

Project NEXT

Executive Steering Group

Meeting Minute

Paper No: 2021-10-20-01

Date:	15 September 2021	
Time:	8:30am – 10:00am	
Location:	Microsoft Teams	
Steering Group (All Teams)	<div>section 9(2)(a) (Chair)</div> <div>Charles Ronaldson</div> <div>Vanessa Ellis</div> <div>Roger Jones</div> <div>Scott Gallacher</div> <div>Delaney Myers</div> <div>Nick Donnelly</div> <div>Stewart Gibbon</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>
In Attendance (All Teams)	<div>Graham Alston -in person</div> <div>James Timperley – in person</div> <div>section 9(2)(a) – in person</div> <div>Rachael Turnage</div> <div>Andrew McCallin</div> <div>section 9(2)(a) - in person</div> <div>Mark McHugh – in person</div> <div>(Secretariat for this meeting)</div> <div>section 9(2)(a)</div> <div>Nikki Lau Young</div>	<div>NEXT</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>AT</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>Waka Kotahi</div> <div>NEXT</div> <div>ECAN</div> <div>GWRC</div>
Apologies		

Item	Description	Action	Resp
01	Introduction	<p>Welcome by section 9(2)(a) who proposed that given some members needed to leave the meeting early that the paper order would be altered with focus on the Customer standardisation first followed by an update on the integrated plan.</p> <p>section 9(2)(a) also acknowledged attendance from section 9(2)(a) and Nikki Lau Young as working group members who were attending as observers. It was also noted that it is going to be an intense time between the steering group and working group over the next 3 months. section 9(2)(a) also reminded all that only the steering group members are the formal members of the steering group.</p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
1.	Approve Draft Minutes 18 August and 27 August 2021 (Covered as ITEM 3)	Minutes are taken as read. All actions are closed or in progress. Minutes from 18 August 2021 steering group meeting accepted. Minutes from 27 August 2021 steering group meeting accepted.	
2.	Open Actions	<p>Open Actions from 27 August 2021 minutes Integrated Plan/Business Case/P2 Agreement</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preferred supplier to be mapped into the structure. 2. Transition governance and BAU state (including ToFs) to be documented 3. Operations model to include an HR strategy and be tabled at the September SG meeting 4. Council/Board decisions and delegation timelines to be mapped out for each participant 5. P2 Agreement to be finalised with 'subject to' criteria and presented at the October steering group meeting for endorsement 6. MPGG meeting to be scheduled prior to the preferred supplier decision to align perspectives on funding and commitment to the P2 Agreement. 7. Additional steering group meetings in October period to be scheduled with placeholder times 8. Early works risks to be assessed at the end of October 2021. 9. Steering Group to get refreshed DBC visibility with architecture and parts not reliant on the updated response for the DBC at the September meeting (15 September) and may be required at the October meeting (20 October) for 'do minimum' alignment, <p>Ecan and GWRC Implementation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engagement between Ecan and supplier is required – questions to be developed by section 9(2)(a) and GA/SG to agree questions and process 2. ECan engagement with preferred supplier on transition and operations to be a high priority and arranged for November following Updated RFP Response, noting dependency that this will be early works and agreement with Waka Kotahi required on funding availability and that early works can be entered into. 3. GWRC arrangements for engagement between preferred supplier and GWRC also to be arranged 4. Early works activities to be identified. <p>Target State for NTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. End to end national customer experience and consequences to be presented at October steering group meeting, 	<p>JT</p> <p>JT</p> <p>JT</p> <p>JT</p> <p>CR</p> <p>CR</p> <p>GA</p> <p>GA</p> <p>JT</p> <p>GA/SGib</p> <p>GA</p> <p>GA</p> <p>GA</p> <p>DM</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>particularly around points 1, 2, 3 of the consequences of this approach for the NTS participants.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Elements of the target state to be prioritised section 9(2)(b)(ii) <p>4. Delaney and Andrew to identify what is required to ensure policy personnel are on the customer experience forum.</p> <p>Other Business</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Branding – Branding paper will be out in next few days. Feedback required on this and request from CR that this feedback is a 'reply all' feedback. Additional steering group meeting will be required before the end of October, some may be earlier <p>Open Actions from 18 August 2021 minutes</p> <p>TTP Establishment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do minimum (including milestones and dates) reasonableness review to be presented to steering group prior to the updated response being received TTP Resource risk status to be presented at next steering group meeting Authorities to detail to James the involvement they want with the TTP resourcing. <p>Approach to service levels</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions of major, medium and low density traffic to be defined Liaise with Authorities as to which services/Stations met each of these definitions To complete the above 2 actions before receiving Updated RFP Response with outcome to be presented through the Working Group <p>NTS Establishment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Hour Steering Group meeting to be organised in next 2 weeks to discuss NTS Establishment and Communications Plan <p>Open Actions from 21 July 2021 minutes</p> <p>2BAFO response required before decision on early works to be made by steering group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Charles to check with Waka Kotahi Board as to their level of comfort with an early works order. <p>Respondent Correspondence</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>DM</p> <p>DM/AM</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>JT</p> <p>AT/GW/ Ecan/RITS</p> <p>GA</p> <p>GA</p> <p>GA</p> <p>CLOSED</p> <p>CR (OPEN)</p> <p>(GA) OPEN</p>

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>11. Debrief response (Formal Report) to be prepared by the Project Director and timing to be agreed with supplier. 18/8 – Reports prepared, waiting for suitable time to release.</p> <p>Open Actions from 19 May 2021 minutes</p> <p>Business Case</p> <p>12. section 9(2)(b)(ii)</p> <p>Preferred supplier workshops</p> <p>13. Memo to Authorities for candidates for fares working group that is also to include section 9(2)(a).</p> <p>P2 Agreement</p> <p>14. P2 Agreement must be tabled at the June MPCG meeting for endorsement, 21 July – Updated draft will be distributed to stakeholders within 10 Days, now distribution due by 20 August</p>	<p>MM(OPEN)</p> <p>DM(OPEN)</p> <p>CR (OPEN)</p>
1.	NTS Customer Experience	<p>(Paper No 2021-09-XX)</p> <p>Paper presented by DM noting that this was a strawman and is not the final position, Appendix B and C are there for contextual purposes and it is expected that PTA staff will go over these questions line by line.</p> <p>DM asked that Appendix A (Target National Customer Experience) and the timelines need to be reviewed with some of these in the design phase and others during Ecan implementation.</p> <p>Attention was drawn to the Timing column key with 1 = detailed design phase, 2 = decision prior to roll-out and 3/4 being before roll-out to other PTA's.</p> <p>AM also brought attention to Line 1 (Fares) detailing the daily/weekly caps, pointing out that this was now a global standard but is limited by the product offerings. The intent to ensure there is no barrier to outside people travelling in a different city.</p> <p>Stewart G asked whether each region is able to set their own caps and this was confirmed by AM as being correct.</p> <p>Stewart G also asked if there is no capping today, is there a revenue impact on roll-out. This also was confirmed by AM as being correct.</p> <p>section 9(2)(a) asked whether any policy changes resulting can be made by PTA's within the policy constructs in the timeframe for NTS?</p> <p>Stewart G felt that this topic would need a much longer discussion</p> <p>DM offered to hold workshops with PTA's on this. also stated that there are a number of items that can be standardised nationally, an</p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>example being 'under 5's'. These items need to be identified with the regions as to what they are comfortable with – RAG assessment.</p> <p>VE liked this approach and confirmed that the team at AT are ready to look at the list and will come back as to what items are straight forward and what will have an impact.</p> <p>DM will set a date for RAG (Red, Amber, Green) status and this will get the table narrowed down.</p> <p>ND detailed the need for each council to make their own decisions, noting that this was not a collective decision. The question to be asked is how to loop in each council to get these agreed, further noting that councils do not like negative impacts.</p> <p>Furthermore, ND stated that with capping it will be confusing if there are different regional caps and will not be a good customer experience.</p> <p>DM responded that a national cap is a long way off as the regional differences are great.</p> <p>VE asked if the decision on branding is soon with DM stating that there is still final some final design. And DM asked what is the final date required for the no 1 timing column. GA stated this decision needs to be understood for design elaboration that will be early next year, unless there are 'Early Works'. This will be indicated by the end of this year.</p> <p>VE stated that branding needs to be a '1' and not a '2'. This was supported by GA who outlined the manufacturer needs to understand this before ordering equipment. If wraps are to be applied in country, then these need to be proven in the factory for thermal and UV testing. This will require a 3 month trial period in the factory before shipping.. VE acknowledged that this will need to be agreed before the end of the year.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RAG status with items to be tabled with steering group 2. Status with each PTA (incl RITS councils) to be picked up in the working group next Monday 3. Regional consortium resources to be co-ordinated to review items 	<p>DM/AM</p> <p>DM/AM</p> <p>DM/AM</p>
2.	Integrated Plan	<p>(Paper No 2021-09-04a)</p> <p>JT comments:</p>	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This plan is a continued evolution on what has previously been discussed and provides a framework and process to manage. There is another level of detail for the approval process Agendas will be forwarded on what is coming back to the steering group for approval. Work is underway with establishing this plan with the workstream leads for the PTA's. section 9 noted that the powerpoint has now been refined that is now clearer on the way working through the procurement through to the target rollout for Ecan and GWRC. VE asked to understand the risk around the milestone dates around execution. This was unable to be provided by section 9 at this stage. GA noted that these dates will reviewed in light of the updated response due mid October that will give a sense as the supplier is putting forward a plan. Early works will also have potential to bring forward dates and the negotiation process also needs to be looked at. VE asked that for the business case for stakeholders that they need to understand the confidence and don't want things in piecemeal. section 9 agreed that there needs to be a joined up view noting the integrated plan is need for conversation and getting AT joined up is challenging. GA noted that with the RFP responses all agreed with meeting the overall roll-out, but not the early dates. There is a lower risk to later dates than earlier dates. section 9 asked that additional placeholders be put into the diaries. These will be cancelled if there are no material matters. Quorums will be required. For these meetings. VE suggested 7:00am to 8:30 as this should be outside pre-existing commitments. <p>Action: Interim meetings to be scheduled.</p> <p>Recommendations noted and endorsed.</p>	GA
3.	Project NEXT Monthly Report (31 August)	<p>(Paper No 2021-09-02)</p> <p>section 9 requested report taken as read unless any comments / questions</p> <p>GA comments to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 9(2)(b)(ii) 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 9(2)(b)(ii) 	
4.	TTP Establishment Report	<p>(Paper No 2021-09-03)</p> <p>section 9 requested report taken as read unless any comments / questions</p> <p>JT update: (outside of Integrated Plan that has been covered earlier)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next stage of the Operations Model is being worked on with AT and this model will now be taken out to the other PTAs Operations model needs to feed into the DBC, landing in November where the management case and financial case need to be updated. Resourcing risk is high due to market issues and mitigations are in place. Active recruitment is under way. section 9 asked for the need to understand the impact on the integrated plan around the resourcing issues. section 9 was asked to be more specific around managing risks and who is managing. Confirmed by section 9 that a risk register is being developed. <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Risk management and identifying who is managing risks to be specific 	JT/section 9
4.	Detailed Business case	<p>(Paper 2021-09-04)</p> <p>Paper prepared in response to providing visibility to the current state do minimum counterfactual for the DBC.</p> <p>JT is seeking confirmation from the steering group that this is the information required for the DBC.</p> <p>Discussion Point 16 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> section 9 noted that the Do Minimum scenarios are looking like 'alternatives' rather than a do minimum, e.g. proposing an alternative approach to existing schemes with extension to Open loop etc therefore more than 'do minimum' CR stated that these costs need to be in the NLTP if these costs are to be represented correctly. Stewart G confirmed that the Ecan figures are a do minimum and don't represent if the NTS didn't go ahead. Scott confirmed the GWRC figures are in the LTP. Observation is understanding what are the overall Waka Kotahi conclusions and what does this mean for the DBC. section 9 responded that the result of these counterfactual numbers is that an overall improvement in the DBC is the result. RJ noted that AT replacement equipment is being rolled out now and not post 2026. section 9 agreed this needs to be flushed out. 	

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VE to check out discussion points 17 and 18 and confirm AT position by early next week. <p>Decisions: Recommendations 1-4 noted, subject to AT confirmation on numbers to be included in the DBC.</p> <p>It was agreed that the following points should be included in the recommendations as items 5 and 6.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Should a Participant not proceed with NTS then a detailed commercial review of the do minimum counterfactual must be a pre-requisite to support any decision not to proceed; 6. Relevant sections of each authority LTP should be attached to the DBC 	VE
7.	Procurement Plan Amendment	<p>(Paper 2021-09-05)</p> <p>GA outlined the need to update the Procurement Plan to account for sequence and timing differences to those anticipated in the plan, particularly around the dependencies on the DBC approval.</p> <p>Key change is the introduction of a new decision point – DP11a which is for the steering group provisional approval of the DBC. DP8/11/12 are now concurrent approvals through the councils before contract award.</p> <p>These proposed changes have been reviewed by Probity who have advised to make these changes.</p> <p>VP was unclear on AT being able to enter negotiations without the DBC being approved. ^{section 91} stated that the risk around this rests with Waka Kotahi, the funding model will be approved by then, MPGG would've approved the P2 Agreement and the DBC would be updated.</p> <p>RJ stated that he didn't want a <i>fait accompli</i> with the provisional agreement. He accepts the notion of DP11a and has no view on the contract negotiations until the impacts of the risks are considered and these are taken back through their own organisation for approval.</p> <p>GA noted that the amendments support the previously agreed plan by the steering group and the changes are procedural.</p> <p>VE requested that internal AT advice on the recommendations in this paper are approved.</p>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
		<p>section 9(2)(b)(ii) noted that DP11a is a later decision and one that does not need to be made now.</p> <p>Scott confirmed from his perspective that there were enough safeguards and there are exit ramps.</p> <p>Recommendations 1-4 approved subject to the following amendment to Recommendation No 3 that is now to read:</p> <p>Approves that the proposed changes are made to the Procurement Plan in an updated version, subject to advice from AT by the end of the week.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AT to provide internal advice on the proposed changes to the Procurement Plan by 17 September 2021 	VE
8.	section 9(2)(b)(ii)	<p>GA confirmed that the preferred supplier has been informed of this approach and any timings will be detailed in the updated RFP response.</p>	
9.	Negotiation Process Planning	<p>(Paper 2021-09-07 a,b,c,d)</p> <p>Negotiation documents are tabled for noting and discussion. GA noted that these documents are a draft and need to be finalised.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negotiation Process Documents to be reviewed by 24 September 2021 and feedback provided to GA. 2. GA to update based on feedback and re-present for approval at next Steering Group 	St Grp GA
10.	Short Term Agreement	<p>(Paper 2021-09-08)</p> <p>Progress update provided by GA on scoping pre-contract works. GA noted that the current scope of proposed priority activities does not include equipment and that will be a separate SOW. section 9(2)(a) noted that equipment order was critical for Ecan and this was noted by the Chair.</p> <p>Recommendations all agreed.</p>	
11.	Working Group Progress	No update from Working Group	
12.	Gateway Review Progress	Confirmed that this review will commence on 15 November 2021 with a pre-meet on 1 November 2021	

CONFIDENTIAL

Item	Description	Action	Resp
13.	AoB	CR noted that section 9(2)(a) was leaving later in a month and passed on thanks for the work she has undertaken in communications and engagement.	
14.	Meeting Closed 10:03am	Next Monthly Meeting: Wednesday 29 September 2021, 7:00am – 8:30am	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982