

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0013 A630 Bus Improvements (Junction Technology Upgrade) OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SYPTE	Total Scheme Cost	£1,600,000
MCA Executive Board	Transport	MCA Funding	£1,600,000
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes. The scheme addresses the following demonstrable problems (pre-COVID) on the corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slow bus speeds caused by congestion at junctions and pinch points • Congestion leading to poor bus passenger experience. • Significant deprivation along the A630. • Poor air quality. <p>It is proposed to improve 15 junctions on a key link between Sheffield and Doncaster using the latest enhanced traffic signal technology strategies based on Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA M8). (Basically, more, longer, green waves). The promoter expects this to provide flexible priority for buses potentially reducing delays by 30% - 60% without taking road space.</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>Yes. Yes</p> <p>The current and potential future problems faced by buses on this growth corridor are clearly laid out and the opportunities for and the advantages brought by quicker bus journey times are well explained.</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>Very well. All three SEP policy objectives (Growth, Inclusion, Sustainability) are shown as being met. (The RAP is not mentioned). Eleven (11) separate policy documents at the national, regional and local level are listed and shown to have objectives in common with the scheme.</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>Yes</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce average bus journey times • Increase accessibility • Drive Investment • Increase bus patronage • Improve passenger perception of bus services • Enable new employment and residential growth • Broaden PT connectivity • Contribute to modal shift from car • Reduce congestion • Reduce emissions <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Yes, the promoter presents a clear logic map in section 3.6 although there is no detailed discussion of the timeframe for the monitoring and evaluation plan except in Appendix M. This needs to be expanded in the form.</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></p> <p>Yes - within the identified corridor – acknowledged to be the main public transport corridor between Sheffield and Doncaster. It would be possible to provide longer bus lanes but this would not be physically possible along the entire route without drastically reducing space for general traffic and not significantly improving queuing/congestion in the shared sections and at junctions. DMBC oppose this. Rail and tram options have been considered and rejected on practicality/efficacy grounds.</p>												
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No. Works comprise mainly signalling equipment and processing units. No hard infrastructure so no TROs required.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No adverse consequences particularly in the form of opposition from other road users are expected.</p>												
Value for Money													
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>3.15 (OB = 15%)</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Slightly beneficial: Noise, LAQ, GHG</p>										
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>No.</p> <p>Tests:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="107 1171 719 1337"> <tr> <td></td> <td>BCR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-25%</td> <td>2.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+25%</td> <td>3.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forthcoming TAG changes</td> <td>2.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-25%+Forthcoming TAG</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> </table>			BCR	-25%	2.99	+25%	3.30	Forthcoming TAG changes	2.96	-25%+Forthcoming TAG	2.00	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>No.</p>	
	BCR												
-25%	2.99												
+25%	3.30												
Forthcoming TAG changes	2.96												
-25%+Forthcoming TAG	2.00												
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</p>													
Risk													

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

7.10 - Top 5 Risks on Risk Log

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
Contractor(DLO) availability to deliver scheme	DLO has the ability to appoint sub-contractor to carry out the civils works required. However minor civils work could be included in the signals tender.	DMBC
Delivery of scheme within TCF time frame	Engagement with DMBC including proposed procurement route to speed up delivery	SYPTTE
Implementation cost increases	Regular cost monitoring during implementation Allowance made in risk allocation for increase cost in implementation	SYPTTE
Brexit - procurement	Due to Brexit some signal equipment is taking longer to receive, currently 12-16 weeks, this delay will be allowed for in the procurement process.	DMBC
Covid-19	Should there be another full country lockdown, this may have an effect on delivery of signal equipment, although the signal companies have operated through previous lockdowns.	DMBC

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

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

No – DLO route to be used

Delivery

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

Yes

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. Detailed design and procurement will be post OBC approval

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?

60%. Until detailed design undertaken, this is as good as can be expected

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

Yes. Tim Taylor, PTE

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

Yes

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

Yes. Appropriate stakeholder consultation has been undertaken

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. This is being managed centrally although the promoter has resources for undertaking the data collection and is aware of requirements.

Legal

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

Yes, No.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approve to proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>FBC to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 95% cost certainty• Updated risk register and P50.	

