

## Project NEXT

### Executive Steering Group

### Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2020-05-01

<b>Date:</b>	<b>22 April 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 (Zoom)	AT
	Andrew McCallin	NZTA
	Stewart Gibbon	ECAN
	Nick Donnelly	ORC
<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>	Roger Jones	AT

Item	Description	Action	Resp
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 18 March 2020	<b>Minutes from 18 March 2020 steering group meeting accepted</b>	
2.	Actions	<b>Open Actions from 18 March 2020 minutes</b> <b>Internal process approvals –</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Consortium – Require paper from Agency to be sent but are not going to seek formal approval from Governance Group. ND had raised and the governance group had no issues</li> </ol> <b>Procurement Plan</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VE to catch up with Wayne Powell, AT Internal Auditor for his approval. Noted that WP had requested latest version at 12 March. No feedback to project.</li> <li>Formal sign-off from NZTA Procurement is required, overall approvals will be subject to this.</li> </ol>	CR  VE - Closed  CR - Closed

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p><b>Probity Plan/Probity Framework</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. VE noted that she needed to check status with Wayne Powell and provide feedback to GA.</li> </ol> <p><b>RFP Document Set</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed that further discussion on the re-use price book and due diligence being undertaken sequentially to be taken off-line.</li> </ol> <p><b>Open Actions from 21 February 2020 minutes</b></p> <p><b>Procurement Plan</b></p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to define the evaluation team members</li> <li>2. Horizontal topics to be defined that require to be scored across all areas – eg customer experience, security</li> </ol> <p><b>Governance Changes</b></p> <p>New ToR is required for MPGG and the decision paper to be updated. CR to draft ToR for MPGG and Steering Group.</p> <p>18 March update – ToR to be distributed by CR for MPGG meeting on Tuesday 28 April 2020.</p>	<p>VE - Closed</p> <p>GA - AM</p> <p>St Grp – Open</p> <p>GA - Open</p> <p>CR - Closed</p>
3.	Project Report (To 31 March 2020)	<p>Project report presented by GA with project status remaining Green however it was noted by GA that there are a number of risks and issues that are amber and should these not be resolved in the next period then the whole project will move to an amber status.</p> <p>Key highlights:</p> <p>RFP was released 21 April 2020, having been released through a two factor security process that required text messages to be sent to primary and secondary contacts providing the keys and details for the download. All respondents have now downloaded with no issues and an audit report is currently being prepared.</p> <p>Noted by GA that the first download was completed at 4:16pm (4:00pm release) and the first RFC was received at 4:27pm asking for details on the changes to the documents from previous draft release.</p> <p>The Respondents had been sent a notice earlier in the month that there was a delay with the RFP release and there was no negative feedback.</p> <p>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>The project team has been working from home since 24 March and this has been working well.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>A Business Continuity Plan has been activated at a project level and this has been working well.</p> <p>Preparation for the RFP handbooks is underway, noting a separate paper later in this meeting outlining the process, framework and development.</p> <p>The financial services negotiations have been proceeding well.</p> <p>section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>Issues around delayed release, AT delayed Board meeting can be closed off and the probity issue is being managed.</p> <p>WH noted that the RFP release was a big milestone and was interested to see if covid related issues will have an impact on responses.</p>	
4.	RFT Negotiation Update	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-04-03)</b></p> <p>MM provided an update in respect of the current status with negotiations with each of the three preferred suppliers.</p> <p>Overall negotiations proceeding well, albeit not as quickly as we would like, but it is acknowledged that the revenue stream for these suppliers is still two years out so there is no urgency from their perspective.</p> <p>AM asked as to what changes were there to the program manager pricing including comparing this to the original pricing. Noted by MM that this was included in the previous months steering group papers.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>Program Manager new cost model information and original pricing proposal to be discussed with AM to ensure alignment.</p>	MM-Closed
5.	Status of RFP and Reporting	<p>GA asked the steering group members as to what level of reporting did they require through the RFP response period.</p> <p>WH asked for weekly reporting in the first month then either fortnightly or monthly thereafter. Should review after the first month.</p> <p>CR requested weekly, including the evaluation handbook development timeline.</p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>GA asked that we shouldn't combine the project progress with activity reporting.</p> <p>It was agreed that these should be kept separate.</p> <p><b>Action</b> RFP activity reports to be completed weekly with a review of frequency after 1 month.</p>	GA - Closed
6.	Development of Evaluation Handbook and Guidelines	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-04-04)</b> GA explained the memo covers the approach to the development of the evaluation handbook.</p> <p>There will be specific handbooks for the different evaluation teams. A simpler model will be used than that used for the ROI. Guidance will be built around the '60' score as being the meets requirements with guidance for scoring lower than the 60 and higher than the 60.</p> <p>The model guidelines are currently being worked through including working with probity.</p> <p>Section 3 of the summary report identifies that there will be close to 20 different documents.</p> <p>CR questioned whether expertise can be provided for more than one evaluation team. GA confirmed that this can be achieved, with section 5.2 of the Summary Report outlining the individual segmentation. An example was a Privacy expert is able to provide input across the teams and this was supported by JT.</p> <p>WH asked that AT to think about the evaluation teams and a discussion will be held at PMB on 24 April as to how this can be brought together.</p> <p>WH noted in section 3.2 of the Summary Report that the Procurement Plan had been completed and approved, noting that certain sections still need to be completed. The Procurement Plan has been approved subject to these sections being completed later. This needs to be reflected.</p> <p>Noted by GA that there is a considerable amount of work to be completed and reviewed including the pricing handbooks. A conversation is needed quickly to enable the structure and GA also noted that evaluation guidance will be discussed and reviewed with probity advisor &amp; probity auditor.</p> <p>JT stated that the mapping approaches to align with the Procurement Plan are being undertaken by the Agency.</p>	<p>PMB</p> <p>PMB</p> <p>GA - Closed</p>

Item	Description	Action	Resp
7.	BCP Covid-19 Plan	<p><b>(Paper 2020-03-05)</b></p> <p>A project BCP plan has been implemented, this includes the BP along with a contingency plan for the internal project team.</p> <p>Recommendations were all noted</p>	
8.	Request for Ticketing Information	<p><b>(Paper 2020-03-06)</b></p> <p>An external approach has been made to the project (through Pier Aldershof) from the Rebel Group in the Netherlands to gather information from Authorities on the impact of Covid-19 on public transportation.</p> <p>GA noted that this could be useful feedback from a project perspective and some value around the national ticketing solution. Overall probity risk is low and overall there is more upside than downside.</p> <p>WH asked whether this was more appropriate to address through the Agency. GA said that there would be a requirement to have PTA and Agency representatives as part of the interview.</p> <p>RD said that the Agency is already collecting data around the free fares and AM said that the Agency had already been approached directly by this organisation requesting feedback.</p> <p>CR said that the project should back out and the Agency will respond. The Agency will also touch base with RD and GA to ensure there is no impact on the RFP.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <p>GA to respond to the Rebel Group that the Agency will respond to this request and the project will not.</p>	GA - Closed
9.	Response Period Design Authority	<p><b>(Paper 2020-03-07)</b></p> <p>There is a need to have a design authority in place during the RFP response period in particular to answer questions between the TSP and the financial services providers.</p> <p>This authority would address questions with a need to have a consistent coherent design being put forward. There is a need for the right people in the RFP process and given there is no design authority established elsewhere there is a requirement for coherent decisions to be made and this is the vehicle for this.</p> <p><b>Section 91:</b> noted the establishment of TTP within the Agency to be responsible for this role. Also noted the integration with the Agency and AT needs are also to be considered. In principle the proposal is good, just need to determine how to complete how this is to be integrated with the Agency and AT.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>JT also supported the concept and noted that the membership needs to be refined.</p> <p><b>Action</b> JT/GA to work through the detail and tie in with the establishment of TTP and engagement with the PTA's.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> Agency establishment of SSO progress to be standard agenda item for steering group</p> <p>GA noted that for the RFC responses there is a requirement to respond within 72 hours. Any model adopted will require the participants to be engaged and respond in an active manner.</p> <p>WH stated that the PTA's are keen to be involved. The concept is understood and the question is how to form.</p> <p><small>Section 91</small> also noted that this steering group is also the Board for the TTP under the P1 Participation Agreement and this authority is important.</p> <p>VE is supportive and noted the nuts and bolts need to be detailed, with the PTA membership and contribution important.</p> <p>WH stated that how to link the needs of the project with the needs of the PTA and Agency TTP is key and how to do this quickly.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. JT/GA to lead thinking through the establishment and implementation of the design authority.</li> <li>ii. The suggested members be used in the interim and involve others as this is moved along.</li> </ul> <p>VE noted that there is a risk in the short term that without PTA resources the right answers might not be given. This risk is acknowledged although it is likely to be low.</p> <p>WH noted this and also said that a new set of work is now to be focussed on.</p>	<p>JT/GA</p> <p>GA - Closed</p>
10.	General Business	No general business	
11.	Meeting Closed 9:53am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 20 May 2020, 9:00am – 10:00am	