

## Project NEXT

### Executive Steering Group

### Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2020-06-01

<b>Date:</b>	<b>20 May 2020/22 May 2020 (9:30am – 10:30am)</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	AT
	Roger Jones	AT
	Andrew McCallin	NZTA
	Nick Donnelly	ORC
	All Zoom	
<b>In Attendance</b>	Graham Alston	NEXT
	section 9(2)(a)	NZTA
	James Timperley	NZTA
	Rebekah Duffin	NZTA
	Mark McHugh	NEXT
	(Secretariat for this meeting)	
<b>Apologies</b>	Stewart Gibbon	ECAN

Item	Description	Action	Resp
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 22 April 2020	<b>Minutes from 22 April 2020 steering group meeting accepted</b>	
2.	Actions Status	<b>Open Actions from 22 April 2020 minutes</b> <b>Development of Evaluation handbook and Guidelines</b> All actions closed <b>Response Period Design Authority</b> All actions closed  <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</li> </ol>	Closed

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>Governance Group. ND had raised and the governance group had no issues</p> <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 – Dependent on evaluation team coverage – no need for SME if covered in teams</li> </ol>	<p>Closed</p> <p>St Grp – Open</p> <p>Closed</p>
3.	Project Report (To 30 April 2020)	<p>Project report presented by GA with project status remaining Green. Financially the project expenditure is in line with budget. Risks are related mostly around Covid-19, and to date there have been no requests for response extensions.</p> <p>The selection of the evaluation teams is a hot topic and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>There are more than 15 handbook documents being developed for evaluation phase and this has been progressing well. Support has been received from probity in respect of the evaluator guidance. These will all need to go through a review cycle before finalisation.</p> <p>AM enquired as to the risk around the GW rail planning. Explained by GA that this planning has been parked with revised approach with GWRC being to engage in consultancy assignment as part of detailed design to determine optimum solution for GWRC, e.g. without gates.</p> <p>WH asked about the nature of the RFC enquiries and how important these requests are. GA stated that the vast majority of RFC's are relatively straightforward clarifications, approximately 20% have been shared generally. Any serious questions will be escalated to the steering group. WH requested a review of the questions and stated that he was happy with the escalation process.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> that the weekly RFC summary to continue.</p> <p>GA confirmed that project resources were working productively from home.</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>JT and GA are in discussion for the transition responsibility for the detailed business case to pass from the project to the Agency. A mini-project plan is being put together for iteration 2 and 3 of the DBC and <b>section 9(2)(a)</b> is on board with the transition across to the Agency.</p> <p>There are no escalations required with risks and while there are some ongoing matters with issues, there are no escalations.</p> <p>In response to the GW Rail risk, GA noted that a scope statement was not included and there is a requirement in the RFP for a consulting exercise for an optimal rail implementation at the design phase. Given the process has been agreed, this risk can be closed.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> – GW Rail Risk to be closed.</p> <p>WH enquired as to the accuracy of the financial tracking graph with project costs after contingency not seen along with cumulative actual costs.</p> <p><b>Action</b> Financial Tracking Graph to be reviewed.</p>	GA
4.	TTP Establishment	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-05-02)</b> JT provided an update on progress with the TTP establishment.</p> <p>In the interim the TTP governance will be handled through the Project NEXT Steering Group. The presented paper will be a regular report presented to the steering group.</p> <p>The paper outlines the approach to establishing the TTP across three phases, (1) planning, (2) supporting procurement (3) establish capability.</p> <p>An internal governance working group is reporting to senior Agency managers who are in turn reporting to the steering group.</p> <p>A model on how to engage with stakeholders is being developed for approval.</p> <p>A Participation Agreement has been drafted and the operational processes and responsibilities will need to be included. It is expected that this package will be completed to take forward for review by the end of May 2020.</p> <p>The Concept of Operations prepared by the project is being mapped against the functional processes in the Agency. This is identifying gaps and determining how the gap can be closed. The overall</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>framework will be dependent on the RFP responses and what the Respondents propose.</p> <p>The Business Case engagement with the PTA's is key as the output from the business case that is required by each PTA is important. In parallel with this there is standardisation activity underway. Noted that this needs to land solidly with the Agency before engagement with outside parties.</p> <p>WH noted that reporting needs to be determined and the need for an overall governance structure that is clear on who is running each piece of work.</p> <p><b>section 9:</b> stated that a collaborative management team is required (including PTA's). This will be workstream intensive with capability required to be up within 6 months. It was emphasised that engagement with the PTA's was incredibly important.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Overall governance structure across programme required with work responsibilities being clear</li> <li>b. Collaborative management teams (incl PTA's) are required as capability needs to be stood up in 6 months</li> </ul>	<p>WH/JT</p> <p>JT</p>
5.	Decision Matrix for RFP Procurement Plan	<p><b>(Paper 2020-05-04)</b></p> <p>The decision matrix was reviewed at PMB 08 May 2020; this revised decision matrix reflects the PMB discussion, plus further review within the Project Team and with <b>section 9(2)(a)</b> as requested at PMB.</p> <p>VS sought clarification as to whether the steering group should be endorsing the down selection recommendation (row 6) or approving. Agreed should be 'approve'.</p> <p>WH enquired as how the Selection Group can approve the recommendation and then inform the steering group given that this is the same group. WH wanted the Selection Group membership sorted, and asked ND whether he was available. ND stated that he probably is and will look at this. Likewise WH will discuss with SG around his availability.</p> <p>WH also noted that the release of the RFP was not approved by GWRC Council and that row 2 of the matrix needed to change to 'Release of the ticketing solution RFP by the Agency'.</p> <p>Changes to Matrix agreed: Row 2 notes to reflect the specific approvals for Authority versus Agency</p>	GA

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>WH also asked how the reporting from the evaluation panel to the selection group was going to be undertaken if the information is anonymised. WH further noted that there was still more time required to work this through.</p> <p>CR expressed reservations on row 7 – TTP Operating Model. This should be an approve for the Steering Group, not the councils, who should be Informed, however, WH expressed the view that the operating model included the governance arrangements which must be approved by authorities as the recipients of the services.</p> <p>WH enquired as to whether the TTP operating model included the Participation Agreement. CR stated that it didn't.</p> <p>VE asked for more descriptors around the table, as an example, what is meant by the TTP Operating Model.</p> <p>Agreed that the matrix needs to be parked with the PMB to look at this further.</p> <p>Also agreed that probity support is required for these matrix discussions.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Issue with Selection Group being the same as the steering group and steering group being informed of Selection Group decision</li> <li>b. Selection Group membership to be agreed</li> <li>c. Probity support required for decision matrix discussions</li> <li>d. Decision Matrix still to be agreed</li> </ul>	<p>St Grp</p> <p>St Grp GA PMB</p>
6.	Steering Group Activity	<p><b>(Paper No 2020-0-05) Noting</b></p> <p>CR stated that monthly steering group meetings are not 'cutting the mustard' and that the PMB should be collapsed into the steering group and the steering group should meet on either a weekly or fortnightly basis.</p> <p>WH asked that the governance structure be discussed before a decision is made on this.</p> <p>VE asked whether the list of activities include all the items discussed with <a href="#">section 9(2)(a)</a>. CR said that they didn't and it was agreed with VE that they should be added in.</p> <p>GA also noted that the timeline for these activities was only through the evaluation period and not later.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Collapse PMB meetings into steering group meetings – meetings to be either weekly or fortnightly, subject to agreeing governance structure</li> <li>b. Steering Group activity list to be expanded to include legal related activities from participation workshop (relative to evaluation period)</li> </ul>	<p>GA</p> <p>GA</p>
7.	<b>Continuation of Steering Group Meeting - Friday 22 May (9:30am – 10:30am) – PMB replaced by continuation of 20 May steering group meeting</b>		
8.	Contract Renewals	<p><b>(Paper 2020-05-06)</b></p> <p>WH noted that with the Agency picking up the project they should be the contracting party. Until this is landed, the contracts can't be agreed to.</p> <p>GA noted that this needed to be carefully considered as we didn't want unintended consequences.</p> <p>CR stated that the preference was for the current arrangement to remain in place and he would work with WH to sort out.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Recommendation for letting Reference Group contracts expire and for James Timperley contract to be under the Agency from 1 July agreed, subject to AT and Ecan endorsing the minutes.</li> <li>b. Contract renewals for Project NEXT contractors understood and agreed subject to agreeing as to whether GWRC or the Agency will be the contracting entity.</li> </ul>	<p>CR</p> <p>WH/CR</p>
9.	Standardisation	<p>AM provided an update on progress with TTP.</p> <p>There was work underway with the project and the PTA's around standardisation and it was taking time to work through the processes especially around governance.</p>	
10.	Handbook and Guidelines	<p><b>(Paper 2020-05-07)</b></p> <p>GA provided an update on the approach and development of the evaluation handbooks. The overall guidance has now been developed in draft and is currently going through peer review. Handbooks are being developed for pricing, TTSC calculations, Induction and for the evaluation panel handbooks.</p> <p>GA asked as to what visibility and review was required by the steering group for these handbooks. The intent was that not all guidance was to be sent out to the steering group members especially around the guidance on questions and steering group input was now being sought.</p>	

GA stated that a couple of examples can be forwarded to the steering group that covers this in an end to end fashion.

section 91 stated that the steering group should look at one handbook and how this flows through. RJ agreed with this approach in that this will give a flavour and everything else will flow.

WH asked for a better understanding of the guidance around the risk adjustment, TTSC and added value premium. Agreed that we should see a subset and the flow through and understand the guidance that supports this. In particular WH was keen to understand how the TTSC calculation is developed and the traceability for adjustments.

Also was noted that these handbooks and guidance need to tie back to the decision making matrix.

**Action**

a. Provide draft handbooks for key process steps and functions together with one evaluation team handbook including small number of example questions. This needs to flow through to guidance around handling risk adjustments, TTSC and added value premium calculations (including traceability)

b. Processes to tie back in with Decision Matrix

**(Paper 2020-05-07a)**

An example RFP Evaluation Handbook was presented. Feedback has been provided by WH and section 92 to GA.

section 91 noted one issue around the evaluators and having access to a wider group.

GA said there was a need to identify cross cutting expertise whereby specific questions can be analysed for individual evaluators. This is separate from the Agency position that are looking to have a support team of 5-6 behind their nominated evaluation team member

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>their evaluation team member was the best way to support the capability on the evaluation group.</p> <p>WH asked that there is probity input into this, also noting that any supporting resources would also need to read all the information.</p> <p>It was noted by [redacted] that this would not be sorted this morning and was further noted by GA that the procurement plan does not support this proposed Agency process.</p> <p>Overall it was agreed that more work needed to be carried out on this different proposal.</p> <p>VE also noted that AT had used cross cutting expertise to support a rail procurement and this had worked effectively. The AT experience would be shared with the steering group.</p> <p>WH said that he would schedule a meeting to discuss.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proposed Agency process for internal resource to support their evaluation members is not currently supported in the current process. Probity input required.</li> <li>b. Vanessa to provide material for how AT have used cross function expertise (Closed)</li> <li>c. Schedule meeting to address the evaluation structure/resources involved</li> </ul>	<p>GA</p> <p>WH/GA</p>
11.	Presentation Approach	<p><b>(Paper 2020-05-08)</b></p> <p>GA outlined the need for options to be explored given attendance at presentations may not be possible due to travel restrictions. Four options were presented and it was recommended that options 2 and 3 be developed with the final decision being made closer to date as to the best approach. It was also noted by GA that option 1 and 3 (attendance in person by whole team of representatives) should also not be discounted as respondents will be keen to be face to face with the buyer and they may be willing to commit to meet the travel restriction requirements.</p> <p>Discussion was held on attendance at the presentations by SME's and steering group members. Noted by RJ that it would be preferred for steering group members to attend the overview session but not the detail sessions. Judgement was reserved on attendance by the steering group members.</p>	



CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>It was emphasised by GA that from a supplier perspective the process must be equitable for all and this also applies to ensuring that any Buyer representatives are in attendance for all respondents.</p> <p>JT enquired as to who can attend. GA outlined the process and said that there is only limited resources required for the presentations as these presentations are designed for assisting the evaluators.</p> <p>GA did note that the make-up of the evaluation teams is required before the participation at these presentations can be determined.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Steering Group member attendance at presentations – decision to be held over</li> <li>b. Make-up of evaluation teams required before decisions on presentation attendance can be decided</li> </ul>	<p>St Grp</p> <p>St Grp</p>
12.	nValuate Toolset	<p><b>(Paper 2020-05-09)</b></p> <p>NOTE: GA advised of conflict of interest in this agenda item and left the meeting.</p> <p>Discussion held around ensuring a proposed electronic evaluation tool is fit for purpose. AL said he was OK with the proposal and CR stated that as long as the product is fully tested and independently reviewed then he was OK.</p> <p><b>Action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Agreement required to ensure access to product during evaluation should Tranzpayment not be involved in project</li> <li>b. Agency/AT to test nValuate product (fit for purpose testing including functional/security/data) and if passes then approved for use.</li> </ul>	<p>MM</p> <p>MM</p>
13.	General Business	MPGG – No meeting to be held for next Tuesday, only a written report will be provided by CR	
14.	Meeting Closed 10:30am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 17 June 2020, 9:00am – 10:00am	