

## 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	O0220 E-cycle Pilot Fund	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant (Revenue)
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SYMCA	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£500,000
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport & the Environment	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£500,000
<b>Programme name</b>	Active Travel	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	BJC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	0
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	-

## 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes there is a clear description of the project which is a pilot programme of activities which will support the promotion and advancement of e-cycling in South Yorkshire. There will be a fleet of cycles which will transfer to the 4 Local Authorities and this revenue funding will provide a range of resources to support the LA's and manage the programme. There is a clear case for change in that e-cycle ownership in the UK remains low and the e-cycle initiatives currently operating are constrained by the numbers and age of the cycles against current demand. This project will aim to widen the appeal of e-cycling to more people and support an increase in e-cycling rates.

The funds will be used for:

- E-cycle loans, including equipment, maintenance, parts, trackers, Hub support
- Hub staff
- E-cycle subsidies
- E-cycle training and confidence building
- Led Rides

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Programme Management
- Marketing/Promotion

Additionally, through the programme Monitoring and Evaluation the project will seek to determine whether e-bikes can be an affordable, viable mode for short and medium journeys. This funding will provide a crucial testing ground to gather behavioural insight, develop and test the long-term model.

### 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>The alternative do something options are either continue the current delivery model, seek more funding to deliver more or the preferred option. The applicant hasn't considered alternative programmes of activities within the available funding as might be expected. However, the approach has been approved in principal by Active Travel England and so is considered reasonable.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<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>The exact number of e-bikes to be transferred from Cycling UK for the project has not been confirmed.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>There is a very clear alignment across all elements of the SEP which show a credible thread from the support of e-bike use in terms of improving connection to employment and training, environmental benefits from mode shift and health and well-being benefits.</p>

### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

**Monetised Benefits:**

<b>VFM Indicator</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>R/A/G</b>
<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>		
<b>Non-Monetised Benefits:</b>		
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	<p>Environmental Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should reduce emissions and improve air quality by modal shift to cycling</li> </ul> <p>Social Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved social value by providing e-cycling self and social opportunities</li> <li>• Increased confidence and travel choices</li> </ul> <p>Wider Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased volunteering programmes</li> <li>• Positive impact on health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Support local community groups reducing social isolation</li> <li>• Improving mental health through mental health physical activity team referrals</li> </ul>	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>		
<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>There are no quantified economic benefits calculated but there is a clear link between the scheme and the potential wider benefits to society should the project lead to a shift in behaviour towards more cycling.</p> <p>Whilst the BJC articulates the potential benefits of the project, it does not include a clear specific and measurable objective of this project in terms of a post project change in behaviour but focusses on the activities and participation during the project implementation phase. However, this is understandable as the project is a pilot and it's role is to determine whether a long-term increase in e-cycling is deliverable.</p>		

As such the use of these funds does represent VfM.

## 5. RISK

*What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?*

The following are the top risks which are reasonable for the project.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Transfer of e-cycles	Med	High	Continual engagement with ATE to understand fleet transfer plans and keep them informed of our preferences for fleet.	MCA
2	ATE do not approve programme	Low	Med	Regular engagement with ATE and their assigned Project Manager covering our plans will reduce the risk of ATE rejecting any parts of our programme and any plans which ATE determine should be changed can be identified sooner.	MCA
2	Changes to government legislation affect e-cycle laws, e.g. upcoming proposed amendments to the legal definition of EAPCs (electrically assisted pedal cycles)	Med	Low	We will need to monitor DfT/gov for announcements and can continue to raise at meetings with ATE and local authorities. Planning for scalable e-cycle loans can be incorporated into programme development - e.g. e-cycle loans become less popular when twist-and-go e-cycles exist.	MCA
3	Availability of external providers to deliver the service	Low	Med	Early and continued consultation with providers. Regular communication with sponsors on Programme Board and MCA dates to keep informed of dates for Grant Agreements.	MCA
4	Low public uptake of the services being provided	Low	Low	Continued engagement with community groups and engagement through targeted social media	MCA

*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?*

No

## 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 Individual Authorities any procurement required will be in line with their procurement and local governance.

*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?*

The level of cost certainty is 95% which appropriate for this stage of the project. The promoter has said any cost overruns will be met by the LA's.

*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 process and a structure set out for each of the Authorities. The SRO has been identified.

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

There has not been any direct stakeholder engagement ahead of the application but the applicant has set a clear public engagement process going forward.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

The business case sets out the scope of the monitoring and evaluation to be carried out. The Local Authorities will individually monitor and report on delivery process in line with the relevant programme level MCA Monitoring & Evaluation Plan.

## 7. LEGAL

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

The applicant has considered subsidy control and has established that Since SYMCA is awarding the subsidy to the Local Authorities and they are not providing services on a market or a commercial basis because the provision of e-cycle use in this project is at nil cost to the end users, the test for a measure to be a subsidy is not met which is appropriate.

--

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve BJC and grant funding of £500,000	
	Barnsley	£67,400
	Doncaster	£85,200
	Rotherham	£73,800
	Sheffield	£152,600
	MCA	£121,000
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal	
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>		