

Project Appraisal Guidelines Unit 6.13 CBA Audit Checklist

August 2011



Project Appraisal Guidelines

Unit 6.13 CBA Audit Checklist

Version	Date	Comments
1.0	August 2011	New Guidance

This document is available to download at www.nra.ie/publications/projectappraisal

For further queries please contact:

Strategic Planning Unit National Roads Authority St Martin's House Waterloo Road Dublin 4

 Tel:
 (01) 660-2511

 Email:
 info@nra.ie

 Web:
 www.nra.ie

1 Introduction

- 1.1. Auditing and checking of the COBA output is an essential element of the cost-benefit analysis process and due consideration, in terms of resources allocated to the task and the time allowed, should be given in the project management of the scheme.
- 1.2. The CBA software provides a detailed analysis of the scheme appraisal. Although the software performs a wide range of data and consistency checks, it is not possible for the program to detect all possible errors. It is, therefore, important that the output be reviewed to determine whether or not the appraisal is robust.
- 1.3. This PAG Unit provides a checklist for the undertaking of CBA assessments and the validation of CBA reports and outputs.

2. Responsibilities

- 2.1. The responsibility for undertaking the auditing and checking occurs at three levels
 - Firstly, the Appraisal Team Leader undertaking the CBA should satisfy him/herself that the assessment has been carried out in a robust manner prior to submitting the appraisal report to the DOPM;
 - Secondly, the DOPM or his/her team should undertake a review of the work themselves; and
 - Lastly, the NRA Strategic Planning Unit will conduct a review of each CBA produced
- 2.2. CBA Team and Design Office audits should take place at each project phase that CBA is required.
- 2.3. Persons involved in the appraisal process must have had some prior experience or attended an approved formal training course on either project appraisal or CBA. This holds true for both members of the Appraisal Team and for the person responsible for reviewing the appraisal work in the Design Offices
- 2.4. The Appraisal Team comprises an Appraisal Team Leader and Appraisal Team Members. The required experience within the Appraisal Team and the Design Office is defined below. Note that the requirements for the Appraisal Team are relevant regardless of whether the team is drawn from the Design Office, or employed as an external consultant. The Design Office Project Manager is responsible for the approval of the CBA Team.

Appraisal Team Leader: The Appraisal Team Leader must be able to demonstrate knowledge of the appraisal process, including the use of standard computer programmes used in traffic modelling and economic assessment. The Team Leader must have been on an approved training course and have detailed experience of appraisal on at least three highway projects. Appraisal Team Member: The Appraisal Team member must have been on an approved training course or seminar and/or have practical experience in undertaking appraisal. At least one Appraisal Team member should be included on each Appraisal Team

3. Key Audit Areas

3.1. The DMRB Volume 13, Section 1, Part 3, Chapter 11 provides guidance on what to check when validating a COBA printout; reference should be made to this document when undertaking the validation. The key areas that require checking are described below. Where modelled networks are large, a sampling approach to the checking may be adopted. For example, for networks consisting of over 100 links, it would be appropriate to check in detail the coding of 10% of the links and junctions

Basic Variables

3.2. If local rather than default values have been used for parameters such as traffic growth, traffic proportions, seasonality index, E- and M-factors, flow groups and accidents, then the basis for the derivation of these values should be examined and any calculations confirmed.

Coded Network Structure

3.3. There should be a direct correspondence between the coded network, the node link diagram and scheme plans for both the Do-Minimum and Do-Something schemes.

Link Data

3.4. A check should be made on the data pertaining to each link, such as the link length and other geometric characteristics, speed and accident rates, with those values falling outside the range of typical values for the link type being investigated further.

Junction Data

3.5. The audit should check that flow patterns and turning matrices are reasonable. Maximum delay coding can be compared against timed runs.

Traffic Flows

3.6. Flows entered for non-neutral months should be queried and the flows should be cross-referenced against those contained in any Local Model Validation Report. There should be no links with zero flow.

Scheme Costs

3.7. The audit should confirm that all items (construction, land, preparation and supervision costs) have been included and the cost estimates input are in

accordance with the most recent estimates agreed with the NRA Cost Estimation Unit.

- 3.8. The auditor should check whether the appropriate scenario testing / sensitivity analysis has been undertaken on costs as well as in terms of traffic growth forecasts (see PAG Unit 6.1: Guidance on Conducting CBA for more detail).
- 3.9. Any indices used to take historical costs to the price base year, such as the CPI and RPF should be reviewed for appropriateness. The Auditor should also consider whether the assumed timing of the scheme costs is correct.

Costs and Benefits

- 3.10. The items listed above all relate to data input by the user and are relatively straightforward to check. A more complex task is the interpretation of the costs (and thereby benefits) that these data give rise to in the context of travel time, vehicle operating costs and accidents, and the changes thereof over the appraisal period.
- 3.11. The process should seek to confirm that the cost and benefit stream relating to each is realistic and also in line with the aims of the proposed scheme. For example:
 - Travel time the audit should investigate links and junctions going over capacity and when this occurs during the appraisal period. The audit should also confirm whether changes in total vehicle kilometres accord with expectation, and should examine the resulting changes to time spent on each link and at each junction.
 - Vehicle Operating Costs fuel and non-fuel related Vehicle Operating Costs will change as a result of the general increase in vehicle kilometres aggregated over the entire network over time. The auditor should confirm that the changes in vehicle operating costs accord with expectation.
 - Accidents are large accident reductions realistic? Can they be reconciled with the problems for which the scheme is designed to address?

Audit Checklist

- 3.12. A checklist that summarises the key elements to be considered during the audit process is outlined below. This list is based on the information contained in DMRB Volume 13, Part 1, Chapter 11, and includes the more important items in each output phase that should be reviewed and commented upon if necessary. It is recommended that auditors use this list, or similar, to ensure that all costs and benefits attributed to a scheme have been checked.
- 3.13. If the audit is being undertaken by an independent consultant, any findings, comments and recommendations may be expanded upon in a separate audit report, with the summary checklist All raw data used during the assessment, as well as the draft CBA Report itself, should be delivered to the NRA SPU for review.

Table 6.13.1: COBA Audit Checklist

Phase	Details	
REQUIRED REFERENCE	Scheme Plans	 Do Nothing
DOCUMENTATION FOR	(plans of option at appropriate scale – tick if provided)	Do Minimum
VALIDATION		 Do Something
	COBA Node Link Diagrams	 Do Nothing
		Do Minimum
		 Do Something
	Input Reports	 COBA
	(reports detailing inputs for COBA– tick if provided)	 TUBA
	Cost Estimates (cost estimates with accompanying spreadsheets for each option - tick if provided)	Do Minimum
		 Do Something
	 Full COBA Printouts (printouts for both high, medium and low traffic growth for all options – tick if provided) 	
COBA OUTPUT PHASES	Traffic Growth	 Link Based
(2&3) – BASIC VARIABLES	(Tick where appropriate. If zone-based values derived, is it reasonable?	 Zone Based
	• Traffic Proportions	Default
	year? How do they compare against default data?)	 Local
	First Scheme Year (Enter first scheme year. Is this realistic?)	
	Seasonality Index	 Default
	(Tick where appropriate. If local values entered have details of derivation, including calculations been provided?)	Local
	• M-Factor/E-Factor (Tick where appropriate. If local values entered have details of derivation, including calculations been provided?)	Default
		Local
	Flow Groups	Default
	(lick where appropriate. If local values entered have details of derivation been provided?)	Local

	Accident Data	Default
	(Tick where appropriate. If local values entered have details of derivation been provided? Compare against default values.)	Local
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (4) –	Does node-link structure of Do Minimum and Do Something	(i) Do Minimum
NETWORK STRUCTURE AND	agree to scheme plans?	Yes
RESTRUCTURING		• No
		(ii) Do Something
		Yes
		• No
COBA OUTPUT PHASES	 Link Data – check the following are reasonable 	(i) Geometric parameters
(5&6) – LINK AND JUNCTION		Yes
DATA		• No
		(ii) Traffic flows
		Yes
		• No
	 Junction Data – check the following are reasonable 	(i) Turning matrices
		Yes
		• No
		(ii) Maximum delay
		Yes
		• No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (8) – AVERAGE LINK SPEED AND	 (i) Do link and junction speeds/times by flow group compare well with observed journey times? 	• Yes
AVERAGE JUNCTION DELAY		• No
PER NODE	(ii) Are there any unusual variations (or lack of) in speeds and times	Yes
	by flow group?	• No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (9) – OVEBCAPACITY BEPORTS	 Is there overcapacity in early years, or outside flow group 4? (if YES this should be investigated further.) 	• Yes
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (10) -	• Does the change in total vehicle kilometres accord with common	• Yes
VEHICLE KILOMETRES	sense given the nature of the scheme?	• No

COBA OUTPUT PHASE (11) – LINK TRANSIT COSTS & LINK TOTAL VEHICLE HOURS	 Check the following are reasonable: 	 (i) Links that have high link transit benefits Yes No (ii) Changes in vehicle hours spent on each link Yes No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (12) – JUNCTION DELAY COSTS & JUNCTION TOTAL VEHICLE HOURS	Check the following are reasonable:	 (i) Junctions with large benefits Yes No (ii) Changes in vehicle hours spent at each junction Yes No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (13) – LINK ACCIDENT NUMBERS AND COSTS; JUNCTION ACCIDENT NUMBERS AND COST; SUMMARY OF ACCIDENT NUMBERS AND COSTS; & ANALYSIS OF ACCIDENT BENEFITS BY YEAR	Check the following are reasonable: (i.e. relate to problems to which scheme is designed to solve)	 (i) Large accident reductions Yes No (ii) Cost and Benefit streams over time realistic Yes No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (14) – LINK TRANSIT AND JUNCTION DELAY COSTS BY VEHICLE CATEGORY; LINK TRANSIT AND JUNCTION DELAY COSTS BY FLOW GROUP; LINK AND JUNCTION VEHICLE HOURS BY FLOW GROUP; LINK	Check the following are reasonable: (i.e. concurs with main aims of scheme)	 (i) Split of benefits per vehicle category Yes No (ii) Split of benefits per flow group Yes No (iii) Split of vehicle hours by flow group Yes No

TRANSIT AND JUNCTION DELAY COSTS FOR ALL VEHICLES BY FLOW GROUP AND VEHICLE CATEGORY BY FLOW GROUP		 (iv) Time of day and vehicle type to which most benefit attributed Yes No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (15) – TIME COSTS AND BENEFITS BY YEAR; VEHICLE OPERATING COSTS AND BENEFITS BY YEAR; FUEL CONSUMPTION BY VHICLE TYPE BY YEAR; AND FUEL CONSUMPTION BY VEHICLE TYPE AND FLOW GROUP	Are the following realistic? Are there any anomalies over time?	 (i) Profile of time costs and benefits over time Yes No (ii) Vehicle operating cost and benefit stream Yes No (iii) Fuel consumption cost and benefit stream by vehicle type Yes No (iv) Fuel consumption by vehicle type and flow group Yes No
COBA OUTPUT PHASE (16) – MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS;	(i) Are assumptions made about future maintenance costs reasonable?	Yes No
ANALYSIS OF EXPENDITURE AND BENEFITS BY YEAR;	(ii) Does Cost and benefit profile over the appraisal period appear reasonable?	Yes No
COSTS TO MARKET PRICES BY VEHICLE CATEGORY:	(iii) Is timing of expenditure and first year of benefits correct?	Yes No
AND ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF ROAD SYSTEM IN	(iv) Is spend profile appropriate to specific scheme?	Yes No
MARKET PRICES	(v) Is benefit profile as expected?	Yes No

Table 6.13.1: TUBA Audit Checklist

Phase	Details	
REQUIRED DATA FOR AUDIT	Scheme Plans (plans of option at appropriate scale – tick if provided)	Do Nothing
		Do Minimum
		Do Something
		Do Nothing
	Traffic Model Network Plans	Do Minimum
		Do Something
	Input Reports	• TMR
	(reports detailing inputs for TUBA – tick if provided)	• TUBA
	Cost Estimates	Do Minimum
	(cost estimates with accompanying spreadsheets for each option - tick if provided)	Do Something
	• Full TUBA Printouts (printouts for high, medium and low traffic growth for all options – tick if provided)	Yes
		• No
	• Traffic Models (Given the link between the traffic model and the TUBA input, the integrity of the model will be the most significant factor influencing the TUBA results. Robust checking of the base model and forecast assignments should provide a degree of assurance that TUBA results are valid)	• Yes
		• No
BASIC VARIABLES	Economics Input File	Yes
	(Tick if appropriate file used based on PAG Unit 6.11)	• No
	• Scheme Input File (A check should be made to confirm that the parameters defining the scheme are correct, in particular the input matrices i.e. demand, distance, travel time and other costs)	• Yes
		• No
	User Classes (Have sufficient user classes been specified?)	• Yes
		• No
	First Scheme Year (Enter first scheme year. Is this realistic?)	• Yes
		• No
	Modelled Years	• Yes

	(Have models been prepared for both the first year and future year (preferably 30 years)?)	• No
	Annualisation Factors (Tick where appropriate. Is basis for annualisation factors provided? Is use of model	Yes
	periods reasonable?)	• No
	Cost Inputs	Yes
	(Have costs been input correctly in terms of profile, cost types, mode, sector etc? Market or Factor prices?)	• No
	Warnings	Yes
WARNINGS IN OUTPUTS	(TUBA undertakes a number of checks on the consistency of the input matrices, have any warnings been checked and rationale for why these warnings are occurring been provided within the report?)	• No
HAVE ACCIDENTS BEEN		(i) Large accident reductions
TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT	 How have accident benefits been calculated – is this acceptable? 	Yes
USING AN ALTERNATIVE	Check the following are reasonable:	• No
METHOD?	(i.e. relate to problems to which scheme is designed to solve)	(ii) Cost and Benefit streams realistic
		Yes
		• No
TIME COSTS AND BENEFITS		(i) Profile of time costs and benefits over
ODEDATING COSTS AND		time
BENEFITS BY YEAR FILE		
CONSUMPTION BY VHICLE		(ii) Vehicle operating cost and benefit
TYPE BY YEAR; AND FUEL		stream
CONSUMPTION BY VEHICLE		Yes
TYPE AND FLOW GROUP		• No
	Are the following realistic? Are there any anomalies over time?	(iii) Fuel consumption cost and benefit
		stream by vehicle type
		Yes
		• No
		(iv)Fuel consumption by vehicle type and
		flow group
		Yes
		• No

MAINTENANCE ANALYSIS;	(vi) Are assumptions made about future maintenance costs reasonable?	Yes
ANALYSIS OF EXPENDITURE	(W) Are assumptions made about future maintenance costs reasonable:	• No
AND BENEFITS BY YEAR;	(, iii) Dees Cast and hansfit mafile annear researching	Yes
CONVERSION OF TRAVEL	(VII) Does Cost and benefit profile appear reasonable?	• No
BY VEHICLE CATEGORY	EHICLE CATEGORY; (viii) Is timing of expenditure and first year of benefits correct?	Yes
AND ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF ROAD SYSTEM IN		• No
	(ix) Is spend profile appropriate to specific scheme?	Yes
MARKET PRICES		• No
	(x) Is benefit profile as expected?	Yes
	(x) is beliefit profile as expected:	• No