

Project NEXT

Executive Steering Group

Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2020-12-01

Date:	18 November 2020	
Time:	9:00am – 10:00am	
Location:	Zoom	
Steering Group	Wayne Hastie (Chair)	GWRC
	Charles Ronaldson	NZTA
	Vanessa Ellis (Zoom)	AT
	Roger Jones (Zoom)	AT (joined 9:20)
	Andrew McCallin	NZTA
	Nick Donnelly (Zoom)	ORC
	Stewart Gibbon (Audio)	ECAN
In Attendance	Graham Alston	NEXT
	section 9(2)(a)	NZTA
	James Timperley	NZTA
	Rachael Turnage (Zoom)	AT
	Laura Wilmot	NZTA
	Mark McHugh	NEXT (joined 9:40)
	<i>(Secretariat for this meeting)</i>	
Apologies	Stewart Gibbon	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
0.	Introduction	All welcomed by WH No additional Agenda items requested	
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 21 October 2020	Minutes from 21 October 2020 steering group meeting accepted.	
2.	Actions Status	Open Actions from 21 October 2020 minutes Transition It was agreed that further discussion on transition requirement for the business case and costing should be taken offline in the presence of probity. Open Actions from 16 September 2020 minutes TTP Integrated Plan	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
	Integrated plan to be discussed at workshop on 2 November 2020 NTP Working Group ToR Regional Consortium and Ecan participation agreed Action		CLOSED
	i. Rachael Turnage to get underway.		CLOSED
	ii. Rachel to follow-up with Regional Consortium ECan about participation.		CLOSED
	Treasury review Actions		
	a. RPA paper to be distributed to SG		JT
	b. Paper to be prepared for the steering Group		JT
	c. Steering Group to identify areas they want covered in the review		St Grp
	18-Nov Update:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions progressing • Met MoT Crown Monitor, review will be June 2021 (earliest) but presentation of supporting information will be required from c. April 2021. Will not happen prior to the TSP Down-Select • Agreed this should be a standing item for future SG meetings 		GA
	Open Actions from 19 August 2020 minutes TTP Status Report		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Charter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NTS plan including milestones to be developed – in progress, tied into the integrated plan b. JT to outline the approach to the NTS charter – in progress c. Revised charter for Project NEXT (v2.0) approved subject to above changes being made and being re-circulated to steering group – working Group ToR to be agreed first before rolling into the charter and then re-circulated 		JT
			JT
			GA
	18-Nov Update:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions progressing • CR Commented that looking to engage a programme manager to help manage actions across TTP / NEXT and Governance work-streams • VE Commented that a dead-line was need for development of the integrated plan • JT commented the plan to use rolling horizon planning • section 4 commented this should be topic for 8 Dec workshop and WH suggested to hold over until he workshop agenda item 		
	Open Actions from 14 August 2020 minutes nVALUEATE		MM

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>Software licence agreement to replace letter that will outline the responsibilities – work in progress</p> <p>Open Actions from 15 July 2020 minutes</p> <p>Governance P2 Agreement – 19 August/21 October – workshops ongoing</p> <p>Open Actions from 17 June 2020 minutes</p> <p>TTP Status Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on engagement with PTA's will be provided at the next steering group meeting 15/7 – Customer experience is the key engagement and JT is working through, AT/GW attendees identified 19/8 – in progress Standardisation changes that require PTA approvals to be included in timeline 15/7 – Status report to be updated 19/8 – in progress 18/11 – Draft ToR to be discussed. VE requested a commit date for the ToR and scope of work. AM to provide the updated ToR for the next SG meeting, noting that there was a new Manager Public Transport commencing at WK. 	<p>CR</p> <p>JT</p> <p>AM</p>
3.	Project Report (To 31 October 2020)	<p>(Paper No 2020-11-02)</p> <p>WH suggested that the paper was taken as read with focus on key points and any questions.</p> <p>Project report presented as read by GA with project status remaining Green.</p> <p>GA commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress was being tracked and managed proactively on a daily basis, responding to evaluation team requirements Weekly reports provide good update on status for SG Resource scheduling was the biggest issue for the RETs with up to 7 people per team, diary co-ordination was very challenging RT commented that this was compounded by conflicts with other work-streams, e.g. internal NTS planning in AT requiring the same people, but making it work (for AT) at present GA commented that from NEXT evaluation perspective, prioritisation from the SG members for their respective organisations would be the biggest assistance but recognised this is not always straightforward WH commented that we need to understand the longer term requirements for evaluation team members Action: GA to provide estimate of resource demands from evaluation team members for future stages (noting this is 	GA

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>not for the scope of the integrated timeline work being undertaken)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of respondent Presentation attendance, need to emphasise that attendance needs to be on the basis of 'attend all sessions for all Respondents or none. • Risk and RCAT assessments unlikely to commence before New Year • AMcC commented on the REP meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Went well with good level of assessment b. Observed that we need to be realistic in assessing how much information is enough; will more add greatly to our understanding in terms of down-select to two c. This was generally acknowledged by SG members • VE questioned status of the P1 Agreement signatures • GA commented that we were working under the P1 agreement already – noting that a change to working under NZTA may necessitate a change to the P1 agreement • ND said he would further follow up at RC Governance meeting for final signatures • section 9(2)(b)(iii) [REDACTED] • Generally agreed that should move to WK-NZTA anyway (paying for two facilities) and that by end Feb would be preferred timeline. 	
4.	TTP Establishment Report	<p>(Paper No 2020-11-03)</p> <p>WH suggested the paper be taken as read with highlights and questions.</p> <p>section 9(1) asked whether JT had the 'horsepower' for the management case or greater resource required? JT was comfortable that he had.</p> <p>section 9(1) stated that he needed the bandwidth to get through to the Authorities and asked whether this can be completed before Xmas. JT stated that the management case was a WIP and would not be done before the proposed workshop on 8 December.</p> <p>section 9(1) enquired as to the progress being tracked week by week. Also there needs to be a join-up with PwC who are working with AT.</p> <p>Action</p> <p>JT to meet section 9(2)(a) today and update Steering Group by email as to where the management case is at.</p> <p>Action</p>	JT

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>VE asked for a risk assessment on the consequences to the procurement schedule if the management case timeline can't be met.</p> <p>JT noted the issue being how each Authority manages back into their entity for the approvals process and therefore the risk is how this flows into the approval process. JT stated that he is looking to the steering group as to how to manage this approval.</p> <p><small>section 91</small> commented that not being able to complete the Management Case would risk snagging an excellent piece of procurement process</p> <p>WH stated that the key is an agreed integrated timeline.</p> <p>Action Integrated timeline to be agreed</p>	JT/GA
5.	RFP Evaluation Progress	<p>GA provided a positive update on progress.</p> <p>However given time constraints GA highlighted that many decisions are being made that is compromising the process and that he will manage this to the best of his ability.</p> <p>VE asked as to the consequences and risks. GA stated that most are around avoiding the schedule. GA undertook to raise any material risks to both probity and the steering group chair.</p> <p>WH proposed that the Steering Group accepts this position and accept the risks to meet the timelines.</p> <p>Agreed Given that the evaluation has been operating on this basis then the project should carry on with the evaluation under these conditions. This was agreed and accepted by the steering group</p>	
6.	Workshop 8 December 2020	<p>Discussion held around progress with the Management Case for the business case with focus currently on the P2 Agreement and the Management Case.</p> <p>Agreed that no focus was required on the procurement process.</p> <p>GA noted that the last day for presentations was 8 December, with up to 14 hour days being scheduled in the two week period prior to this meaning there was no capacity within the project to plan for the workshop.</p> <p>Agreed Discuss this position with the steering group working group and if this date can't be made to work then the workshop to be deferred to new year.</p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
7.	Observer Protocol	<p>(Paper No 2020-11-05)</p> <p>A request from the AT Probity Manager to attend moderation meetings was received and a Protocol was developed outlining the conditions for any person authorised by the Process Management Team to be an Observer at any Evaluation Meetings in support of the initial moderation meetings.</p> <p>Subsequently a further request was received for the AT Probity Manager to attend all RFP evaluation meetings through to preferred supplier selection (post BAFO) and receive all documents and reports.</p> <p>At the request of the Chair of the Steering Group an Extended Observer Protocol has now been prepared by the Probity Advisor to support attendance on an "as-desired" basis the second round of moderation meetings, presentations, other RFP processes and to review documents in accordance with the obligations of the Probity Auditor. This 'Observer' role will be extended to any participating authority on request.</p> <p>The Extended Observance Protocol was accepted with no comments.</p>	GA
8.	Participation Agreement (P2)	CR stated that the P2 Agreement is on track. A paper will be presented by CR at the next MPGG meeting next Tuesday outlining the progress.	
9.	General Business	<p><i>Financial Services MSA progress</i></p> <p>MM noted that two of the three MSA had been further reviewed by Buddle Findlay and the final MSA(Program Manager) was with Buddle Findlay for review.</p> <p>Once this feedback on the last MSA is received then all three can be aligned and the updated position then sent to all three suppliers for further review.</p> <p><i>RFP Respondent Presentations</i></p> <p>Respondent presentations will be conducted from the Maringiwai room at 181 Vivian Street.</p> <p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Protocol to be distributed to all attendees b. Agenda to be re-circulated 	GA GA
10.	Meeting Closed 10:10am	Next Meeting: Wednesday 16 December 2020, 9:00am – 10:00am	