may be tabled if the pricing report has been reviewed in time. Following Monday the REP will review the RFP Down-Select Report and will make recommendations to the RSG who will meet on 25 March. GA noted that the process is quite mechanical and there is only one day for the RSG to receive and review the RFP Down-Select Report. SG sought feedback on GA's outline of the process and there were no comments. GA also emphasised that there was no visibility of pricing to the evaluators. 	
8.	BAFO Process Documentation	<p><u>BAFO Documents for approval</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given these documents are not yet in a fit state GA suggested that the approval of these either be held over to 21 April PSG meeting, or hold an out of cycle meeting or receive email approval. CR responded by saying that this can be achieved out of cycle by email and only if there are issues then an out of cycle meeting would be required. SG has a need to understand the resource commitment for BAFO. GA responded that there is a need to understand who will attend the BAFO workshops. There will be an intense demand on resources over a 4 week period and in addition there will be resource requirements for the pre workshops and also any Statement of Understanding reviews. SG stated that transition is a critical workshop and asked RJ whether he wanted to attend. RJ agreed that he needs to be at the workshop(s). GA also noted the need to commit to preparation time and that RJ will need to attend the relevant transition workshops for all down-selected parties <p>Action GA to give SG a call to outline resource requirements</p>	GA
9.	Probity	<p>(Paper No 2021-03-09) RFP Probity Plan (v4.2) tabled for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments identified to section 3.1 (Probity risks) P 12, 4.4.2 in respect of discussion around selection 	

Commented [GA1]: COMPLETE. SOME EXCHANGES WITH STEWART TO ASSIST PLANNING – WILL BE ONGOING AND NOTE THAT REVISED PLANNING UNDERWAY FOR PREFERRED SUPPLIER WILL CHANGE DATES AND RESOURCE DEMANDS

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		outcome and M7 Process step with review of wording around term 'externalities'.	
		Action Probity Plan to be amended and re-circulated for approval.	GA
10.	Finalisation of Roadmap	(Paper No 2021-03-11) Paper presented requesting information to be collated from the PTA's around the drivers, constraints and dependencies around meeting transition dates. Action a. Request for information to be channelled through working group members to their PTA to get information b. SG to take to Ecan given no Ecan representation on working group Recommendations approved	GA RJ/SGall SG
11.	NTS Customer Experience Forum	(Paper No 2021-03-12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paper presented with focus on customer interactions with national element. AM asked for feedback. section acknowledged that the National vs Regional approach is good. Scott agreed that this was a good foundation and acknowledged the good work that had been done. GA enquired as to whether there was a link back to the Requirements. AM answered that there was not. Action Sanity check with alignment back to the Requirements to be completed by the project team before BAFO	GA
12.	Gateway Review	No update	
13.	NTS Communications	(Paper No 2021-02-13) Communications and Engagement Plan tabled <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum two weeks is required to finalise the communications around down-select Key question still to be answered is how the Respondents are to be informed of the result Noted that a micro plan is required, especially for the PTA's CR asked for any notes on the plan to be sent to Jamie or through their communications representative section also asked for a reactive plan if there was any fallout. Action a. section to ask PTA's who wants to communicate Down-selection decisions b. Reactive plan to be developed to address any fallout from decision	SG SG SG

Commented [M2]: REVIEWED WITH section UPDATED. NOTING THAT THE PARTICULAR RISK IS RELATED TO THE ISSUE OF INFORMATION 'LEAKAGE' WHEN IN A BAFO SITUATION WITH TWO DOWN-SELECTED RESPONDENTS. SUGGESTS CLOSE.

Commented [GA3]: COMPLETED. NOT HOWEVER THAT THE WORKSHOPS ARE BEING SIGNIFICANTLY REVIEWED IN LIGHT OF PREFERRED SUPPLIER. CHANGES THE NATURE AND SCOPE WITH REMOVED CONCERNS FOR EQUIVALENCE.

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		c. section 96 to work through the working group on actions	
14.	General Business	Cash Fares Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none">section 9(2)(b)(ii)SG responded that Ecan has this on their radar.	
15.	Meeting Closed 9:58am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 21 April 2021, 8:30am – 10:00am	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982