

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0016 Doncaster Access to Stations Package FBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£6,172,638
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£6,172,638
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

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

Yes. This scheme is unchanged in coverage from the OBC approved by TEB 24/5 /21. The main change is to the width of lanes and the benefits arising.

Outputs remain:

- 10.1km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 10.9km of new walking and cycling infrastructure
- 30 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes.

Costs requested have increased from £6,015,550 to £6,172,638 (+£157,088) of which:

Preparation +£195,147
 Fees +£79,520
 Construction -£73 523
 Risk -£44,055

Clear rationale for these changes is not given, although the following new text is provided in the FBC:

With many of the schemes now designed to LTN 1/20 standards more width has been needed to accommodate the new standards. This additional width of footway and cycleways has meant an increase in costs. This was due to many schemes needing a new kerblineline to reallocate road space for active travel users.

Original designs were drawn before the new Sheffield City Region design standards were rolled out across the region. Therefore, costs have increased due to the extra width needed to meet design standards. Most schemes were designed to a standard of 3m shared use, this has increased to a minimum width needed of 4m. This is then separated to create a 1.5m footway and a 2.5m bi-directional cycleway. This change has led to cost increases.

So clearly in-house and consultancy design costs/fees have risen by more than construction costs, with the rise in the latter outweighed by more accurate costings and the consequent reduction in the OB factor.

The profile of spend has slipped slightly, which, together with the reduced level of Optimism bias allowance (15% to 4%) improves the BCR, assuming completion dates unaffected.

	OBC	FBC	Diff
2021/22	£3,057,958	£2,941,022	-£116,936
2022/23	£2,957,952	£3,231,616	£273,664
Total	£6,015,910	£6,172,638	£156,728

A number of conditions were set for FBC:

- 3.8 - single tick, not 3.
- Appraisal results for the 'Do Less' option;
- final scheme costs based on the completed detailed scheme design and an agreed price with the successful contractor/value contained on the supplier brief.
- a brief exploration of wider benefits;
- final appraisal results using the latest version of AMAT;
- fuller DIA as set out in section 7 of the Economic Assessment Report;
- procurement strategy in more detail;
- clarity on timescales and key milestones for delivery;
- reconciliation of residual risk claimed with total expected value of remaining risks in the risk register;
- an organogram.

The following reports on the extent to which these conditions have been met.

Strategic Case	
Scheme Rationale	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes. Unchanged from OBC</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Good alignment. Unchanged from OBC</p> <p><u>Conditions of OBC approval to be satisfied:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.8 - single tick, not 3. <p>Response from promoter: Scheme is primarily designed to improve public transport efficiency</p>

Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes. Unchanged from OBC</p>		
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case. Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Yes. Unchanged from OBC</p> <p><u>Conditions of OBC approval to be satisfied:</u></p> <p>For the FBC, the applicant should include the further detail on how it intends to measure uplifts in Active Mode transport along the route (counters). The clarifications response confirms that is the intention, but the FBC should include this along with links to the wider TCF monitoring plan.</p> <p>Assessor's comment: Further clarifications were sought on the use of automatic counters to monitor usage and uplift in active modes and how these would support wider TCF M&E activity. This approach to using counters has now been confirmed by the applicant in the FBC.</p>		
Options assessment	<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> Yes. Unchanged from OBC, reinforced by introduction of LTN 1/20</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements? Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	4.41	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> Noise, LAQ and GHG – Slight Positive
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No. The various sensitivity tests performed in AMAT shows that the BCR remains above 3 in all scenarios</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No</p>		
Value for Money Statement			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes. Unchanged substantially from OBC.</p> <p><u>Conditions of OBC approval to be satisfied:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> final appraisal results using the latest version of AMAT <p>The applicant has provided an updated EAR (10th June) which presents a revised PVB, PVC and BCR for the project drawing on the latest AMAT outputs. The same approach is taken to presenting the preferred scheme, while a lower cost scheme with varying degrees of uptake (90% and 50% uplift) are also presented, along with appropriate sensitivity testing again. However, as set out in the FBC, lower cost schemes do not meet the required SCR design standards.</p>			

- Appraisal results for the 'Do Less' option;

AMCB table has been provided including both the preferred and the Low Cost option

- fuller DIA as set out in section 7 of the Economic Assessment Report;

a screening proforma and a mapping of impacts on disadvantaged groups has been carried out.

- a brief exploration of wider benefits;

Not done but no land use change involved and monetised benefits considered substantial enough.

Risk

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

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

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

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

Unchanged from OBC.

Conditions of OBC approval to be satisfied:

- reconciliation of residual risk claimed with total expected value of remaining risks in the risk register;

Sum of mean values of risk events in risk register totals £821,650 whereas risk element in 6.1 is £819,547. This is close enough but the total still includes £187,500 for delays to approval beyond September 2021. The risk log should be updated on the assumption that the FBC is approved in the timescale laid out.

Delivery

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

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

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 without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

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

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

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

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Unchanged substantially from OBC.

Conditions of OBC approval to be satisfied:

- clarity on timescales and key milestones for delivery;

The FBC provides greater clarity on start and completion timescales, as well as the order in which the station schemes will be progressed. It is also clearer on the DLO process for implementation.

- procurement strategy in more detail;

The FBC provides a clear update on the proposed procurement strategy the applicant will deploy. Procurement will not arise, with the works being undertaken by Doncaster as part of a 'DLO' approach

- final scheme costs based on the completed detailed scheme design and an agreed price with the successful contractor/value contained on the supplier brief.

Cost certainty has improved since the OBC, but is judged to be 75% now that Bill of Quantities for each scheme within the package have been developed following detailed design work. SCR should confirm with the applicant when greater cost certainty (95%) will be achieved and provided, given the works will be undertaken under the DLO approach.

- an organogram.

Supplied.

Legal

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

Yes, No. Unchanged from OBC.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Authorisation to proceed to Contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	

Full approval and award of contract is recommended, subject to the following conditions being satisfied prior to contract execution -

1. MCA Appendices to be populated in full
2. Applicant should confirm when the detailed DIA assessments will be completed and any implications for the project.
3. FBC to be signed by Applicant
4. Breakdown of costs per station to be provided by DMBC and included within the contract

The conditions above should be fully satisfied by 30th October 2021. Failure to do so could lead to the withdrawal of approval.

The following conditions must be included in the contract -

5. Clawback on Outputs

6. Grant allocated to Thorne Station to be ring fenced and managed via change control if it's inclusion needs to be amended at a future date. This may result in deduction of grant.

