

## Appendix A2 - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

### 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	T0013: A630 Bus Improvements (Junction Technology Upgrade)	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£1.60m
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£1.60m
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	FBC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	£0.084m
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	5.25%

### 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### *Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

It is proposed to improve 15 junctions on a key link between Rotherham and Doncaster using the latest enhanced traffic signal technology strategies based on Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA M8). (Basically, more, longer, green waves). The promoter expects this to provide flexible priority for buses potentially reducing delays by 30% - 60% without taking up road space.

### 3. STRATEGIC CASE

<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p><b>Yes. Yes</b></p> <p>The current and potential future problems faced by buses on this growth corridor are clearly laid out and the opportunities for and the advantages brought by quicker bus journey times are well explained.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p><b>Very well.</b> All three SEP policy objectives (Growth, Inclusion, Sustainability) are shown as being met. (The RAP is not mentioned). Eleven (11) separate policy documents at the national, regional and local level are listed and shown to have objectives in common with the scheme.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p>

<p><i>SMART scheme objectives</i></p>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improve the passenger perception (i.e. satisfaction survey) of bus services along the A630 through improved reliability, improved journey times and state of the art technology.</li> <li>2. Reduce average bus journey time for all services that use the corridor.</li> <li>3. Increase bus patronage along the corridor from current levels.</li> <li>4. Reduce congestion at junction along the A630 corridor.</li> <li>5. Contribute towards the modal shift from private modes to bus for commuter journeys to, from and within Doncaster and the City Region.</li> </ol> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> The logic map and the timing of monitoring activities are shown in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Appendix J).</p>	
<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Is there a genuine Options assessment and is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b> - within the identified corridor – acknowledged to be the main public transport corridor between Sheffield and Doncaster. It would be possible to provide longer bus lanes but this would not be physically possible along the entire route without drastically reducing space for general traffic and not significantly improving queuing/congestion in the shared sections and at junctions. DMBC oppose this. Rail and tram options have been considered and rejected on practicality/efficacy grounds. Sections 2.7 and 2.8 (FBC) describes the shortlisted options – which are cumulative interventions along the corridor, with the option that maximises the number of bus operators on some or all of the corridor experiencing time savings and accessibility due to the proposals. This results in a preferred option that has a lower BCR than others, but the largest carbon saving</p>	
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>No.</b> Works comprise mainly signalling equipment and processing units. No hard infrastructure so no TROs required.  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>No.</b></p>	
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i>  <b>Yes</b>  <i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i>  <b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>4. VALUE FOR MONEY</b></p>		
<p><b>Monetised Benefits:</b></p>		
<p><b>VFM Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Value</b></p>	<p><b>R/A/G</b></p>
<p><i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i></p>	<p>£2.825m</p>	<p>G</p>
<p><i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i></p>	<p>3.8</p>	<p>G</p>
<p><i>Cost per Job</i></p>	<p>n/a</p>	
<p><b>Non-Monetised Benefits: 6t p.a. CO2e</b></p>		

Non-Quantified Benefits	n/a
-------------------------	-----

## Value for Money Statement

*Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?*  
**Yes**, even with a 25% decrease in demand as possible.

## 5. RISK

*What are the most significant risks ?*

1. Implementation Cost increases
2. Availability of road space to carry out works
3. Works are delayed due to adverse weather
4. Contractors and sub-contractors don't perform as expected....delays whilst remedy works
5. Brexit – Delay in delivery of traffic signal equipment

*.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?*

Costs are being monitored regularly, there has been engagement with DMBC Network management and a process is in place to monitor contractor performance through construction

*Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)*

**No**

*Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?*

**No**

*Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?*

**No. Existing FW used** Procurement is complete

## 6. DELIVERY

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?*

Works are expected to commence October 2022 and complete April/ May 2023

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes** – procurement complete

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?*

**95%. Yes.**

*Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?*

The promoter states (5.7) that the risk allocation is sufficient for all contingencies.

*Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?*

**Yes.** SRO is PB

*Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?*

Pending <i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i> <b>Yes.</b> There is full support for the scheme by all stakeholder groups (see FBC section 6.8) <i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i> <b>Yes.</b> See FBC section 6.9
<b>7. LEGAL</b>
<i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i> <b>Yes. No</b> (See FBC section 6.4)

<b>8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to contract
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b>The following conditions must be included in the grant agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clawback on outputs and outcomes</li> </ul>	