

Project NEXT

Executive Steering Group

Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2021-05-01

Date:	21 April 2021	
Time:	8:30am – 10:00am	
Location:	Microsoft Teams	
Steering Group	<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 (Teams)</div> <div>Delaney Myers (Teams)</div> <div>Nick Donnelly (Teams)</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>	
In Attendance	<div> <div>Graham Alston (Teams)</div> <div>James Timperley</div> <div>Rachael Turnage (Teams)</div> <div>Andrew McCallin</div> <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> <div>Mark McHugh (Teams)</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>	
Apologies	No apologies	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
0.	Introduction	All welcomed by section 9(2)(a) and section 9(2)(a) asked if there were any other items required for the agenda. No new items were suggested.	
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 17 April 2021	Minutes are taken as read and section 9(2)(a) then reviewed the action items Minutes from 17 March 2021 steering group meeting accepted.	
2.	Actions Status	Open Actions from 17 March 2021 minutes <u>TTP Establishment Report</u> 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.	CLOSED

team at 11am this morning and will discuss how to get the other regions information)	
<u>BAFO Process Documentation</u>	
GA to give SG a call to outline resource requirements – Update	
Some exchanges with Stewart to assist planning – will be ongoing	CLOSED
and note that revised planning underway for preferred supplier will	
change dates and resource demands	
<u>Probity</u>	
Probity Plan to be amended and re-circulated for approval. Update -	
reviewed with section 91 noting that this particular risk is related to the	
issue of information ‘leakage’ when in a BAFO situation with two	CLOSED
down-selected respondents. Now superseded.	
<u>Finalisation of Roadmap</u>	
a. Request for information to be channelled through working	CLOSED
group members to their PTA to get information	
b. SG to take to Ecan given no Ecan representation on working	CLOSED
group	
<u>NZ Customer Experience Forum</u>	
Sanity check with alignment back to the Requirements to be	
completed by the project team before BAFO – Update - the	
workshops are being significantly reviewed in light of preferred	
supplier recommendation – this changes the nature and scope with	CLOSED
removed concerns for equivalence.	
<u>NTS Communications</u> – now overtaken by paper on the 21 April 2021	
agenda.	
a. section 9(2)(a) to ask PTA’s who wants to communicate Down-	CLOSED
selection decisions	
b. Reactive plan to be developed to address any fallout	CLOSED
from decision	
c. section 9(2)(a) to work through the working group on actions	CLOSED
Open Actions from 16 February 2021 minutes	
NTS Communications	
Update to Councils and Boards	
a. PSG approvals required for Funding, Communications	
Plans/Protocols, plus P2 Agreement.	CLOSED
b. Options on funding to be taken out of responsibility	
17/3 – Noted also that the Communications Plan must include	CLOSED
stakeholder communications at the front.	
Communications and Working Group Scope	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DBC draft to be tabled at next PSG. b. DBC to address end to end costs c. section 9(2)(b)(ii) Open Actions from 20 January 2021 minutes NTS Integrated Programme P2 Agreement 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.	CLOSED CLOSED CLOSED Working Grp (OPEN)
3.	Project Report (To 31 March 2021)	(Paper No 2021-04-02) Project report presented by GA and taken as read in the interests of time. Project Status: Green GA commented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The costs against budget are being managed. The down-select period has added 4 weeks due to the impact of additional layers of verification and reporting. This has however resulted in a more robust selection of the down-select. Overall the reports give complete confidence in the process. section 9 passed on his thanks to the team and there is an appreciation of the effort that has got the project to this stage, The project team and the RSG has put the project on a firm footing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition planning has been a worthwhile activity working with the respective Authorities. • BAFO Planning – work underway to define what activities need to be in this pre-negotiation stage given we are not in BAFO with 2 parties. Noting that a significant of rework of process documentation is required. Timing will be a key part as we may seek more detail up front rather than waiting for the negotiation. • Financial services – the MSA review by the merchant acquirer is taking longer than envisaged. The supplier has an issue with access to legal counsel and are using an external party. There is also a broader issue with around timing of the AoG agreement and this may result in reduced fees. • Project member contracts are up for renewal from 30 June 2021 and these will need to transition across to Waka Kotahi within this timeframe as these can't be renewed (as under GWRC). Confirmed by JT that this process is underway. • Probity assurance has been received from probity advisor, probity Auditor and AT probity assuring a robust process. 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule risk is at amber due to the down-select delay of 4 weeks. Now this is being replaced by a preferred supplier this will go back to 'green' once planning is complete – Noted by section 91 that this will be covered in agenda item 4 on the impact of down-select. 	
4.	TTP Establishment Report	<p>(Paper No 2021-04-03)</p> <p>JT noted a change of approach with reviewing this report with the focus on operation model and the business case as there was now more certainty with these.</p> <p>Project status: Amber</p> <p>Key points:</p> <p><u>Detailed Business Case</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs are up significantly with the counter-factual costs also up. There is work required to understand the reasons for this. Plan is to get the next version of the business case distributed at the end of April. This will give direction to conversations with the preferred supplier. The plan is being refreshed around qualitative benefits. Holistically there is increased benefits and increased cost. The assumption is that reduction in costs in the next phase will make the business case stack-up. VE enquired as to the process for the steering group to walk through the business case. section 91 stated that a steering group workshop ahead of the next steering group meeting in May needs to be held to address: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cost/benefits and management case from the business case Strategy for negotiation Strategy plan Funding strategy Operations model section 91 also requested that we need to understand the position with each Authority pre-negotiation and we require their feedback VE stated that she was unsure where the process was at with the operating model, given the next business case iteration is due at the end of April and asked whether all participants have had the opportunity to work through this alignment. In response, JT stated that the operating model was shared in December with a workshop with Authorities. AT have undertaken work and this has been shared with GWRC. Currently he is conversation with Ecan/RITS. There is complexity in the AT/GWRC space with this work still ongoing and is awaiting finalised feedback. Waka Kotahi 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>feedback has been received and overall he is expecting feedback from everyone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 94 stated that the operating model will be picked up at the steering group workshop next month. It is essential that further feedback is received from the Participants before this workshop section 94 also noted that the roles, accountabilities and decision making process will be an MPGG role. <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Steering group workshop to be scheduled in early May before negotiation activities commence. Feedback from Participants on the operating model before May steering group workshop. Feedback from Authorities on business case required pre-negotiation 	GA JT JT
5.	RSG Down Select Recommendation	<p>(Paper No 2021-04-04)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by GA that memo to steering group is the same memo that will be tabled with MPGG later that day. This memo outlines the decision to recommend the selection of a preferred supplier section 94 asked for the views of the Authorities on this recommendation. All Authorities represented on the steering group all endorsed the recommendation. <p>Action RSG Down select Recommendation to select a preferred supplier Endorsed.</p>	
6.	NTS Communications	<p>Communications Plan (Paper No 2021-04-06)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 9(2)(a) introduced the plan, noting that there are three variations for internal messaging, section 7 covers notifying the proposers and section 8 covers the timing of these activities, which will be detailed after being agreed. section 9(2)(a) asked for any thoughts. CR asked asked what advice to Councillors was required and also enquired as to including Snapper in the Comms Plan. section 9(2)(a) said this depends on GW and GA asked as to why Snapper is included in the plan. Scott stated that Snapper was fundamental to the Transition Plan and they require a speedy implementation. GA responded that his question was more about timing and why they needed to be informed in the negotiation stage as there is no impact on service at this stage. Scott said that there needs to be consistent messaging. For example SG noted that ECAN are part of the conversation 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>with section 9(2) it was also acknowledged that Waka Kotahi is in the same position with the same supplier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VE asked that the messaging and sequencing to key audiences be fleshed out. • RJ noted that the Comms Plan is not a one-off plan and that transition needs to be taken into account. This comms discussion will be ongoing for the next several months. • section 9 stated that the steering group needs to have comfort with the plan and this needs to be passed through all Authority comms people before launching. • section 9 asked about the intent of the web-site. section 9(2)(a) stated that the intention was for background information if media start making enquiries. • GA agreed with RJ that the AT position is complex and the initial comms should be around the preferred supplier then addressing ongoing provision of services to transition and then the re-use of existing equipment, and what is maintained, contracted and managed. • GA also acknowledged that section 9(2)(b) needs to be carefully managed. • GA also emphasised the need to move quickly with each respondent and inform them of the outcome across a short window with 2 days being suggested. • section 9(2)(a) pointed out that there is a risk to this timing with 3 of the WK comms group unavailable next week. • GA also stated that the Comms sequencing is essential with notification being either face to face or over video followed up through a formal letter. <p>Suggested that the best times are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cubic section 9(2)(b) – Monday ○ section 9(2)(b)(ii) - Tuesday <p>Noting that the position of the parties is not to be declared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was asked that with the high level stakeholders that the down-select outcome is shared through the CE's to the councils. • section 9 asked whether there was a need to share at Board and Council level before notification. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ VE said AT was about no surprises so AT Board needs to be informed before notification ○ section 9 noted that the notification may vary between entities as to timing ○ Scott also supported VE in that everyone should have a line of sight with no surprises and that wording needs to be consistent ○ RJ stated that sub-contractors also need to be taken into account and asked how this was to be managed. GA responded that this was important as there were some sub-contractors common across all 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>respondents and we needed to notify the Respondents quickly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ section 9 agreed that there was a need for a common story-line. Comms are to work up and check back with the steering group members individually as the steering group is not meeting in time. ○ GA asked whether we should be informing the Respondents in the week of 3 May. Confirmed by CR that this can be done depending on the comms availability. If not section 9 said this would then need to be done early the following week. <p>Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Messaging and sequencing to be fleshed out for key audiences 2. Communications Plan title to be changed to 'Communications and Engagement Plan'. 3. section 9(2)(a) to work with steering group around timing of notifications of outcome 4. section 9(2)(a) to work up consistent messaging and check with each individual steering group member before notification release. 5. Notifications to be released week 3 May subject to comms availability, failing this then release early following week. 	
7.	Design Authority Paper	<p>(Paper No 2021-04-09)</p> <p>Paper presented by JT, noting that the Design Authority is required on an on-going basis and this paper has passed through the working group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VE asked that changes are checked back to customer experience <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure explicit cross-over with customer experience. <p>Approved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of NTS Design Authority confirmed 2. Respective members from each NTS Participant confirmed as per paper 	JT
8.	NTS Customer Experience Forum	AM confirmed that there had been no real progress and that there was a need to flesh out the impact of a national experience.	
9.	Gateway Review Process	CR confirmed that there will be further discussion on this next week.	
10.	NTS Communications	Big Picture – why do we need NTS (Paper No 2021-048)	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 9(2)(a) stated that this was useful for Councils and provides answers as to why they should invest in the NTS. Scott said this was a good foundation document, however there needs to be more granularity around the customer experience gains and the integration of fares. CR asked that more diagrams/pictures are added so that this becomes more useful for Boards and Councils GA asked as to whether this should be specific for regions and CR said that this can be achieved at a higher level. <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Detail on customer experience gains and integrated fares Insert more diagrams and pictures with regional specifics being at a high level 	<div>section 9(2)(a)</div> <div>GA</div>
11.	Steering Group Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement to re-baseline going forward Workshop to cover planning, operating model and detailed business case <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Draft agenda required section 9(2)(a) to locate a date in early May for a one-day session. 	GA GA
12.	Meeting Closed 9:37am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 19 May 2021, 8:30am – 10:00am	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982