

# INVESTMENT QUALITY ASSURANCE (IQA)

Recommendation and summary		DP&S / PI / I&F to complete
Business case assessment summary <i>DP&amp;S / PI</i>	Summary of your assessment of the business case. Be solutions focused. Be specific and use examples where appropriate.	
Assessed by		Date
Investment assurance assessment summary <i>I&amp;F if relevant</i>	Summary of your assessment of the investment proposed in this business case. Be specific and use examples where appropriate.	
Assessed by		Date
Recommendation commentary	Other factors, readiness, acceptance on certain conditions, good enough, etc.	
<b>Proposed Recommendation</b>	<b>Recommend</b> <b>Recommend with conditions (precedent / subsequent)</b> <b>Not recommended</b> Delete all as relevant	
Proposed conditions (if applicable)	We recommend that the Senior Manager OPPP includes the following conditions. As a condition precedent... As a condition subsequent... Conditions should reference an elsewhere noted issue, be specific, and be the responsibility of someone to sign off.	
Delegated decision maker	(Vanessa Browne) Senior Manager; Operational Policy, Planning & Performance Explain if escalated (Howard Cattermole) General Manager; Investment & Finance NZ Transport Agency Board	
Reason for recommendation	Provide a neutral and short summary of the activity and the outcomes it is expected to achieve. This needs to be written <b>for a public audience</b> and will be published on the NZ Transport Agency website. See <a href="https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/our-investments/investment-decisions/board-decisions/">https://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/our-investments/investment-decisions/board-decisions/</a> for examples.	
IAF Profile	E.g. L/L	
Readiness / urgency factors to consider	If relevant.	

Business case quality assessment questions		DP&S / PI to complete
<b>Problem/opportunity statements</b>		
Is it clear what the problem is that needs addressing (both cause and effect)?	What is/are the problem/s? Is it clear? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.	
Is there evidence to confirm the cause and effect of the problem?	Is the evidence sound, thorough and does it support the problem/s? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.	
Does the problem need to be addressed at this time?	Is it urgent? Prioritised anywhere? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.	

Is the problem specific to this investment (or should a broader perspective be taken)?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
<b>Benefits</b>	
Have the benefits that will result from fixing the problem been adequately defined?	What is/are the benefit/s? Is it clear? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Will the measures specified provide reasonable evidence that the benefits have been delivered?	Do the measures proposed match the 'list of performance measures' on PIKB? If not, is there sufficient reason? See <a href="https://www.pikb.co.nz/home/monitor-investment-performance/nzta-investment-monitoring-overview/framework-for-investment-performance-measurement/">https://www.pikb.co.nz/home/monitor-investment-performance/nzta-investment-monitoring-overview/framework-for-investment-performance-measurement/</a>
Are the measures both attributable and quantifiable to this investment?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Are the benefits of high value to the NZ Transport Agency (furthering its objectives)?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
<b>Alternatives and options considered (strategic response level)</b>	
Have a sufficient range of strategic alternatives and options been explored (demand, productivity and supply)?	Are the programme alternatives investigated fit for purpose? Is there a logical flow from the long list of options to short list and to the recommended programme? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Is it clear what alternatives and options are proposed and the rationale for their selection?	Is the selection/assessment criteria used sound, thorough and fit for purpose? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Are the proposed programmes the most effective response to the problem (comprehensive and balanced)?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Are the proposed programmes <i>feasible</i> ?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
<b>Detailed programme of packages/activities intervention (solution/outcome level)</b>	

Consistent with the strategic alternatives chosen, have a <i>reasonable range of project options</i> been analysed?	Are the options investigated fit for purpose at an <b>activity/options</b> level? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Is the proposed solution specified clearly and fully (all business changes and any assets)?	Is the recommended option sound and fully detailed (costs, risks, plan, implications, etc.)? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Is the proposed solution the <i>best</i> way to respond to the problem and <i>deliver the expected benefits</i> ?	Is the recommended option fit for purpose? Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.
Can the solution really be delivered (costs, risks, timeframes, governance, etc)?	Explanations are necessary. Yes/no answers are not sufficient.

General assessment		DP&S / PI to complete
Robustness of management case	Is scope/project plan relevant, complete and comprehensive? Is it fit for purpose, clear what is to happen next, how long it is expected to take and what the funding will be used for? If not, why not? <i>Procurement team confirms approach</i>	
Strategic context and programme linkages	How does the activity fit within the context of the Transport Agency policies, national business case, government accelerated projects programme, etc. How does the activity align with key regional transport documents? What is the agreed development path (ie traditional, transitional, business case approach)? What other projects are in the area that are interdependent or may have effect on this business case that decision makers need to be aware of? What strategic case and/or programme business case is this activity part of? Has the activity evolved from a previous supported strategy or package of activities?	
Results alignment	Does the assessment align with the <a href="#">Knowledge Base guidance on results alignment</a> , ensure you use the criteria appropriate to the activity class found in the developing assessment profiles section. Include a summary of your assessment against the relevant criteria	
Cost benefit appraisal	Does the cost benefit appraisal align with the <a href="#">guidance in the Knowledge Base</a> and Economic Efficiency Manual? Has the BCR been updated as part of this funding request?	
Economics robustness	Has an incremental analysis between the options been undertaken? Do the results appear sound? Has sensitivity testing of the BCR been undertaken? E.g. traffic count, growth rate, costs or an influential factor – what happens to the BCR if any of these things change in future? Peer reviews undertaken as relevant?	
Risks and significance	What are the key risks and opportunities identified for the proposed activity? Has appropriate mitigation/management been identified? If so, describe briefly; if not, include concerns.	

	<a href="#">Significance policy</a> . Has the significance assessment been completed for the previous phases? What are the outcomes of the significance assessment regarding the approval path and funding request?
Form, function and standards	<p>ONRC, whole of life implications, deviations from standards, resolution of peer review / audit findings</p> <p>Compliance with the appropriate form and function guidelines and standards e.g. bridge, cycleway, shoulders (consistency), etc., or explanation of approved departure from standards.</p> <p>What are the whole of life implications from the activity, including maintenance and operating? Are they reasonable? Could the expected costs place a significant future demand on the NLTP? (Talk to David Darwin's team.)</p> <p>What is the current customer level of service experience across the journey and what is the expected customer level of service resulting from the proposed activity?</p> <p>Has a peer review been undertaken? Have any concerns identified been corrected satisfactorily? Are the peer reviews included in TIO?</p>
Investment	<p>The <b>x activity</b> is eligible to be funded from <b>x</b> work category and <b>y</b> activity class Priority xx Funding availability has been confirmed by <b>x</b>.</p> <p>Ensure alignment with the requirements of both <a href="#">activity class and work category</a> Confirm <a href="#">priority</a> Confirm funding availability with PMO / I&amp;F and NLTP affordability. Variation of costs between phases?</p>

Investment and Finance questions		I&F to complete (if relevant)
Affordability	<p>Affordability should be considered in the context of the size of the problem. For large projects, take into account the 30 year revenue and expenditure model outputs and the Long Term Strategic View.</p> <p>For projects &gt;\$20M, has Form C been completed? Where does this project rank in terms of priority in the Activity Class? Are there funds available in the activity class? Have all funding options been considered (e.g. multi-party and/or third party funding)?</p>	
Robustness of the financial case	<p>Are the elements of the financial case are complete? Explain any issues or comment on how robust the financial case is.</p>	
Procurement approach	<p>Is it value for money? If required, has the section 25 assessment been completed?</p>	