



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>D0030 Passenger Information Displays</b>	<b>Type of funding</b>	<b>Grant</b>
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	<b>SYPTE</b>	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£675,000</b>
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	<b>TEB</b>	<b>MCA Funding</b>	<b>£675,000</b>
<b>Programme name</b>	<b>Gainshare</b>	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i>	
<p><b>Yes</b> – 193 new PIDS are proposed. However, the preferred option includes the scrappage of 243 “obsolete” units that could be refurbished for a 10 year life at a cost equivalent to the cost of 44 new units.</p>	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b>, to fulfil the Mayor’s pledge in the Transport Strategy “to ensure people feel safe when they travel and invest in our streets to make them more attractive places”</p> <p>Whilst bus timetable and real time information is generated from private bus and tram operators the responsibility for its coordination and publication traditionally rests with SYPTE/MCA. Information is high on bus users’ list of priorities according to market research. (Transport Focus)</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p><b>Well aligned</b> – especially re Access to employment and Fairer and Greener aims.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Implicitly</b>, although there is no quantification/monetisation of this impact</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><b>No commitment</b> to measuring outcomes against objectives is made</p> <p><i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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></p> <p><b>Yes</b>. There is a cost effectiveness analysis of 4 options including the Do Minimum, but the most effective option has not been selected for reasons that are unclear.</p>

<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>No</b>  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>            No although optimum location of displays need to be determined.</p>
--	---

**Value for Money**

Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i>  <b>None calculated</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>  <b>None provided</b></p>
-------------------------	---	---	---

<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>            Promoter considers that a shortage of microchips could delay manufacture. It is not clear what this risk is nor how it would be avoided. The Assessor considers that a bigger risk is that the existing units if renewed fail at a rate higher than 13% p.a. after contracting for their refurbishment. This may be the reason why scrapping them in year 2 is preferable to refurbishment although this is not clear from the bid.</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>Unknown.</b></p>
--	---

**Value for Money Statement**

*Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?*  
**Unknown –** although likely to be so.

**Risk**

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

This is provided in section 6.7. The first two risks are considered by the Assessor to be irrelevant. The end March deadline is self-imposed.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Deliver project within desired timescales - i.e.31st March 2022.	High	Med	SYPTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Rebecca Roe
2	Failure to deliver the project by the 31st March 2022 may cause an unwelcomed reputational risk via various media sources	High	Med	SYPTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Rebecca Roe

3	A shortage of microchips to enable manufacture of new displays	Med	Low	SYPTE are working with suppliers to secure stocks of microchips to enable them to fulfil the orders.	Rebecca Roe
---	--	-----	-----	--	-------------

*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 of the scheme?*

**No – 100% Gainshare**

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

**No** – existing FW contract to be used

**In**

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

**Yes**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**

*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?*

**100%**

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

**Yes**, an organogram is provided

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

**No**

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

**Yes** - the Mayor's Bus Review 2019 identified this problem but specific locations have not been consulted on

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes**

**Legal**

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

Applicant considers the question "not applicable"

It is unlikely that the scheme would be considered a subsidy to any person as the goods to be provided are for the benefit of the public generally.

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to Contract</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
Clarity on the reasons why all 243 existing units will be scrapped rather than refurbished for a 10 year life to give a greater coverage from the available funding.	
<b>Conditions in contract –</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard clawback</li> </ul>	



