NEW ZEALAND
INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMISSION
Te Waihanga

Investment Decision Assurance Report

[Investment Name]

IDA Review Point 1



REVIEW TEMPLATE

Agency Name:

Senior Responsible Owner:

Report Date:

IDA Review Reference ID:

NEW ZEALAND
INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMISSION
Te Waihanga

REVIEW TEMPLATE



Purpose and scope of this review

Investment Decision Assurance (IDA), established under the Treasury's IDA Policy, provides investors with independent, risk-based assurance as high-risk investments progress through their development and delivery.

For infrastructure investments, this assurance is delivered by the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission through six IDA Point Reviews, each aligned with a key decision point in the investment lifecycle. IDA Reviews provide forward-looking advice on whether a proposal represents a sound investment, including whether it is strategically aligned, offers value for money and can be successfully delivered.

IDA Reviews are mandatory for central government investments assessed as high risk through the Treasury's Risk Profile Assessment process. Infrastructure is defined as fixed, long-lived structures that facilitate economic performance and wellbeing. For investments where infrastructure is the primary investment type, the Commission is the designated Assurance Unit and undertakes the required IDA reviews.

IDA Review Point 1 provides assurance on whether an investment idea is sufficiently justified, strategically aligned and credible to warrant further investment in business case development. It considers whether the problem and its scale are sufficiently understood, whether potential responses could provide value for money, and whether the agency has a credible basis for progressing to the next stage.

This report was prepared by the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission. The review was undertaken by a team independent of the submitting agency using the assessment approach set out for IDA Review Point [1]. It draws on the documents and evidence provided by the agency and information obtained through the review and interview process. This report presents the overall review outcome rating, ratings across the six key focus areas, and the Review Team's findings and recommendations.

Disclaimer

This review was completed at a specific point in time and is based on the information provided to the Commission by the submitting agency through the submission, review and interview process. While the Commission seeks to obtain the information necessary to complete the review, submitting Agencies are responsible for providing complete and accurate information to support the review process, and the Commission is not responsible for assessing information that has not been provided by the submitting Agency.

As the proposal continues to develop, the review findings and recommendations may become out of date.

This report provides forward-looking assurance advice only. This report provides forward-looking independent assurance advice only. The IDA review is an advisory process, not a decision-making or approval process. It is not an audit of compliance or financial accounts and does not constitute funding approval. Funding decisions remain with investors, and responsibility for the proposal and its outcomes remains with the submitting agency.

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Treasury Fitness Assessment Summary

Field	Review Team Summary					
Review	Point 1, completed [Final report date]					
Decision being supported	[State the decision or approval being sought.]					
Overall IDA Point Review Outcome	[PROCEED / PROCEED WITH ACTION / PAUSE AND REVISE / STOP OR REVERT]					
Basis for overall outcome	[Provide a short narrative explaining the evidence and judgement supporting the overall outcome]					
Key focus area ratings	Strategic alignment	Value for money	Financial	Commercial	Governance & capability	Deliverability
	Green / Amber/ Red	**Green / Amber/ Red**	**Green / Amber/ Red**	**Green / Amber/ Red**	**Green / Amber/ Red**	**Green / Amber/ Red**
Key actions for the investor	[Any key actions for Investors]					
Key recommendations for the SRO	[Summarise the most important Urgent or Essential recommendations for the SRO]					

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Summary of Review Outcomes

The Commission received an IDA Review [1] submitted by [Agency Name] for [Proposal Name].

Investment Description

[One paragraph summarising the investment]

Summary of the Review Findings

Overall review outcome rating:
The Review Team's overall advice is to **[Proceed with action]**. [Summary of what this means for this investment – 1-2 sentences.]

IDA Review Outcome	Criteria description
Proceed	The investment is ready to proceed to the next stage.
Proceed with action	The investment is ready to proceed to the next stage provided critical recommendations are addressed within an agreed timeframe.
Pause and revise	The investment is not ready to proceed to the next stage until critical recommendations are addressed.
Stop or Revert	The investment is not ready to proceed; it is recommended to either stop or revert to a previous stage for further development before any further investment decisions are made.

Basis for overall rating:
[2-3 paragraphs highlighting the key points from the IDA Review Team]

Key Focus Area	Rating	Key reasons for rating
Strategic alignment	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating
Value for money	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating
Financial	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating
Commercial	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Key Focus Area	Rating	Key reasons for rating
Governance & Capability	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating
Deliverability	Green / Amber/ Red	• 1-2 bullets summarising reason for rating

Actions for the Investor

Ref	Directed to	Suggested actions
A1	Investor	
A2	Investor	
A3	Investor	

Urgent and Essential Recommendations

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R1	SRO		[Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]
R2	SRO		[Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]
R3	SRO		[Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Table of Contents

1. Background 8
2. Strategic Alignment Assessment 9
3. Value for Money Assessment 11
4. Financial Assessment 13
5. Commercial Assessment 15
6. Governance and Capability Assessment 16
7. Deliverability Assessment 19
8. SRO identified areas of interest 22
9. Next review 23

Appendix A: List of Documents Reviewed 24

Appendix B: List of Interviewees 25

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Version History

Revision Date	Version Status	Author	Version no.
[Date]	[e.g. First Draft]	[e.g. Review Team; Infrastructure Commission]	[e.g. 0.1]

1. Background

About Investment Decision Assurance

Investment Decision Assurance (IDA) provides independent, risk-based assurance to support investor decisions on high-risk infrastructure investments. Reviews consider whether an investment is strategically justified, represents value for money, and can be successfully delivered. At Point 1, the review focuses on the strategic case for an investment and whether sufficient justification exists to commit further resources to planning and business case development. It does not require detailed options analysis, design or a fully developed investment proposal.

The Review Approach and Process

The Review Team assessed the proposal through document review and interviews, using the [Point 1 workbook] and standardised review questions to structure the assessment. The review covers six key focus areas: Strategic Alignment, Value for Money, Financial, Commercial, Governance & Capability and Deliverability.

The Review Team applies professional judgement to the evidence available, taking account of the scale, complexity, risk and maturity of the investment. Findings against the review questions inform the key focus area ratings, recommendations and overall review outcome.

Acknowledgements

The IDA Review Team would like to thank [].

REVIEW TEMPLATE

2. Strategic Alignment Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Strategic Alignment assessment considers whether a material problem has been identified and sufficiently evidenced, whether its scale and consequences are understood, and whether addressing it contributes meaningfully to current strategic priorities.

Information only questions **I1: What are the Investment Objectives for this project?**
[Add the Review Team response]

Defining & sizing the problem

Defining and sizing the problem is the process of identifying the root cause of an infrastructure issue and estimating the scale of its impacts. At Point 1, the problem definition may still be developing, but it should identify the likely root causes rather than only the symptoms, and provide sufficient evidence of the scale and consequences of the problem to justify further investigation.

S1: Is there a clearly defined problem?
[Add the Review Team response]

S2: Has the problem been sized in monetary or quantitative terms?
[Add the Review Team response]

Alignment to national and sector strategies

Alignment to national and sector strategies is the extent to which a proposal contributes to recognised and current strategic priorities. At Point 1, the proposal should demonstrate how the problem fits within the wider infrastructure network, system or sector, and how addressing it aligns with relevant current government, sector and agency priorities.

S3: Does the proposal make a meaningful contribution to priorities signalled in sector or agency long term strategies?
[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Strategic Alignment. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R1	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

3. Value for Money Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Value for Money assessment considers whether the agency has established an appropriate initial scope, considered plausible ways of addressing the problem, and identified a credible approach to evaluating costs and benefits at later stages.

Scope

Scope is the defined boundary of what an investment will and will not deliver. At Point 1, the agency should identify the types of activities and asset types that are expected to be in and out of scope, together with any material interfaces or dependencies that could influence the investment boundary.

V1: Is there a clear understanding of the activities and asset types that will be in and out of scope of this investment?
[Add the Review Team response]

Identifying Options

Identifying options is the process of considering plausible ways to address the identified problem. At Point 1, the agency is not expected to develop a formal longlist or shortlist. It should, however, demonstrate awareness of potentially viable approaches, including lower-cost and non-built responses where relevant, and their broad cost implications.

V2: Has the agency considered a range of potential options for investigation at later stages?
[Add the Review Team response]

V3: Has the agency identified approaches to address the problem that could provide value for money?
[Add the Review Team response]

Evaluation Approach

The evaluation approach sets out how the costs and benefits of potential options will be assessed. At Point 1, the agency should identify the material costs, benefits and outcomes that will need to be evaluated during subsequent business case development, including monetary and non-monetary effects

V4: Has the agency identified benefits (monetary and non-monetary) and costs that they intend to assess in their economic analysis of shortlisted options?
[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Value for Money. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R2	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

4. Financial Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Financial assessment considers whether the agency understands the likely scale of investment required and has a credible approach to securing the resources needed to progress to the next planning stage.

Affordability

Affordability is the extent to which the expected cost of an investment is realistic and manageable within the relevant funding context. At Point 1, the agency should demonstrate an early understanding of the likely upper investment limit, including an order-of-magnitude view of capital and whole-of-life costs, proportionate to the maturity of the proposal.

F1: Does the agency understand the upper limit of investment for this project / programme?
[Add the Review Team response]

Available Funding

Available funding is the extent to which resources are available, approved or on a credible pathway to support progression of the investment. At Point 1, there should be a credible plan to secure the funding needed for the next stage of investment planning and supporting investigations. Full funding for delivery is not expected at this stage.

F2: Is funding in place to progress the project / programme to the next stage?
[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Financial. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R3	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority

REVIEW TEMPLATE

5. Commercial Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Commercial assessment considers whether the agency has an initial understanding of the market conditions and constraints that could materially affect future development and delivery.

Market Conditions

Market conditions include supplier capability, capacity and interest, supply-chain constraints and competing demand for resources. At Point 1, the agency should demonstrate a baseline understanding of likely supplier capability and capacity, material supply-chain constraints, competing demand and other relevant market conditions.

C1: Has the agency demonstrated a baseline understanding of the market conditions that could materially affect development and delivery of the investment?
[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Commercial. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R4	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

6. Governance and Capability Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Governance & Capability assessment considers whether the agency has appropriate accountability, governance, capability, planning and assurance arrangements to progress the investment to the next stage

Information only questions **I2: What are the governance arrangements for this project?**
[Add the Review Team response]

Organisational Track Record & Ability to Deliver

Organisational track record and ability to deliver considers whether an organisation has the experience and capability required to successfully develop and deliver an investment. At Point 1, the organisation should have relevant experience and capability, or a credible approach to accessing the expertise necessary to progress and ultimately deliver the investment.

G1: Does the organisation have relevant delivery experience and capability, or a credible approach to accessing the capability required as the investment develops?
[Add the Review Team response]

Team Capacity & Capability

Team capacity and capability considers whether the investment has access to the people, skills and resources needed to progress successfully. At Point 1, the people, skills and specialist resources needed for the next stage should be identified, with sufficient capability available or credible arrangements to secure it.

G2: Does the agency have the appropriate capability and capacity to progress the proposal to the next stage?
[Add the Review Team response]

Project Planning Maturity

Project planning maturity is the extent to which planning is sufficiently developed to support progression through the investment lifecycle. At Point 1, project planning should identify the principal activities, investigations, approvals, resources and deliverables required to progress through the next stage of business case development.

G3: Is the project planning at a level of maturity that is appropriate and sufficient for this project stage?
[Add the Review Team response]

Project Assurance

Project assurance provides independent or objective review and challenge to support investment development and decision-making. At Point 1, the agency should have considered the assurance, independent challenge and oversight likely to be required as the investment develops, proportionate to its scale, complexity and risk.

G4: Has a proportionate assurance approach been identified to support progression through the next stage of investment development?
[Add the Review Team response]

Appropriateness of Governance Arrangements

Governance arrangements establish accountability, oversight and decision-making for an investment. At Point 1, overall accountability should be clear, with an appropriately authorised SRO or equivalent and governance and decision-making arrangements proportionate to the investment's current stage and risk.

G5: Is overall accountability for the investment sufficiently clear for this stage?
[Add the Review Team response]

G6: Are accountability, governance and decision-making arrangements sufficiently clear, proportionate and operating effectively to support progression through the next stage?

[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Governance and Capability. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R6	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

7. Deliverability Assessment

At IDA Review Point 1, the Deliverability assessment considers whether the agency has identified the principal dependencies, risks, stakeholders and organisational requirements that could affect development and future delivery.

Interdependencies and Interfaces

Interdependencies and interfaces are activities, approvals, infrastructure, services, organisations or decisions outside the direct control of the project team that may affect successful development or delivery. At Point 1, significant external and internal dependencies, interfaces, constraints and enabling requirements should be identified at a preliminary level and reflected in planning for the next stage.

D1: Have the key delivery dependencies, interfaces and constraints that could materially affect development and future delivery of the investment been identified?
[Add the Review Team response]

D2: Where successful development or delivery depends on other organisations, is there sufficient alignment and a credible approach to managing those relationships?
[Add the Review Team response]

Risk Management

Risk management is the process of identifying, assessing and managing risks and uncertainties that could affect successful development and delivery. At Point 1, the agency should demonstrate an initial understanding of the material risks and uncertainties and a proportionate approach to identifying, assessing and managing them as the investment develops.

D3: Has the agency demonstrated an understanding of the key risks and appropriate risk management approaches for this investment?

[Add the Review Team response]

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement is the process of identifying and engaging the people, organisations, communities and users affected by or able to influence an investment. At Point 1, the agency should identify key stakeholders, affected communities, users and delivery partners, understand their potential interests and influence, and have an appropriate early engagement approach.

D4: Have key stakeholders been identified and appropriately engaged for this stage of the investment?

[Add the Review Team response]

Change Management

Change management considers the organisational ownership, responsibilities and changes required to successfully implement and operate an investment. At Point 1, the agency should demonstrate that the problem falls within its mandate, that organisational ownership is understood, and that likely future asset or service ownership and organisational changes have received early consideration.

D5: Does the agency have the mandate and organisational ownership required to address this problem?

[Add the Review Team response]

D6: Is there sufficient organisational alignment and support for the need for and scope of the investment?

[Add the Review Team response]

Rating and Recommendations

Taken together, these findings result in a [Green / Amber / Red] rating for Deliverability. [Add explanation of the rating.]

The following recommendations identify actions arising from the findings above.

Ref	Directed to	Recommendation	Priority
R5	SRO		[Good practice – Consider / Essential – Do by <date> / Urgent – Do Now]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

8. SRO identified areas of interest

As part of an IDA Review, the Senior Responsible Owner may identify specific areas of interest where additional assurance or Review Team commentary would be useful.

Where these matters are already addressed through the standard Key Focus Area review questions, the Review Team's findings should be recorded in the relevant section of the report. This section may be used where an SRO-identified area of interest is not adequately covered by those questions.

SRO1: Additional response to SRO identified areas of interest not covered in Key Focus Area review responses
[Add the Review Team response]

REVIEW TEMPLATE

9. Next review

[Next review point, timing and any commentary from the review team].

REVIEW TEMPLATE

Appendix A: List of Documents Reviewed

Document Title	Version and/or Date
[Document Title]	[Version and/or Date]

REVIEW

Appendix B: List of Interviewees

Name	Role/Position	Interview Date
	[Role/Position]	[Interview Date]

REVIEW