AGENDA ITEM: 12 Page nos. 30 - 45

Meeting	Cabinet Resources Committee
Date	28 June 2006
Subject	**Building a Future for Barnet's Children: Procuring the Primary School Capital Investment Programme (PSCIP)**
Report of	Cabinet Member for Education & Lifelong Learning Leader of the Council
Summary	This report seeks Cabinet Resources approval for the procurement model for Wave 1 of PSCIP

Officer Contributors	Chief Education Officer and Director of Resources
Status (public or exempt)	Public (with a separate exempt section)
Wards affected	All
Enclosures	Appendix 1 - Risk Management Appendix 2 - Indicative procurement timetable
For decision by	Cabinet Resources Committee
Function of	Executive
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in (if appropriate)	Not applicable

Contact for further information: Sarah Harty (Education Service) 020 8359 7350

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That a Strategic Partnering Agreement is adopted to deliver the Primary Schools Capital Investment Programme.

1.2 That officers be instructed to prepare for the procurement of a Strategic Partner for the Primary Schools Capital Investment Programme with a view to going to tender after the September 2006 Cabinet meeting.

1.3 That officers be instructed to prepare for mandatory variant bids for:

- **the construction of the schools only**
- **the construction of the schools plus land disposal**

and to seek bids for external agencies to sell the land separately to test value for money.

1.4 That officers be instructed to prepare plans for the procurement of the ICT infrastructure for the Primary School Capital Investment Programme.

1.5 That the Chief Education Officer be instructed to report to Cabinet in September 2006 on the schools to be included in Wave 1 and on the feasibility of including VA and foundation schools in the programme.

1.6 That the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Resources be instructed to report to Cabinet in September 2006 on land valuation and planning issues and the financial assessment.

1.7 That the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Resources report to Cabinet in September 2006 on the updated costs of procuring the contract.

1.8 That a part of the budget of £1.1m agreed by the Cabinet in December 2005 be applied to the work needed to prepare for procurement.

1.9 That officers be instructed to engage the necessary internal and external resources to support the programme.

1.10 That the application to the DfES to become a pathfinder in the national Primary Capital Programme be noted.

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

2.1 Cabinet 9 September 2002, Investment Needs and Opportunities – Way Forward

2.2 Cabinet 20 January 2003, Private Finance Initiative – Bid to DfES

2.3 Cabinet, 5 December 2005, Building a Future for Barnet's Children: The Primary School Capital Investment Programme

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 A First Class Education Service is a key priority of the Corporate Plan. The Primary School Capital Investment Programme will support the delivery of this priority by providing high quality, twenty first century learning environments for Barnet's primary school children.

3.2 In line with the council's procurement rules, the full range of funding and service delivery options has been considered when developing the proposals contained in this report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

4.1 The Primary School Capital Investment Programme is a complex project with risks attached to it. The following strategic risks have been identified by the programme team and the council's technical and financial advisors:

- Failure to address the investment need (leading to an increasing maintenance backlog with little associated funding)
- Planning and providing the right number of primary school places in the right locations
- Land valuations (lower receipts achieved than expected and/or delays)
- Government grant settlements for Local Government over the coming 10 years (causing prudential borrowing to become unaffordable)
- Government imposing limits on prudential borrowing
- Section 106 planning obligations (failure to receive funding at anticipated levels or timescales)
- Market appetite
- Construction capacity and pricing
- Other increases in construction costs
- Planning permissions
- Section 77 consent
- School Organisation Committee approval
- Education and Inspections Bill
- Stakeholder perception and support

A full analysis of these risks and the risk management process adopted by the council is included as Appendix 1 to this report.

5. FINANCIAL, STAFFING, ICT AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Financial

The programme has been segmented into three waves. This paper is concerned with the procurement of Wave 1 schools only. A review of the costs of building schools in Wave 1 of the programme, potential receipts from land sales and procurement costs will be presented to Cabinet in September 2006.

5.2 Staffing

The programme represents the biggest single capital investment the council has undertaken for some years. The procurement phase of the programme will require a dedicated team and effective working across a range of service areas. Budget provision has already been agreed to cover this stage of the programme.

5.3 ICT

5.3.1 The underpinning Educational Vision commits the council to providing new and refurbished schools with ICT provision that meets the changing demands of the modern primary curriculum.

5.3.2 The ICT infrastructure will be procured as a separate contract as it is considered that this will provide greater flexibility and value for money. Hardware will be procured closer to the time of school openings.

5.4 Procurement

There are four major elements to be considered in procuring the programme:

- the procurement model;
- whether land should be bundled up with the main procurement or sold separately;
- whether to include facilities management or not; and
- the route to be followed in the EU process.

This report recommends that a strategic partner be sought on the basis of two mandatory variant bids for:

- the construction of the schools only
- the construction of the schools plus land disposal

and that bids from external agencies to sell the land separately be sought. The purpose of this approach is to provide assurance that the council is achieving value for money in disposing of the land.

6. LEGAL ISSUES

6.1 Education and Inspections Bill

6.1.1 The Education and Inspections Bill 2006 will confer a choice for community schools to seek trust status and thus gain ownership and control of the school's assets, including land and buildings. Should this occur while any part of the project remains to be carried out, so that there is a binding but uncompleted contract, it is conceivable that new legislation might provide for the transfer of the benefit of the contract and/or the receipt or control of sale proceeds. Although unpredictable at present this is a potential risk.

6.2 Schools Forum

The Schools Forum is a statutory body established by the Education Act 2002, which has formal powers to approve proposals from their local authorities to move away from the requirements of the school funding regulations in order to take account of specific local circumstances. Any proposal to ring-fence revenue savings from the programme to help finance Wave 1 would need the approval of the Schools' Forum.

7. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

Constitution Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions – Section 3: Powers of the Executive

8. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

8.1 DfES Primary Capital Programme

The DfES has initiated consultation on its Primary Capital Programme which aims to improve a significant number of primary schools nationally. Pathfinder status with funding of approximately £4-5m is available from 2008-9. Funding will then be made available from this DfES programme to all authorities for 15 years from 2009-10. An estimated £2-3m will be available annually to an authority of Barnet's size and socio-economic profile.

Barnet has submitted a bid for pathfinder status. If the council bid were to be successful the pathfinder capital would help to underpin the programme financially, thus reducing its financial risk. Although draw down conditions for the ongoing capital available from 2009-10 have not yet been determined, it seems likely that at least some of this money could also be used to offset the costs of the programme.

8.2 Procurement

8.2.1 Procurement issues

There are four major elements to be considered in procuring the programme:

- the procurement model;
- whether land should be bundled up with the main procurement or sold separately;
- whether to include facilities management or not; and
- he route to be followed in the EU process.

8.2.2 Procurement model

External advice was sought on the most appropriate procurement model, especially in relation to value for money issues.

The options considered were:

a) Traditional procurement;
b) PFI;
c) Joint Venture;
d) Strategic Partnership.

a) **Traditional procurement** involves the construction of schools on a one-off basis. This entails the need to go to the market for individual contracts. The possible advantages of traditional procurement are the ability to continually test value for money and to incentivise contractors to produce quality buildings as they have no assurance that they will win future contracts. These advantages are, however, more than offset by the costs and logistical difficulties of repeated procurement exercises. Moreover, the absence of a long-term relationship with a contractor precludes continuous improvement and risk sharing, thus potentially making traditional procurement more costly and less effective. Traditional procurement would therefore be inappropriate for a programme of this complexity.

b) **PFI procurement** normally funds development over a period of 20 years or more. A comparison of costs shows that PFI procurement is only cost effective if PFI credits are available. In the absence of such credits, this route would be considerably more expensive than prudential borrowing, largely because the council can access more advantageous borrowing interest rates. Since there are no PFI credits for this scheme, this route was discounted.

c) Joint Venture Company

Advice on the use of a Joint Venture Company (JVC) and Strategic Partnering was obtained by the Borough Solicitor from Trowers and Hamlin (Appendix 2, Exempt report).

A JVC is a company limited by shares. It has its own legal identity, separate from the council, defined in a Shareholders Agreement and Articles of Association. The council and the chosen contractor would be shareholders.

Councils have typically used JVCs where long term projects are to be procured e.g. for Building Schools for the Future.

Advantages

- the ability of the parties to gain a future financial return on an initial investment (e.g. in this case the input of the council's land);
- the production of separate accounts allowing greater clarity on company income and expenditure;
- An ability to "hive off" liabilities; and
- The ability to create a jointly owned and managed separate legal vehicle to whom staff may be transferred or seconded and which may itself employ staff, enter into contracts or own land

Disadvantages

- It would normally only be considered appropriate for a long term commitment i.e. longer than for Wave 1 of the PSCIP
- expense and administrative work, as well as the set-up costs;
- the JVC would be subject to a different tax regime;
- the need to appoint and pay for company auditors in addition to the council's own audit controls;
- any activities by the council carried out through a JVC would need to comply with local government rules and with the Companies Act;
- JVC directors would be personally liable in the case of insolvency or any action in breach of their fiduciary duty; and
- the complexity of the required exit strategies i.e. the mechanism by which financial separation would be achieved on dissolution. A risk could be that one partner would be forced to buy shares at inflated values.

Conclusion

The legal advice states that "an alternative solution which avoids the need to establish a separate corporate body will certainly be less complicated and more cost effective." The relatively short-term nature of Wave 1 does not lend itself to the expense and complexity of a JVC, especially given that its status as a separate legal entity would in itself pose a series of additional financial and regulatory risks.

d) Strategic Partnering Agreement

Strategic Partnering would involve an agreement between a contractor and the council over a specified period to work together to deliver the aims of PSCIP. The contractor would have exclusivity to deliver the schools subject to performance and value for money testing (using benchmarking and market testing). Individual school projects would be called off under separate design and build construction contracts. It is the responsibility of the Strategic Partner to manage all the sub-contractors and to develop a common solution if issues are identified. There are significant costs to a contractor bidding for this type of contract. The volume and value of work therefore needs to be sufficiently high to warrant this expenditure.

Advantages

- a more balanced sharing of risk than in traditional procurement
- a greater ability to overcome obstacles by avoiding adversarial relations by setting shared objectives
- the ability to take a long-term perspective with arrangements that balance risk and reward;
- improved management techniques during design and construction
- potential cost and quality gains through the process of continuous improvement carried forward from one project to the next.

Conclusion

Strategic partnering offers a mechanism to take advantage of the cost and quality benefits of a longer term contractual relationship with elements of risk sharing without the complexity and administrative expense of setting up a JVC. This is therefore the recommended procurement model for this programme.

8.3 Land disposal

There are two options for dealing with the disposal of the land identified as providing capital to part-fund the programme:

- the contractor takes responsibility for both the construction of the school and the disposal of the surplus land. This option would include an overage agreement to ensure that the council benefited from any rise in land values and/or increased receipt from optimised land use. This option is similar to the regeneration projects the council has already embarked on; or
- the contractor constructs the school only and the council sells the land independently via an external agent.

There are advantages but also risks with each approach. These would have to be carefully evaluated during the procurement stage. Soft market testing, however, has demonstrated an interest in both options.

The critical point in establishing the best way of handling land disposal is how to ensure that the council minimises the need for prudential borrowing by maximising the value of the land and achieving value for money from the construction of the schools.

This issue is not straightforward. Whilst the council might forfeit a percentage of the capital value of its land by bundling it up into the procurement, this could be offset by the elimination of any conflict of interest between maximising the land available for sale and achieving an economic build. Moreover, in handing the land over to the contractor, the council would not bear the financial risk of a failure to sell the land within the timescales anticipated in the financial model, thus exposing the council to a need for increased prudential borrowing. But there is no way of definitively establishing the relative merits of these two options without going to the market.

The strategic partnering agreement would have to provide safeguards to ensure that a developer who was also handling the land could not delay the school building programme unreasonably by deferring the sale of land.

In order to test value for money it is therefore proposed that the council goes to market with the inclusive bid and the construction only bid combined with the option of selling the land independently. The two bids would be mandatory variants. The council would also seek bids from agencies which might dispose of the land on the open market. A comparison can then be made between the inclusive bid and the best construction-only bid and the land agency bid.

This method of procurement is clearly more complex and expensive than simply deciding on a single route in advance. It is, however, the only way of providing any assurance that the council has achieved value for money through the procurement process.

8.4 Facilities Management

It is important that the new and refurbished schools are well maintained so that the backlog of repairs and maintenance does not build up again. In order to achieve this, hard facilities management (FM) (regular and routine repairs and maintenance of the building) and lifecycle maintenance (major structural works) could be included in the procurement.

The financial modelling undertaken so far includes provision for hard FM and lifecycle maintenance over 25 years and assumes that schools meet all these costs by contributing their devolved capital budgets for an agreed period and their revenue maintenance budgets. More flexible variations on the model are also being investigated

Consultations are currently taking place with schools on the financial and management implications of these proposals. Schools will need to agree to commit parts of their budgets to cover the costs if these FM elements are to be included in the contract negotiations. Subject to gaining this agreement, the costs and desirability of including hard FM and lifecycle maintenance in the contract would be tested as part of the procurement process.

8.5 EU Procedure

New EU procurement procedures have recently come into effect. This enables the council to enter into discussions with a number of contractors in an equitable manner and to use a staged approach to select the preferred bidder.

This procedure is new, relatively untested and onerous in terms of the supporting work generated for both the council and the bidders. Combined with the complexities of the recommended procurement route outlined above, this new procedure will be involved and expensive. But there is no real choice of procedure (and older methods present their own problems).

It is estimated that the procurement phase will be completed by early 2008 (Appendix 2). This would enable construction to commence by May 2008.

8.6 Conclusions

Legal advisers to the council indicated that the formation of a joint venture company would be a complicated and costly model for the council without any major benefits. The conclusion reached was therefore that a strategic partnering agreement should be sought.

Following evaluation, a procurement model with mandatory options has been developed which could be used to go to market:

- the partner takes responsibility for both the construction of the school and the disposal/construction on the associated land for disposal; or
- the partner constructs the school only and the council arranges the land disposal through its normal arrangements via an external agent.

The council would also seek bids from external agencies to dispose of the land separately in order to provide a comparison wit the mandatory variant bids.

In both models:

- ICT procurement will be conducted separately;
- a decision will be required, following discussions with Wave I schools, on the inclusion of hard FM (regular and routine repairs and maintenance of the building) and lifecycle maintenance in the contractual negotiations; and
- the new competitive dialogue process will be followed to select the Strategic Partner.

8.7 Programme Management Arrangements

Preparation for procurement will commence in August 2006 so that documentation is ready to enable the EU process to commence in late September/early October 2006. It is possible that this process may take 2-3 months longer than anticipated because of the complexity and newness of the procedure. The review of schools and land disposals will continue up to a Cabinet paper in September 2006. Prince2 methodology will be applied throughout.

This will require ongoing input from external advisers and consultants and will require the continuation of the programme management team. The budget agreed by Cabinet in December 2005 was £1.1m. This budget will be used to continue this work. It is estimated that the costs will be approximately £200K. This breaks down into Programme Management 35%, specialist advice 40%, procurement 15%, internal 10%. These costs would be abortive if the programme did not proceed.

From September 2006 to 2008 the major task for PSCIP will be to procure a Strategic Partner. Therefore from September 2006 the Resources Directorate will take on the management of the programme as this is where the procurement expertise resides in the council. Education will then take on the client role.

The Education Service will, in conjunction with a Professional Advisory Board made up of governors, headteachers and selected experts, provide the educational advice needed for the procurement phase.

8.8 Next Steps

As stated in the opening paragraph of this report, the Primary School Capital Investment Programme provides Barnet with a significant and strategically grounded opportunity to rejuvenate its primary school estate. The next steps towards the realisation of the programme are to:

- initiate the development of the procurement process;
- continue to review the schools and land in Wave 1 in the light of the consultation responses;
- review the feasibility of including VA and foundation schools in the programme; and
- bring a proposals for Wave 1, an associated land disposals programme and financial assessment to Cabinet in September.

9. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Programme Risk register – Interim Programme Director PSCIP
KPMG Financial Assessment – Interim Programme Director PSCIP
Programme Governance Paper – Interim Programme Director PSCIP

Legal: JEL
Chief Finance Officer: CM

Appendix 1 – Risk Management

1. Risk Identification

1.1 The effective identification and management of risk is a central component of effective project management. A risk identification and management workshop was undertaken with the Project Team on 19 October 2005. The output from the workshop, along with risks identified by the council's technical and financial advisers have been recorded in a risk register. The register has since been regularly updated and reported to the Board. The risk register includes:

- an assessment of the priority of the risk, taking probability and impact into consideration.
- the risk treatment strategy the council has applied to respond to the risk and actions that the council will take to achieve the chosen strategy
- ownership of the risk – showing who in the council is responsible for successfully implementing the chosen strategy

1.2 The project's risk register is included as Appendix 1B to this report. The programme is large, complex and subject to a range of risks. The key strategic risks to the PSCIP are outlined below and apply to the programme as a whole. This is underpinned by a comprehensive risk register.

2. Risks

2.1 Strategic

a) Planning and providing the right number of primary school places in the right locations (Ref. 28). Overall numbers on roll in Barnet are projected to increase over the next ten years. However, the impact of this is likely to be spread unevenly over the borough, with increases in some planning areas and decreases in others. Changes could mean that there is an under supply of places in some planning areas and an over supply in others

To mitigate this risk, the council has utilised the GLA's School Roll Projection Model to inform the programme's phasing structure. In addition, the flexible nature of the programme means that it can be re-scoped to reflect changes in demand for primary places.

b) Failure to address the investment need (Ref. 39). The size of the primary sector's capital investment needs and a lack of Central Government funding have resulted in a failure to identify an appropriate way forward to date. Failure to address decisions about the disposal of surplus land and capital investment funded through Prudential Borrowing could result in the continuation of this situation, with a continuing deterioration of school buildings.

2.2 Financial

a) **Land valuations (Ref. 41).** The programme is heavily reliant on funding from capital receipts. The level and timing of receipts achievable will depend on the type and extent of development allowed by the Planning Authority and prevailing market conditions. Failure to achieve capital receipts at expected levels and at the planned time could make aspects of the programme unaffordable – either overall, or due to very short-term borrowing requirements. The timing of these receipts will also influence the level of financial support required for the project.

To mitigate this risk valuation officers have undertaken detailed assessments of the potential land valuations, including a review of best case, most likely and worst case valuations. In addition officers have undertaken an internal review and checked with external advisors. The Chief Finance Officer is also continually reviewing the markets to determine the most advantageous time for the council to borrow the sums involved. The financial report contains sensitivity tests around the quantum and timing of land receipts to enable assessment of the potential financial impact of these risks.

b) **Government grant settlement (Ref. 36).** Poor government grant settlements for local government over the coming 10 years could cause prudential borrowing to become unaffordable. It must be borne in mind that the Government could at any time impose limits on prudential borrowing.

c) **Market appetite (Ref. 15).** With much choice available to construction companies they are likely to be more selective in the projects they bid for in future. In the council's case this is exacerbated by the fact that the project is not supported by Government funding and that bidders may be concerned that the project will not progress.

This risk will be mitigated by defining a procurement model that is attractive to the private sector, without compromising value for money. It will also be important to demonstrate that the council has the capacity and expertise to manage the procurement well. Finally, the project will be well marketed. This process has commenced with early market testing with a number of potential bidders.

d) **Section 106 planning obligations (Ref. 24).** The funding package includes anticipated Section 106 planning obligations from major developments in the borough. If payments are received latter than expected, this could cause affordability problems. To mitigate this risk, only Section 106 planning obligations with a high degree of certainty have been included in the financial model.

e) **Construction capacity and pricing (Ref. 23).** There is a risk that extensive construction activity in the schools sector nationally (with £5 billion per year funding), as well as regional and local activity (due to the Olympics and the number regeneration projects) may stretch market capacity and force prices up. Tender price inflation has been allowed for at current forecast levels but these may be exceeded.

This risk will be mitigated by progressing the procurement at a fast pace, so that construction can occur before the supply chain is absorbed in projects associated with the Olympics.

f) **Other increases in construction costs (Ref. 18).** A quantified risk assessment has been undertaken of other risks that may cause an increase in construction costs. This has resulted in an overall risk of approximately 5% to 10% escalation in construction costs (at 50% and 90% confidence levels respectively).

The above is within the range of the potential savings that may be accrued from undertaking a programmatic approach to procurement. In addition the risk allocation associated with the proposed procurement models would transfer significant elements of this risk to the private sector supply chain which is better placed to deal with those risks. Therefore, these risks will be contained and with no additional costs to the base estimates. As described below, a rigorous risk management process will be adopted during project development to ensure that these cost targets are met. In addition we will undertake comprehensive surveys before procurement to ensure that the private sector can properly assess and price risks.

The financial assessment (included as Appendix 1 to the exempt section of this report) contains sensitivity tests around construction costs to enable assessment of the potential financial impact of the above risks.

2.3 Regulatory

a) **Binding contractual obligations (Ref. 11).** If a joint venture arrangement is chosen this will involve a long term partnership. The governing contract will necessarily provide for reciprocal obligations throughout the contract term but once the contract is entered into it will mean that the Council will be bound to implement all of the disposals agreed under the joint venture. The current recommendation is, however, for a strategic partnership

b) **Planning permissions (Ref. 16).** A number risks are associated with the obtaining of planning permissions for the new schools and various enabling developments. This is a particular issue where there are planning policy issues and developments on protected open space. Beyond the council's statutory planning requirements, there may be other higher planning consents (from for example the Government Office of London, the Mayor of London and Sport England) required where strategic planning policies are affected.

At present planning issues do not appear to be insurmountable and proposals will continue to be reviewed with the Head of Planning as they develop. Early consultation with respect to higher planning consents will be initiated following approval of this report. In order to improve certainty, Planning briefs will be obtained for schools in the first phase of Wave 1 of the programme before or during the procurement. A full appraisal of planning policy and site options will form part of a wider study by specialist education planning advisors.

c) **Section 77 consent (Ref. 14).** Approvals will be required from the DfES regarding land disposal. Detailed assessments of Section 77 requirements have been undertaken and the DfES has been consulted to minimise this risk.

d) **School Organisation Committee approval (Ref. 12).** Approvals will also be required for any significant changes in school organisation. These will take the form of public consultation and subsequent approval by the School Organisation Committee.

e) **Education and Inspections Bill (Ref. 29)** The Bill contains a number specific proposals which would impact on the ownership and control of schools' assets. If implemented fully, the proposals outlined in the Bill could have a significant impact on the programme. Officers will monitor the progress of the Bill, keep Cabinet informed of developments as they arise and seek approval to amend the programme as necessary.

2.4 Reputation

a) **Stakeholder perception and support (Ref. 37).** The programme involves the disposal of a number of parcels of surplus school land. This could generate negative media coverage and erode community support for the programme.

3. Risk Management

3.1 The Project Manager is responsible for ensuring that risks are identified, recorded and regularly reviewed. To this effect, the Project Manager maintains a risk register and action plan, which is reviewed at each Project Team meeting.

3.2 The Project Director regularly presents the risk register to the Programme Board, which has four responsibilities in relation to risk management:

- notifying the Project Director of any external risk exposures to the project
- making decisions on the Project Manager's recommended responses to risk
- striking a balance between the level of risk and the potential benefits that the project may achieve
- making Directors Group aware of any risks that impact upon the project's ability to meet corporate objectives

Appendix 2 – Indicative Procurement Timetable

	Key Milestone	Date
1	Cabinet Resources Committee approval of procurement model	June 2006
2	Publish OJEU Notice	September 2006
3	Complete Information Pack	July – September 2006
4	Information Day and site visits	September 2006
5	Receive Expressions of Interest (EOI)	November 2006
6	Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ)	November -December 2006
7	Evaluation of PQQs long list. Issue invitation to participate in the dialogue	January - February 2007
8	Competitive dialogue process (includes clarification meetings and short listing)	February - October 2007
9	Approval of short list of bidders by Programme Board. Issue invitation to submit final tenders	October 2007
10	Evaluation of Final Tenders and selection of Preferred Bidder.	November 2007 -February 2008
11	Section 77 & Sport England Approval	September 2007- Jan 2008
12	Programme Board and CRC approval of Preferred Bidder	February 2008
13	Final contract negotiations with Preferred Bidder	March - April 2008
14	Contract Award	April/May 2008
15	Work commences on site	May 2008
16	First new school opening	September 2009
17	Service commencement Phase 1	September 2009
18	Service commencement Phase 2	September 2010
19	Service commencement Phase 3	September 2011