

## Project NEXT

### Executive Steering Group

### Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2020-08-01a

<b>Date:</b>	<b>14 August 2020</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	9:00am – 10:30am	
<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 (Zoom)	ORC
	Stewart Gibbon (Audio)	ECAN
<b>In Attendance</b>	Graham Alston	NEXT
	section 9(2)(a) (Zoom)	NZTA
	James Timperley	NZTA
	Rebekah Duffin (until 9.30am)	NZTA
	Mark McHugh	NEXT
	<i>(Secretariat for this meeting)</i>	
<b>Apologies</b>	Roger Jones	
	Vanessa Ellis	
	Nick Donnelly	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
0.	Meeting	<p>WH Noted that there was now no attendee from AT and the meeting would proceed on the basis that AT members would be briefed by Wayne and seek approval the outcomes later. WH requested that as no quorum, the meeting proceed and seek confirmation of any decisions post meeting. All attending members agreed.</p> <p>Note – as this is an extraordinary meeting the minutes of the previous meeting would be presented for approval at the scheduled 19 August meeting.</p>	
1.	nValuate Testing and Access Outcomes	<p><b>(Paper 2020-08-01)</b></p> <p>Agreement to proceed with the nValuate tool was conditional on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Access to product during evaluation should Tranzpayments not be involved</li> </ul>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>Outcome</p> <p>i. Tranzpayment letter received 13 August 2020 confirming provision and reasonable endeavours support</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Software licence agreement to replace letter that will outline the responsibilities</p> <p>b. Functional/Security testing</p> <p>i. PwC has completed functionality and security testing and following identification and remedy of some defects and retesting, the testing has passed to enable the product to be used for evaluation scoring.</p> <p>ii. Reports from PwC have been received and although accurate do not clearly outline the approach and the level of tests passed. PwC have been asked to re-draft the reports to better reflect the work undertaken and the full results. Noted by the steering group chair that the functionality report was sloppy.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>a. Test Reports to be revised to reflect work undertaken and results</p> <p>b. RPMT to oversee additional controls with the use of the assessment tool.</p> <p>c. Tool accepted to use subject to revision of reports and ongoing support (software licence) agreed</p>	<p>MM</p> <p>MM</p> <p>MM</p> <p>MM</p>
2.	Cross cutting themes	<p><b>(Paper 2020-08-02)</b></p> <p>GA explained that the Privacy theme has been separated out as Waka Kotahi didn't have a suitable resource and both AT and GW are looking for a resource.</p> <p>GA outlined that David Boyd (Customer Experience) GWRC, Brendon Barrett (Security) AT, and Liz Fields, with support from Henry Pretorius, (Data) Waka Kotahi have been selected to be the specialist SME resources.</p> <p>SG asked how the SME work was collated in the evaluation. GA said that the cross cutting theme reports are not scored and are intended to provide a perspective across all areas. This process has been defined.</p> <p><b>Section 91</b> asked as why Engineering was not classified as a cross cutting theme and GA explained that this rail engineering work is to be treated as an external SME providing input to one RET as the questions do not cut across all multiple teams. The intent is to provide extra expertise for that evaluation team.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>AM also noted that Scott Rasmussen could be used for privacy / security.</p> <p>Recommendation approving themes, SME resources and mapped questions approved.</p>	
3.	Preferred Supplier Selection Process	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-08-03)</b></p> <p>GA outlined the approach to the preferred supplier selection is an empirical based assessment taking into account more than process and quality. The Selection Group will need to make a well informed consensus based decision that is not based on a formulaic calculation. This process was discussed at workshop 30 January.</p> <p>At the request of AT probity, it was agreed through the Probity Issue Monitoring Team that the precise selection criteria needed to be known as a precursor to responses being received.</p> <p>This paper sets out the criteria with 14 separate indicators, each to be graded A – G. Once the acceptance criteria and indicators are agreed then the guidance will be provided and will be used by the Evaluation Panel for their preferred supplier report to the Selection Group.</p> <p>The objective of the paper is to reach approval of the acceptance criteria with the guidance to come later.</p> <p>AM noted that Shared Services functions should be a criteria and it was agreed to include this as an indicator.</p> <p>SG expressed concern that ongoing support did not have enough emphasis and wanted to ensure that the preferred supplier was nimble to market changes so the criteria needed to include an attitude capability to support business change.</p> <p>CR also wanted to ensure dynamic fare table changes were able to be accommodated. WH noted that these should be covered under ease of doing business.</p> <p>Noted by <span style="background-color: #cccccc;">section 91</span> that this was not a numerical based outcome. To which AM asked whether a supplier with more A's might not be selected and the answer was yes, the other supplier may be a better fit. This is an example of the Acceptance Criteria not being weighted.</p> <p>Noted by WH that the Evaluation Panel will NOT make a recommendation to the Selection Group who will make their own judgements in reaching a conclusion. Overall progress has been good with a broad enough range of criteria that will help the Selection Group make a decision that can be justified.</p>	GA

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>GA asked as to when the guidance should be delivered and CR said this was prudent to be done when we understood what type of system is proposed to be delivered.</p> <p>WH suggested that the guidance design be drafted and then be reviewed post down-select.</p> <p>Agreed that criteria guidance to be drafted pre moderation 1, with probity approval for process required.</p> <p>SG asked as to what advice is coming through to the Selection Group regarding the A-G rankings. GA said that a report on the criteria and indicators will be produced by the Evaluation Panel and will include graphs and tabular information plus statements on why the particular grading has been proposed, just that there will be no recommendations.</p> <p><small>section 91</small> supported this process, noting that the alpha grading was elegant for decision makers and the reports will contain the detail necessary. <small>section 912</small> also suggested that the criteria should be grouped up to less attributes (it was noted there are only 4 attributes) and that the grading should be A-D rather than to A-G.</p> <p>After discussion it was agreed that the grading will only be for three levels – A, B and C.</p> <p><b>Actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RFP Preferred Supplier Assessment Criteria (V2) to be updated to only reflect three grades – A,B,C</li> <li>2. Criteria guidance to be agreed pre moderation 1, subject to Probity agreeing with timing</li> <li>3. Updated RFP Preferred Supplier Selection Criteria paper to be re-submitted to next Steering Group meeting.</li> </ol>	GA GA GA
4.	Probity Plan	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-08-04)</b></p> <p>Agreed that Probity Plan approval will be delayed until next Wednesday's steering group meeting.</p> <p>To be included on Agenda.</p>	GA
5.	Evaluation Group Structure and Members	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-08-05)</b></p> <p>Updated Evaluation Group Structure and members tabled.</p> <p>Noted by GA that the membership is subject to change pending the review of the completed Conflict of Interest declarations.</p> <p>WH asked for start dates for each of these groups and GA stated that each individual will get a timeline at the training.</p>	

	Risk Assessment	<p>Risk profile between the ROI and RFP processes has been undertaken especially given the remote evaluation now required.</p> <p>Overall risks have been assessed as negligible although the risk profile has changed. Although remote evaluation is different the risk profile between ROI and RFP alters but there is no significant difference in overall risk.</p> <p>Report was noted.</p>	
7.	Conflict of Interest Refresh Process	<p><b>(Paper No: 2020-08-07)</b></p> <p>A requirement of the Probity Framework is that the Col Declarations are refreshed at certain points in the RFP process and is a responsibility of the Probity Advisor and Project Director to manage. There is a requirement that these are refreshed prior to the responses being open and before commencing evaluation when the consortium responses are known.</p> <p>The process for the Col refresh has been agreed by the Probity Incident Management Team with these processes now in place.</p> <p>WH enquired as to the expectation on wider groups like PTA's for this and it was noted by CR that the Waka Kotahi ELT will not be required to sign a refreshed COI and this was agreed.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>SG asked that a list of individual from each organisation on the Col list be sent to each steering group member.</p> <p>SG also asked about how the project is dealing with localism as part of the evaluation. It was noted by WH that this was not a requirement although GA noted that given Waka Kotahi has taken over the responsibility for the procurement that the Government Rules of Sourcing come into play and a story needs to be developed on how localism is being assessed.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Agreed that localism will be included within the criteria.</p>	GA  GA
8.	Procurement Plan	Verbal update that Waka Kotahi has approved the revised Procurement Plan (V5.0).	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
9.	General Business	<p>1. Rachel Turnage Rachel has been appointed by AT to be the Programme Manager for the NTS. WH asked whether Rachel should be invited to the steering group as an attendee to ensure that AT is always represented. CR suggested that Rachel should be a support person on the steering group.</p> <p><b>Action</b> WH to raise Rachel's attendance as a support person on Project Steering Group with Roger Jones.</p> <p>2. Extension Request A Shortlisted Respondent has requested a one week extension to the RFP Submission date. The probity Advisor has been consulted and stated that this request in the current environment is not unreasonable. GA noted that he was ambivalent but noted that any extension must be offered to all parties as each must have the same opportunity. After discussion the general consensus was that the extension should not be approved.</p> <p><b>Action</b> WH to discuss with Roger Jones/AT and if supportive then extension will be declined. Should Roger/AT not be supportive then the steering group to reassemble to discuss</p> <p>3. Pricing Assessment Locality GA stated the pricing assessment of the RFP responses was to be held in a closed environment in the project office. This ability may be removed in the Covid environment if we move to level 3 or higher and discussion was held on what controls needed to be in place for this information to be assessed remotely. PwC had asked the project for what controls they wanted but was noted by the Steering Group that as a professional services organisation they should have the necessary controls on place that we can rely on.</p> <p><b>Action</b> PwC to outline their controls around the risks to undertake the price assessment remotely.</p>	<p>WH</p> <p>WH</p> <p>GA</p>
10.	Meeting Closed 10:55am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 19 August 2020, 9:00am – 10:00am	