

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	Active Travel Capability and Ambition Fund	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SYMCA	Total Scheme Cost	£986,585
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£986,585
Programme name	Active Travel Capability and Ambition Fund	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	BJC	MCA Development costs	-
		% of total MCA allocation	-

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes. £986,585 is requested in revenue funding to support the delivery of two types of initiatives: capability building activities and behaviour change initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capability building activities focus on building the technical capability of local authorities, as well as effectively engaging with local communities, to plan good active travel infrastructure. • The behaviour change initiatives focus on encouraging the uptake of active travel by giving users the awareness, skills, and confidence to move to more active travel. <p>The total funding request has been provided from Active Travel England to SYMCA to deliver the agreed programme of works.</p> <p>The allocation per authority is split as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BMBC: £167,760 • DMBC: £211,533 • RMBC: £179,214

- SCC: £398,480
- MCA (management costs): £29,598

3. STRATEGIC CASE

<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>Yes. The BJC has set out the short-listed options and rationale for the preferred option. A ‘do-minimum’ option and one ‘viable alternative’ option have also been considered.</p> <p>The funding requested has been provided to SYMCA by Active Travel England and has already been approved. The ‘do-minimum’ option has been discounted on the basis that it would entail not using the approved funding. The viable alternative option is to request an increased funding amount from ATE. However, this has been discounted on the basis that this request has already been rejected by ATE.</p> <p>The remaining option has been selected as the preferred option on the basis that ATE have already approved the bid and supported the measures proposed within that bid (which also make up the preferred option).</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No – none are included within the BJC. None are likely given the type of measure expected to be delivered by the scheme.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>Various ways in which the scheme contributes to the ‘stronger’ ‘greener’ ‘fairer’ outcomes have been included in the BJC. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greener – the scheme aims to decrease the number of local trips undertaken by car and encourage a mode shift to active travel which may help to reduce carbon emissions and air quality. • Fairer – the scheme will promote walking and cycling between neighbourhoods which will improve access to education, training and employment opportunities. • Fairer – the scheme aims to upskill local authority employees and ensure that all future schemes are LTN 1/20 compliant. • Fairer – the scheme aims to improve both physical and mental health of local residents by encouraging increased physical activity.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:				
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G		
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	N/A			
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	N/A			
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A			
Non-Monetised Benefits:				
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Increased demand for active travel schemes, increased participation in active travel which may contribute to reduced carbon emissions and increase both physical and mental health of residents.			
Value for Money Statement				
<p><i>Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes. The scheme aims to support the delivery and uptake of active travel projects through: upskilling local authority employees through further training in areas such as scheme design and national guidance; and engagement with the public to raise awareness of active travel opportunities. This is intended to increase the number of users of active travel schemes. The scheme does not have direct benefits, other than realising the benefits of active travel.</p>				
5. RISK				
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>Information relating to the key risks has been provided as per the below:</p>				
Risk Description	Impact / Consequence of Risk	Risk action owner	Risk Control / Mitigation	Latest update from promoter
Availability of external providers to deliver the service	reduced delivery	All	early and continued consultation with providers	Negotiations with external providers are already underway to manage contracts

Low public uptake of the services being provided	reduced delivery	All	continued engagement with all community groups, come through targeted social media	Past delivery has received positive uptake however the delay in funding being awarded has created a gap in service provision and lapsed users may not all return.
Sustainability of projects post funding	end of service being offered	All	continue looking for other available programmes	Without external funding some services will end as there is inadequate provision in LA revenue funds to support this. Active Travel England have this week re-iterated their commitment to longer term revenue support however won't be able to progress this until they know future budgets.
Difficulty engaging with selected organisations	reduced delivery	DMBC	targeted promotion around large employment sites	Doncaster have identified the hospital, colleges etc as the larger employment sites to consult with. Due to ongoing political issues with the NHS/academic arenas, Doncaster wanted to highlight the possible risk of engagement. They have a reasonable working relationship with most larger employment organisations so identified the risk as Low. With regards to other areas, they have all identified ongoing engagement so the links and updates are already there.

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 for the scheme?

The funding for the scheme has been provided by Active Travel England to SYMCA and has already been approved.

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

No. The procurement for all measures included in the scheme will be the responsibility of the local authority partners.

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Yes. Appendix A.2 shows the full funding amount being spent in FY 23/24. This aligns to the funding end date of 31/03/24 outlined in the management case.

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 100%. The BJC notes that the interventions have been designed to meet the available funding.

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

The governance structure has been outlined for each LA. **However, the SRO is yet to sign the BJC.**

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. The Local Authorities will individually monitor and report on delivery process in line with the programme level Active Travel Monitoring & Evaluation Plan once this is in place.

7. LEGAL

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

Subsidy control compliance has been considered as part of the BJC and it is noted that Since SYMCA is awarding the subsidy to the Highway Authority whose purpose is to carry out highway improvements and deliver projects benefitting all users of the public highway the test for a measure to be a subsidy is not met.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
BJC to be signed by SRO.	