



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	D31 Electric Community Transport Minibuses	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive	Total Scheme Cost	£1,773,941
MCA Executive Board	Transport and the Environment Board	MCA Funding	£1,400,000
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	79%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes. The bid is for phase 1 of a scheme costing £3.5 - £5m for “upgrading” all 42 CT minibuses owned by SYPTE with electric vehicles. Levelling Up funding has been bid for separately. This phase will therefore upgrade up to half the fleet.	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> Yes, it aims to deliver on the Mayor’s pledges for Greener and Fairer investment by reducing roadside emissions whilst maintaining the health benefits provided to disabled and elderly people who would otherwise be more confined to their living areas.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> Well aligned
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Implicitly, although there is no quantification/monetisation of this impact
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> No commitment to measuring outcomes against objectives is made <i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> No
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> No. There is shortlist of BAU, full replacement, partial replacement and depot v vehicle upgrade but no consideration of whether the service provides a significant, socially necessary service as stated by the promoter that could not be provided by alternative means and why it’s not fundable through other budgets or privately, or, more cheaply per trip, as a subsidy to private bus operators. How frequently and for what purpose are trips provided to patients? What would happen if funding were not provided?
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> No <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> No

Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] None calculated	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] None provided – Likely to be related to health
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> Unknown – requires quantification of demand and benefit.		<i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> Unknown.	

Value for Money Statement

Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?
Unknown

Risk

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

Note: Appendix A3 Risk Log not seen by Assessor – but bid has this:

Risk/Uncertainty	Mitigation activity
1. Cost	Arup is currently working up options around minibuses and chargers. It hasn't yet been decided what size of vehicle should be used. Larger vehicles offer greater operator flexibility, but require greater charge time and cost a lot more money. Smaller vehicles take less time to charge, are cheaper to buy, but are not as flexible operationally. Arup will be providing a range of options, which SYPTe will consider and make a recommendation on within the subsequent OBC/FBC. This decision will ultimately determine how many vehicles / chargers we can buy with the initial funding allocation.
2. Power requirements at each minibus depot.	Ongoing work There has been initial engagement with Northern PowerGrid, but more detailed estimates are needed.
3. Procurement route.	There are lots of different projects going on across the city region with regards to charging infrastructure. It is not known what route we will use to deliver this project. A procurement strategy will be developed as part of the next phase of work.
4. Vehicle and charger specifications.	The requirements are currently being worked through by Arup. Further details will be provided in the OBC/FBC.
5. Barnsley CT depot is leased, so getting landlord approval is a potential risk, although considered a small risk. Landlord permissions are not needed at the other depots.	Low risk – but needs to be followed up.
6. A decision is still to be made on the location of the initial phase.	A decision has not yet been made on where to implement the first phase of electric CT minibus roll out. The decision could become political as although it is likely that other future funding sources would pay for the full roll out, there are no guarantees.

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

Yes– Levelling Up Funding not secured - 50% of total scheme cost. This will be confirmed at OBC

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

No – the existing contract is to be extended.

In

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

Yes, the applicant is pressing for approval this month to achieve March delivery target.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

No – it will be provided with the OBC (by 19/10?)

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?

<30%

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

No

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. "Engagement has been undertaken with SYPTE's bus services team, SCR, as well as the Community Transport operators. All are supportive of the project and understand the need from an air quality / carbon reduction perspective."

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

No

Legal

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

Yes – the scheme does not raise any additional concerns than the current arrangements which relate to providing free vehicles to some operators who compete in the mainstream market with others. The vehicles would still be free.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
For the FBC: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An assessment of the "Do Nothing" with:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Remaining life of existing vehicles- Quantification of annual demand (type and purpose of persons) and fleet mileage- Details of new/upgraded vehicles – number, cost, specification, emissions,• Preferred option to include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Clear specification of work- 75% certainty on cost estimates- Confirmed match funding- Targets v Fairer and Greener aims.	

