

FROM: BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: APPOINTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISOR FOR MASS TRANSIT PROJECT

DATE OF MEETING: 12 JANUARY 2022

Forum	SMT	GMB	STOB	TEB	MCA	A&RC	Approval/ Information
Report schedule/date	12/01	X	X	X	?	X	Approval

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This report seeks approval to appoint a consultant to progress the tram infrastructure aspects of the Mass Transit project. The Infrastructure Advisor will form part of a larger team needed to progress the tram renewals and related tasks.
- There is currently budget provision for the first tasks to be carried out under this commission and clauses in the contract to allow works to be suspended if no further funding becomes available or if the project is suspended or terminated. Lack of certainty regarding funding remains a key issue for the whole project.
- It is recommended that Mott Macdonald be appointed as Infrastructure Advisors to carry out the design, programming, tendering and site management tasks laid out in the brief for the Mass Transit project.

1. REASON FOR REPORT

This report seeks approval to appoint Infrastructure Advisors for the Mass Transit project.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Mott Macdonald be appointed as Infrastructure Advisor for the Mass Transit project at a cost of up to £5,803,073 on the terms and conditions laid out in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) subject to any further contract discussions prior to final award.

3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3.1 Overall

- The overall project plan for the continued development of the Mass Transit project was approved at the start of 2021. In summary, this was to procure a team of advisors to work on the project from the production of the revised Outline Business Case (OBC), through to the production of the Full Business Case (FBC), then to assist with the implementation and post implementation

periods. This avoids the need for re-tendering part way through the project's development. One of the consultants needed for this is the Infrastructure Advisor, the subject of this report. The scope of this contract includes a review of the existing body of work, review of asset condition, production of designs, specifications, tender documentation, supply of engineering outputs and outcomes, forecast design lives, costs, management of tendering, construction and commissioning. Changes since this project approach was agreed are dealt with later in the report.

3.2 The Infrastructure Advisor Contract

To assist with dealing with some of the uncertainties inherent in how the project and funding will develop, the contract for this appointment has been broken into three stages and these stages into tasks. Provision has been made in the contract for break clauses should the project not progress. Not all of the tasks that have been requested will be required. Conversely, some provision has been made for as yet unforeseen work.

The contract has been designed such that the outputs can be used for the Mass Transit OBC/FBC, but they would be equally applicable to short-term planning and other uses, such as that required as part of the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) funding approvals. Provision has also been made in the contract for other tram-related tasks such as assisting on work needed for the development of Sheffield Rail station and vision related works if these are required. The consultant will act as Lead Consultant as well as Principal Designer as defined by CDM regulations.

The tasks covered by this commission include:

Stage One – Production of the OBC

- Feasibility and Concept Design for the Core Scheme, e.g.:
 - Review of existing information
 - Inspection of various assets to determine condition, asset life and to act as a starting point for the tasks in future stages
 - Update estimates of economic life of infrastructure assets
 - Prepare outline specifications and designs
 - Production of a programme for renewal and refurbishment options and a recommendation on which of these is the best way forward.
 - Production of other information needed for the preparation of the OBC.
- Concept and Feasibility stage Design for 'Additional Tasks' (i.e. operational resilience, sustainability, tram extensions).

Stage Two – Production of the FBC

- Production of designs, specifications and tender documentation for works.
- Development of a detailed transition plan, covering how the proposed works will be delivered in an operational environment.
- Assistance with the tendering process and tender evaluation, including discussions with suppliers and recommending which bidder(s) should be selected.
- Production of information required for the preparation of the FBC.

Stage 3 - Implementation

- Manage the design process of all contracts with contractor design elements.
- Provide supervision and management of work packages during the contract period.
- Manage the transition plan for delivering the works in an operational environment.
- Provide progress reports, forecasts and information throughout the works and respond to technical queries and requests for information.

General Tasks – The role of the advisor in the wider team and more general tasks common to all stages are also included in this commission.

The contract is designed such that the outcomes can be used in any funding bid which may become available for infrastructure-related work on the tram network.

The contract does contain some obligations for SYMCA, including:

- Providing information held by SYPTE and SYSL as laid out in the ITT, including detailed maintenance records covering at least the last ten years.
- SYSL being available to provide information, support and access (including organising possessions etc.) in line with the programme included in the ITT.
- Any existing non-compliances to be provided by SYPTE along with advice on their resolution.
- Funding for works to be available in line with the information include in the ITT.
- Complying with the timescales for responding to requests for information, comments and approvals as laid out in the ITT.

Where these obligations cannot be met, there will be implications for costs and programme.

3.3 Procurement Process

Due to the estimated value of the contracted (£7.5M), Expressions of Interest were initially sought, to which three companies, Bidder 1, Bidder 2 and Mott MacDonald, responded. As all three met the minimum standards for Technical and Financial Capacity and demonstrated the required levels of previous relevant experience, they were invited to submit full tenders. A detailed specification and accompanying tender documentation were issued on 6 September 2021 and a 'pre-tender' meeting, giving tenderers the opportunity to raise any questions / seek clarification on the contract, and which representatives from all three companies attended, was held on 7 October 2021. Subsequent to the 'pre-tender' meeting, Bidder 1 advised that they would not be submitting a bid due to pressures of other work. Following a request from bidders a 2-week extension to the tender period was granted.

By the deadline of noon on 12 November 2021, two submissions were received, from Bidder 2 and Mott MacDonald:

Organisation	Cost
Bidder 2	£7,607,920
Mott MacDonald	£5,803,073

3.4 Evaluation

Pre-agreed tender evaluation criteria were included in the tender documentation, including a 70/30 quality/price split. Tender evaluation was carried out by representatives from the Projects Team and the Tram Team. The outcomes of the first round of this were:

- Both bidders passed the Economic and Financial Standing checks
- Both bidders achieved the required minimum standards and quality score.
- There was a need for some clarification questions.

The responses to the clarification questions have been evaluated and the outcome of the overall process is given in the table below:

Organisation	Quality Score (70%)	Price Score (30%)	Total
Bidder 2	50	23	73
Mott MacDonald	61	30	91

On this basis it is recommend that Mott Macdonald be selected to carry out this work.

3.5 Changes since Project Approach, ITT and Specification were approved

There have been several changes to the project since the specification was written. These include:

- Delays to the programme
- Changes to likely funding profile (now mainly CRSTS)
- Changes to the scope and objectives.

The flexibility in the contract as written means that it should be possible to accommodate these changes within the proposed costs. It is also hoped that the format of the contract is capable of dealing with future changes, however, it will not be possible to confirm this until details have been agreed with the consultant. These changes will be discussed with Mott Macdonald before the contract is signed.

3.6 Project Costs and Funding

There is provision in the current approved Mass Transit budget for 2021/22 for the works planned under this commission for this year. There is also provision in the draft budget for 2022/23 for this work. There are break clauses in the contract that will allow the cost to be controlled if funding is not approved for future years.

4. IMPLICATIONS

4.1 CONTRIBUTION TO SYPTE BUSINESS PLAN DELIVERY

- | | |
|---|---|
| ✓ | Promote the use of public transport and maximise patronage |
| ✓ | Make the most of new technology to improve public transport services |

- Work with partners to reduce the impact public transport has on **Air Quality** and the **Environment**
- Get the best return for the region from **our investment** in public transport

4.2 RISK

Risks 00042 – 00046 Associated Risk Reference(s) from risk register

Describe existing or new risks as a result of this paper and any mitigations which are available.

There are no new risks to SYMCA associated with the award of this contract. There are significant risks to delivery if these works are not carried out in a timely manner in line with the approved programme.

All existing risks and mitigation, financial and otherwise, are logged in the project's Risk Register and stored in Verto.

4.3 FINANCIAL

- Existing Budget No Budget
- No Financial Implications

Budget code to be used to fund:	
If capital, specify capital funding source available:	MCA budget*
If virement specify which budget code:	
Have Finance been consulted?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

*The 2021/22 budget is currently funded from 2021/22 ITB, 2020/21 ITB carried forward and DfT grant.

The 2022/23 budget is subject to approval.

The forecast spend profile for this contract is shown below, this is dependent on programme and scope which have not been agreed internally yet.

	2021/22	2022/23
Forecast spend	£0.15M	£1.7M

4.4 LEGAL AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Y N

Does the report contain information which is potentially exempt from the Freedom of Information Act?

Y N

Are there any exceptions to Standing Orders which need approval?

Y N

Other Legal Implications

Y N

4.5 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS

Have IT been consulted on the proposals in this paper and do the recommendations require amendments or new IT software systems or infrastructure?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No

4.6 GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION

Y N

Does the paper have implications for the handling, transfer, processing or management of customer or other personal data?

Is there a requirement to conduct a Privacy Impact Assessment? If so, please include as an appendix.

Data retention requirements

Other Data implications

4.7 HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Have HR been consulted on the proposals in this paper?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No

Does the paper have implications for any of the following;?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual job roles/responsibilities/grades	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Skills requirements, e.g. training needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	Policies and procedures

4.8 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Does the paper have implications for any of the following; **No**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gender reassignment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marriage and civil partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	Religion or belief
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pregnancy and maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Race
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sexual orientation		

Is an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) needed	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	----	-------------------------------------

4.9 COMMUNICATIONS AND STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT

Does the paper have implications for any of the following; **No**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal communications
<input type="checkbox"/>	Media and Press (including reactive communications)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marketing plans and campaigns
<input type="checkbox"/>	SCR Mayoral activities (presenting either a risk or opportunity)	<input type="checkbox"/>	No communications and stakeholder implications

No Mayoral Briefing Document is required.

4.10 ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

Do the recommendations in this paper change SYMCA's environmental impact?

- Yes
 No

4.11 CHANGE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Does the paper result in any significant change management activity;

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Business Case is required to proceed | <input type="checkbox"/> A Project Initiation Document is required to proceed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Managed through BAU change activities | <input type="checkbox"/> No change management implications |

Describe the scale and complexity of any change management activity which would result following the approval of any recommendations in the document, including necessary decision making and approval requirements and documentation to proceed.

The scale and complexity of this project, and the level of change management activity required is high.

Author: Peter Elliott, Senior Principal Project Manager
Tel: 0114 221 1206
Email: peter.elliott@southyorkshire-ca.gov.uk