

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Realtime Detection – Virtual Bus Triggers	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£392,287
MCA Executive Board		MCA Funding	£392,287
Programme name	CRSTS	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	BJC	MCA Development costs	0
		% of total MCA allocation	-

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes, it is clear what the MCA is being asked to fund which is a selective detection system that provides priority at signals to individual vehicles; in this instance buses.

The virtual triggers will be cover every signal- controlled location in the borough. The traffic signal controller then manages the sequence of the lights to assist the movement of the bus through the junction. This can be by extending a green phase, skipping a stage or shortening the green phase for other traffic in order to give the bus a green signal earlier than would otherwise be the case

The funds will be used upgrade the software in the Urban Traffic Control (UTC). This will also allow the collection of bus information at each of the signals which is not currently universally available, and the first phase of the project will be to establish a baseline of bus reliability data against which the improvement can be measured.

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Options assessment	<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>The alternative do something options are based around differing levels of sites at which to implement the virtual triggers with the preferred being the full 97 sites. The options are appropriate and the selection of the preferred option logical to have the maximum impact to bus punctuality and journey times.</p>	
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>The project does not have any statutory requirements.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Because data on current reliability and patronage is not available for all of the sites currently then the information that the MCA Data team hold for the A628 corridor has been used as a proxy for the whole of the borough in terms as baseline performance and the potential improvement and economic benefits that will be achieved. There is a risk therefore that this is not representative, and improvements may not be as consistently achieved. In order to overcome this, the first task of the applicant therefore will be to establish current performance at each of the locations and inform the MCA from which the increased bus reliability and patronage can be measured.</p>	
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p>There is a good alignment with the SEP in terms of improving bus journey times and the impact on access to employment and training. It will also assist in mode shift and the environmental benefits that that will enable.</p>	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	£28,963	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	2.8	
Cost per Job		

Non-Monetised Benefits:					
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>		<p>Economic – improving access to for all to jobs and amenities stimulating growth</p> <p>Carbon – improves the punctuality of bus travel which is one of the major barriers to greater patronage. Improvements in this area will make bus travel a more viable option to the private car. A decrease in private car usage will lead to reduction in carbon output</p> <p>Social – improves bus service on offer to all Barnsley residents, enabling those who rely upon public transport a great degree of social inclusion and connectivity</p>			
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>As stated above, the premise of the appraisal is that as the A628 corridor data as available is representative of the borough as a whole. The BCR has therefore been established by apportioning the costs to that corridor and monetising the expected benefits based on the time saving effects. The assumption being that all 97 locations will be similarly improved and therefore the BCR would be consistent for the full expenditure.</p> <p>The approach is reasonable for the scale of the project and follows recognised DfT methodology for the benefits calculation. <u>The BCR at 2.8 puts the project in the High Value for Money category under the DfT classification.</u></p> <p>Whilst there is an inherent risk in the methodology used the sensitivity analysis carried out illustrates that the re would have to be significant reduction in the passenger number improvements for the VFM to change classification.</p>					
5. RISK					
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>The following are the top risk which are reasonable for the project.</p>					
No.	Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Owner

		(High, Med, Low)	(High, Med, Low)		
1	Insufficient resources, both consultants and employers	Low	High	Ensure robust selection policy and management processes. Scope alternatives as "back Up"	Project Director
2	Additional requirements associated with technical approval from SYMCA	Low	High	Sufficiently detailed information is provided, timetables are understood and kept to.	Project Director / Manager
3	Funding for additional works / changes to scope	Low	High	Maintain control of brief and exclude unnecessary changes	Project Director / Manager
4	Failure to meet Outputs / Outcomes	Low	High	Outputs/outcomes based on A628 corridor with data provided	Project Director

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

Clawback on outputs

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

n/a

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

The quote for the supply the existing contractor Yunex/Siemens was time limited and has now expired and a revised call-off will need to be agreed which could risk time and cost.

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

The timetable for the delivery is reasonable

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

The supply is to be delivered by the applicant existing supplier Yunex / Siemens a direct call off contract.

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

The level of cost certainty is 95% which is appropriate for this stage of the project. The promoter has said they will manage any cost overruns through reducing the scope of sites covered.

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

There is a clear governance structure with the SRO identified.

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

The applicant has consulted with the bus operator Stagecoach who are in support of the project. There has also been public travel survey showing that people would be more encouraged to travel by bus if journey times were improved.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

The business case sets out the scope of the monitoring and evaluation to be carried out. This will be supported by a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

7. LEGAL

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

The applicant has considered subsidy control and has established that the project falls outside the scope of the Act as all four limbs of the test have not been satisfied which is appropriate.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Approve BJC and grant funding of £392,287
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Conditions prior to contract execution: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agreement with SYMCA of baseline bus performance data for inclusion in the contract Conditions prior to award of grant: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation of call-off contract with Yunix/Siemens	

