

# Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

## 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Doncaster TCF Programme – Edlington	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£380,486
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£380,486
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	-
		% of total MCA allocation	-

## 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The funding request of £380,486 is requested to deliver:

- 1km of new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 x improved pedestrian crossing

**This scheme has already been delivered and is complete. The assessment has been expediated given the time pressures relating to the TCF funding deadlines.**

## 3. STRATEGIC CASE

*Options assessment*

*Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?*

Details have been provided on how the scheme aligns to SCR's objectives and how the scheme will contribute to achieving the TCF objectives.

	The promoter has provided background as to why the specific route design was chosen and information on the optioneering process has also been included. A lower cost option was considered which provided a reduced scale route of 0.5km. This was discounted on the basis that it did not connect to the existing network coherently which would impact the overall benefits of delivering the scheme.
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>TROs are applicable. The FBC suggests TRO approvals are still outstanding. However, discussion with the promoter confirmed this is incorrect and all approvals are in place.</p> <p><b>This will need to be updated as a condition of funding release.</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No adverse consequences of the scheme are highlighted in the FBC.</p>
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	<p>Yes, although the old template has been used the question has not been directly answered. However, various ways that the scheme links with MCA outcomes have been outlined, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way</li> <li>• To affect a mode shift away from the private car on those corridors where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled</li> <li>• Creating a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys,</li> <li>• Achieving the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR.</li> </ul> <p>This scheme aims to provide high quality walking and cycling links which will make active travel a natural choice for residents. The scheme links in with existing and proposed cycle routes and is a missing link in the existing network. Increased cycling will also help to achieve improved health and wellbeing.</p>

#### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

##### Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	-£30,375	Latest AMAT not received
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	0.88	Latest AMAT not received
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A	

Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits	No supplementary modelling was undertaken.	
Value for Money Statement		
<i>Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?</i>		
The scheme represents poor value for money as the BCR is below 1.		
Sensitivity analysis has been undertaken showing a BCR ranging from 0.70 – 0.85 when sensitised. This remains poor value for money.		
As noted above the scheme has already been delivered. The promoter has verbally commented that this scheme represented a missing link in the wider network and forms a key connection for the deprived area of Edlington. It also connects to future planned routes ultimately connecting to Doncaster centre.		
5. RISK		
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>		
Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Lack of labour through DLO causing a delay to start of works as cannot secure labour 25% probability High risk	Communicate early with DLO to plan for delivery of package	Major Projects
2. Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner: Negative impact on the proposals - lack of buy-in and support from stakeholders for the package requires re-design and/or removal of package elements 20% probability High risk	Engagement will be continuous with key stakeholders, and undertake early consultation with those most directly affected with revised scheme design Corporate Communications team will be involved	Major Projects / Corporate Communications
3. Traffic Regulation Orders: - Objections to TROs will delay the start of the package and completion dates - Significant objections could result in the scheme being revised downwards and not achieving the desired outputs	TROs will be prepared and submitted for each individual element of the package Any objections will be for specific location and minimise the impact of delay of delivery of the package	Major Projects

25% probability High risk		
4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers 37% probability Medium risk	Workers maintain social distancing Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved	Contractor
5. Increased competition for resources across SCR TCF programme: Lack of available resources means a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 20% probability Medium risk	Early contractor engagement	Major Projects / Contractor

The above risks are out of date and likely no longer applicable as the scheme has been delivered and is complete. **It should be confirmed by the promoter that the risks were managed and that there was no impact on the overall scheme and associated benefits.**

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

As per the above.

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

No, the scheme is complete and 100% of the funding is requested from SYMCA. There is a time pressure relating to the TCF funding deadline, however the assessment of this FBC has been expedited to mitigate this risk.

It is noted that in the previous FBC maintenance costs were requested and the total scheme costs were £380k. In the latest FBC the total scheme costs remain the same (£380k) despite the fact that maintenance costs have been removed. The promoter verbally confirmed that the overall scheme costs have increased due to inflationary impacts on material costs which is why the funding request has not reduced in line with the maintenance costs being removed.

**However, it is not clear what the total scheme cost was (as it is unlikely the scheme costs increased by exactly the same figure as the maintenance costs) and this needs to be clarified, as well as how any costs above the £380k were funded.**

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

No, the scheme is complete.

## 6. DELIVERY

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?*

The promoter verbally confirmed that the scheme was delivered as per the delivery programme. However, it would be beneficial to know if the scheme is on track to meet any other deadlines (such as those relating to monitoring and evaluation).

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

Yes – the scheme is complete.

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?*

Cost certainty is noted as 75% which the promoter verbally confirmed was incorrect. **This should be updated.**

*Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?*

The SRO has been named and a project organogram has been provided. **The FBC has not been signed and this will be required as condition of approval.**

*Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?*

Unknown.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

Yes. A monitoring and evaluation plan has been provided.

## 7. LEGAL

*Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?*

It has been confirmed that State Aid is not applicable to the scheme.

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract, with conditions
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	

Conditions of approval

- FBC to be signed

Conditions required to be satisfied prior to contract execution:

- Latest AMAT which is aligned to the Economic Assessment Report (BCR of 0.88, optimism bias of 20%) needs to be provided.
- The timetables for delivery should be reviewed to ensure any outstanding milestones remain appropriate.
- FBC updated - For example, cost certainty is listed as being at 75% and TROs are noted as being outstanding. The promoter confirmed this is incorrect.
- The promoter should provide confirmation that the risks were appropriately managed and will not impact successful delivery of the benefits of the scheme.
- Total scheme cost needs to be clarified, as well as how any costs above the £380k were funded

It is also recommended that the promoter is reminded that submitting the FBC once the scheme has commenced / completed is not standard procedure.