APPENDIX A  
Cheshire and Warrington LTB  
DRAFT - Major Scheme Business Case Guidance

Part One – Purpose

1.1 Background
Following submission of the initial list to the Department for Transport (DfT), the Cheshire and Warrington Local Transport Body (CWLTB) wishes to work with promoters to progress business cases for the highest priority schemes. This document has been produced in order to guide this process.

Irrespective of the funding route, it is essential that priority schemes follow a clear and transparent process which establishes in an appropriate level of detail:

- **Contribution to important policy objectives** – in particular economic growth.
- **Value for money** – with the benefits significantly exceeding the costs (usually by at least 2:1).
- **Affordability** – within the government’s allocation to CWLTB.
- **Deliverability** – getting the scheme on the ground (and therefore delivering benefits) as soon as possible.

Defining a robust business case process was a requirement set out by the DfT as part of its proposals to devolve major scheme funding to Local Transport Bodies.

There are also a number of good reasons why a robust business case process is necessary:

- To ensure that the right schemes are identified to solve actual problems.
- To provide a consistent and transparent framework for decision making.
- To understand the impacts of schemes (including those that may not have been anticipated).
- To provide a clear and transparent “audit trail” of assessment work and decision making.
- To reduce the potential for legal challenge as a result of a clear process not being followed.

1.2 Assurance Framework
As a condition of receiving devolved funding from the DfT, the CWLTB has produced an Assurance Framework which sets out, in Part 3, Section 19 how the business case process will operate.

The DfT document, *The Transport Business Case*, sets out three business case stages:

1. **Strategic Outline Case (SOC)** – Undertaken in order to identify the range of options for addressing a particular problem; and selection of a preferred scheme.
2. **Outline Business Case (OBC)** – Detailed work on assessing the costs, benefits and deliverability of the most favourable scheme options.
3. **Full Business Case (FBC)** – Confirmation of the scheme value for money once the contractor procurement process has been undertaken.

CWLTB’s Assurance Framework set out a two stage approval process for schemes based broadly on the DfT’s previous Programme Entry (PE) and Full Approval (FA) stages. This guidance follows the same two stage approach and as such regards any scheme which has successfully completed a prioritization process has achieved PE status. These schemes have successfully made the strategic case for them to be eligible to receive funding from CWLTB. Therefore, there will be no requirement for such schemes to produce an SOC.

1.3 Status of this Guidance
The guidance is a “working document” and will be updated periodically as required by changes of circumstance – for example changes to government guidance and technical refinements.

This document does not aim to repeat at length the guidance produced by the government. Instead it proposes to summarise the overall process and, where necessary, “sign post” scheme promoters to the key guidance documents that they will need to follow in order to produce robust business cases.
One of the main purposes of this guidance is to outline how that technical evidence should be assembled, so that approval to deliver schemes can be obtained as efficiently as possible.

**Part Two – Key Guidance Documents**

**2.1 Introduction**
There are a number of guidance documents that scheme promoters will need to be aware of when producing their business cases.

*The Transport Business Case*
- **Purpose:** Outlines how the DfT assesses the business case for its own proposals.
- **Usage:** Promoters will be expected to follow the principles of the guidance when producing their scheme business cases, with the CWLTTB advising on proportionality (i.e. level of detail required for specific schemes). The document also provides further sources of advice and guidance, which scheme promoters should consider using as necessary.

*The Green Book*
- **Purpose:** Detailed guidance from HM Treasury as to how all public sector bodies should appraise schemes before committing to invest.
- **Usage:** Promoters will be expected to follow the basic principles (in particular the five case model) and (where relevant to the scheme) the detailed guidance.

*Value for Money Statement Information Note*
- **Purpose:** Summarises how the DfT assesses and presents the economic case for transport schemes (including economic, environmental, social / distributional and public accounts impacts).
- **Usage:** Promoters will be required to produce value for money assessments and statements for their schemes, as part of the OBC and FBC stages. The information will be particularly important for the “Accountable Body” to be able to release funding, following approval of the FBC.

*Transport Analysis Guidance - WebTAG*
- **Purpose:** Provides detailed guidance covering all the main areas of appraisal for transport schemes – in particular the positive and negative impacts on economic, environmental, social / distributional and public accounts objectives.
- **Usage:** Promoters will be expected to follow the relevant parts of WebTAG as agreed with the CWLTTB, following production of an Appraisal Specification Report (ASR).

*Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)*
- **Purpose:** Provides detailed guidance covering appraisal and design of highway schemes.
- **Usage:** Promoters will be expected to follow the relevant advice when appraising and designing their schemes; in particular ensuring that they liaise with the relevant highway authority for specific advice and especially if there are likely to be departures from DMRB standards (which will need explicit approval).

*Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) – For Rail Projects Only*
- **Purpose:** Network Rail’s guidance for the planning, appraisal and delivery of projects on the rail network.
- **Usage:** Promoters of rail schemes will be expected to follow the GRIP process, and ensure they receive
appropriate technical advice from Network Rail. Understanding the delivery of services in rail projects under the GRIP process takes place at GRIP 2 – Feasibility, GRIP 3 – Option Selection, and GRIP 4 – Single option development. Broadly, GRIP 2 sets the baseline for the scheme and determines the level of services that would be feasible if infrastructure was delivered. GRIP3 allow promoters and Network Rail to consider different options to address the issue, and understand the level of services that could be used on each. GRIP 4 develops the preferred option and determines service levels for that option. Using this process will allow scheme promoters, through engagement with Network Rail, to fully understand the extent to which services would need to be supported and a commitment from the scheme promoters would be required.


The Magenta Book
- **Purpose:** Detailed guidance from HM Treasury on how to design an evaluation of a project.
- **Usage:** Evaluation is a vital part of the CWLTB’s work and all scheme promoters will be expected to use the principles in the guidance to propose a robust, but proportionate, approach.

### Part Three – Summary of the Business Case Process

**3.1 Introduction**

It is important that promoters fully understand the overall process to be followed, between prioritisation of schemes and the start of construction.

**3.2 Summary of the Process**

Figure 1 provides a summary of the business case process that promoters will need to follow.

![Figure 1 – Summary of the Business Case Process](image)

A scheme which is prioritised for funding will need to undertake work on producing an OBC and FBC. The precise requirements for these business case stages will vary by the size and type of scheme – and more details are provided in sections 5 to 7 below. However each scheme being considered for CWLTB funding will need to receive approval of the two business cases.

---

1. Source: DfT
Part Four – The Five Cases Model

4.1 Introduction
Within the OBC and FBC, there is a common structure based around the “five cases model” which has been developed by HM Treasury as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 – Summary of Five Cases Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Overall Purpose</th>
<th>Summary of Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Explains why the scheme needed.</td>
<td>To demonstrate the case for change based on a clear rationale for making the investment, and strategic fit, how the scheme will address existing problems and further the aims / objectives of the promoter and its customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Establishes value for money.</td>
<td>The economic, environmental, social / distributional and public accounts impacts of a scheme are all examined, using qualitative and quantitative (monetised) information. In assessing value for money, all of these impacts are consolidated to determine the extent to which a proposal’s benefits outweigh its costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Assesses affordability and financial sustainability.</td>
<td>Concentrates on the affordability of the scheme, its funding arrangements and technical accounting issues. It presents the financial profile of the different options and the impact of the proposed investment on the accounts of the organisation which will become responsible for future maintenance of the asset created by the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Outlines procurement and construction strategy.</td>
<td>Clearly sets out the financial implications of the proposed procurement strategy, focussing on evidence on risk allocation and transfer, contract timescales and implementation timescale as well as details of the capability and skills of the team delivering the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Assesses timescales, governance and risks.</td>
<td>Outlines the project planning, governance structure, risk management, communications and stakeholder management, benefits realisation and assurance (for example a Gateway Review to ensure that the scheme is still likely to deliver value for money). There should be a clear and agreed understanding of what needs to be done, why, when and how, with measures in place to identify and manage any risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This summary applies to all types of investment and the precise requirements of the CWLTB will need to be tailored to individual transport schemes.

Part Five – Proportionate Appraisal
5.1 Appraisal Specification Report
The CWLTB does not want promoters to undertake appraisal work for the sake of it, and therefore encourages promoters to engage with it at an early stage to determine the most appropriate level of assessment needed for the scheme.

In order to do this, promoters should briefly summarise the expected impacts / benefits of their schemes in the form of an Appraisal Summary Table (AST) which can be used to provide an initial assessment of the scheme’s value for money. Based on this initial assessment of value for money the promoter should set out the proposed scope of the appraisal and modeling work in an Appraisal Specification Report (ASR).

Appendix 2 provides information on what the AST should cover. DfT guidance on the ASR can be found at [http://www.dft.gov.uk/ha/standards/ians/pdfs/ian176.pdf](http://www.dft.gov.uk/ha/standards/ians/pdfs/ian176.pdf)

Submission of the AST and ASR to CWLTB will determine the level and detail of analysis required for the Outline Business case.

5.2 Proportionate Appraisal
In general terms, CWLTB will apply the following criteria for proportionate appraisal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Cost (£m)</th>
<th>AST² and ASR needed</th>
<th>Level of Appraisal Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refined AST*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Proportionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 – 15.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full-Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where a refined AST* = more detailed AST which confirms the preferred option is the best, AND delivers against all objectives, AND presents very good vfm (i.e. BCR > 2), AND has no significant risks or show stoppers.

This is general guidance and these terms are not fixed. For example, a low cost scheme with high levels of uncertainty may need proportionate or even full appraisal before funding is approved. To apply proportionate appraisal all schemes, as a minimum, need to provide an AST and ASR for the LTB to decide what level of appraisal is needed for funding approval.

The key principles of the CWLTB’s proportionate approach are:

- Less expensive and technically straight forward schemes should generally have less of a need for detailed appraisal.
- Unless there are exceptional circumstances, it will generally be mandatory to produce a quantified economic appraisal using the DfT’s Transport User Benefits Appraisal (TUBA) package and an appropriate transport modelling package.
- It will be mandatory to appraise and identify potential mitigation measures of any negative impacts, especially those that relate to the environment (as identified by Statutory Environmental Bodies and local organisations) or particular social groups.
- If the promoter can demonstrate that there is likely to be a neutral impact on any specific sub-objective, the CWLTB may agree that no appraisal of that sub-objective is required.
- It is in the promoter’s interest to appraise as many of the benefits as possible, as this will boost the value for money case and potentially make CWLTB member approval more likely.

² It is noted that DfT advice on proportionate appraisal for less costly simpler schemes is that funding could be approved based on an enhanced Options Appraisal Report (OAR). CWLTB schemes will have provided information that would broadly have formed part of an OAR, and options would have been considered in the past. There is no necessity for promoters to update this work, unless there has been a material change in circumstances since the scheme was prioritised.
Part Six – Outline Business Case (OBC)

6.1 Purpose
The overall purpose of the Outline Business Case (OBC) is to provide a detailed economic and financial appraisal of the preferred scheme option and any credible alternatives. This appraisal should also inform an assessment of scheme deliverability, in particular focusing on the management and commercial cases.

Promoters should become familiar with the specific purposes of the OBC, as outlined by The Transport Business Case, as shown in Box 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1 – Specific Purposes of the OBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to ensure that the scheme option(s) continue to align with the objectives of the promoter and key stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirm the strategic fit and case for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If appropriate, set out a detailed assessment of the options for a solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refine the investment proposal for the preferred option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertake economic and financial modelling in order to establish the Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set out the management and commercial arrangements for delivering the preferred option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Format
The OBC needs to be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme being considered which will be determined as described above. The document should be structured around the five cases. The detail of the OBC will emerge from the promoter’s proportionate use of WebTAG. The following section provides an outline structure for the document and some initial advice on possible issues to consider at OBC stage under each of the four headings in the AST (summarised in Appendix 1).

The structure of the OBC should be based on the following sections:

- Main document:
  - Executive summary
  - Chapter 1: Strategic case
  - Chapter 2: Economic case
  - Chapter 3: Commercial case
  - Chapter 4: Financial case
  - Chapter 5. Management case

- Appendices – the following must be included:
  - Economic appraisals
  - Financial appraisals
  - Benefits register
  - Risk register
  - Risk potential assessment (RPA)
  - Letter of commissioner/ stakeholder support
  - Draft OJEU notice
  - Strategic business plans.

The OBC

Economy

- What are the specific journey time saving benefits that accrue to different business user groups – such as car drivers, car passengers and public transport users / operators?
- What is the material impact on day to day journey time reliability for business users and public
transport operators?
- Is there a positive impact on access to key Regeneration areas – for example by tackling congestion and improving sustainable transport provision?
- Are there wider economic impacts that the scheme could positively deliver or at least influence? For example:
  - Reducing costs of travel to businesses, and hence improving market competitiveness.
  - Opening up new markets that were previously unviable because of transport barriers.
  - Reducing or removing barriers to inward investment in an area.
  - Opening up specific parcels of land for development.
  - Widening access to labour markets.
  - Keeping people in education and training.
  - Enabling companies to do business with each other in the same locality.
  - Providing sustainable transport links to new housing sites.
- BCR – it is important to note that an indicative BCR should be provided in the OBC.
- WEBs – CWLTB's Assurance Framework states that it will generally support schemes with a BCR > 2, but schemes with a BCR < 2 could be considered if they can show other wider economic benefits. The OBC should confirm and quantify any WEBs claimed in the AST.

Environment
- What is the change in the prevalence of noise at key receptor sites; and what mitigation measures are necessary to deal with any significant noise increases (and the possibility of Part 1 Claims)?
- What is the change in local air quality as a result of the scheme; in particular within any designated Air Quality Management Areas?
- What are the changes in greenhouse gas emissions from surface transport through changes in overall traffic levels and the promotion of public transport, walking and cycling?
- What are the visual impacts of the scheme on the landscape – in particular the setting of natural features and areas of particular value? What are the mitigation measures that will minimise any impacts?
- What are the visual impacts of the scheme on the townscape – in particular the setting of historic buildings or other features within the urban area such as parks and trees? What are the mitigation measures that will minimise any impacts?
- What are the impacts on areas which are used by protected species of flora and fauna, and are there impacts on “corridors of movement” for these species? What are the mitigation measures that will minimise any impacts?
- Is there a risk that the scheme could result in flooding as a result of increased surface run-off into natural or man-made watercourses? What are the mitigation measures that will minimise any impacts?
- Is there a risk that the scheme could result in surface water contamination from run-off into natural or man-made watercourses? What are the mitigation measures that will minimise any impacts?

Social
- What are the specific journey time saving benefits that accrue to different social – such as commuters, shoppers and students – and by different transport modes?
- What is the material impact on day to day journey time reliability for commuters, shoppers and students?
- What are the opportunities that the scheme provides for increased levels of physical activity – specifically walking and cycling?
- How does the scheme improve the quality of journey for car drivers, car passengers, public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists?
- How does the scheme change the predicted levels of accidents?
- What potential benefits to personal safety and security does the scheme provide?
- What is the level of change in terms of access to key services – such as employment, shopping and education – as measured by public transport, walking and cycling journey times?
- What is the impact on affordability of transport?
- What are the key issues of severance addressed by the scheme?
- Does the scheme provide a facility that non-users would be nevertheless be willing to pay for as an option?
**Public Accounts**
- What are the capital and revenue costs associated with constructing, operating and maintaining the scheme?
- What is the impact on tax revenues (in particular fuel duty) as a result of changes to travel demand?

**Public and Stakeholder Consultation**
Promoters will be required to undertake public and stakeholder consultation on their preferred option scheme design and appraisal. It will be necessary for promoters to ensure that the relevant transport asset owners / operators and the statutory environmental bodies have given their “in principle” approval.

There is no specific format or methods required for the consultation, as long as stakeholders are given an adequate opportunity to have their say.

The OBC document should describe the consultation, outline the results and set out (if necessary) how the consultation feedback has been incorporated into the scheme design and appraisal.

**Wider Economic Benefits**
With the introduction of Strategic Economic Plans (SEPs) and Growth Deals as part of the 2013 Comprehensive Spending Review, transport has been placed firmly in the context of its ability to deliver economic growth. Traditional economic appraisal, whilst not ignoring Wider Economic Benefits (WEBs), has tended to concentrate on direct benefits to transport users (i.e. journey time savings and reliability). Whilst these remain vital to any business case, promoters should also consider whether their scheme is likely to deliver WEBs. The AST stage identifies the scheme’s potential contribution to WEBs.

In order to assist promoters identify and quantify WEBs, they may wish to consider how their scheme is able to positively impact on the following issues:

- Reducing costs of travel to businesses, and hence improving market competitiveness.
- Opening up new markets that were previously unviable because of transport barriers.
- Reducing or removing barriers to inward investment in an area.
- Opening up specific parcels of land for development.
- Widening access to labour markets.
- Keeping people in education and training.
- Enabling companies to do business with each other in the same locality.

It will also be important to state why there will be positive impact on key economic indicators – which could include:

- Safeguarding or creation of jobs (via investment from existing or new companies).
- Reduction in exclusion from jobs and training (especially for people without access to private transport).
- Supply of affordable housing.
- Supply of land for employment (based on the optimum balance of different use categories).
- Increases in business to business transactions (thereby retaining more money in the local economy through supply chains).

Quantification of WEBs can be completed using a number of different methodologies, but to ensure consistency between different scheme promoters the LTB proposes all promoters apply the Homes and Communities Agency’s methodology to GVA (Gross Value Added) calculation.

Using this approach it is possible to evaluate schemes on a measure than is wider than the narrow transport assessment of BCR. Schemes would be grouped as follows:

- Category 1: High BCR and High GVA
- Category 2: Low BCR and High GVA
- Category 3: Low BCR and Low GVA

Under this approach Category 1 schemes would be supported for funding by the LTB; Category 2
schemes are those with low BCRs, but deliver wider benefits that could justify receipt of LTB funding; and category 3 schemes would not be funded.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The promoter should provide details of how they propose to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (MEP), based on the three tier approach advocated by the guidance:

- Standard monitoring – a standard set of measures that will need to be reported for every scheme
- Enhanced monitoring – additional measures for schemes costing more than £50m or are likely to have a significant impact on a particular indicator (e.g. local air quality)
- Fuller evaluation – for larger schemes as defined by DfT in the guidance

The expectation is that the majority of schemes in Cheshire and Warrington will undergo Standard Monitoring. Early engagement with CWL TB is recommended to get agreement on the approach to be detailed in the OBC.

The outline MEP should also propose a method that will capture any lessons learned in relation to project delivery.

**Part Seven – Full Business Case**

7.1 Purpose

The overall purpose of the Full Business Case (FBC) is to provide confirmation of the value for money and deliverability of the scheme following:

- Completion of the detailed design.
- Obtaining of all the necessary statutory orders.
- Completion of the contractor procurement process and obtaining of a firm tender price.

Promoters should become familiar with the specific purposes of the FBC, as outlined by The Transport Business Case, as shown in Box 3:

**Box 3 – Specific Purposes of the FBC**

- Confirm the strategic fit and case for change.
- Provide details of the overall balance of benefits and costs against objectives and set out plans for monitoring and evaluating these benefits when required.
- Provide the detailed contract management and construction approach, based on the procurement process.

7.2 Format

The FBC should be structured in the same way as the OBC, using the headings of the five cases (see Part 6 above).

7.3 Information Required for FBC

*Strategic, Economic and Financial Cases*
The FBC should update the OBC strategic, economic and financial cases with additional information obtained as part of the detailed design, statutory orders and contractor procurement processes. The extent of this update will vary.
At one extreme it is theoretically possible that very little, if any, update will be required. For example the scheme design and appraisal impacts may not have changed significantly as a result of any statutory processes and the contractor prices may be very close to the original cost estimates. If this is the case, and it is clear that further work is not likely to be required, then it may be possible for the CWLTB to agree to move to approval of the FBC without the need for any more appraisal.

However, it is possible (and perhaps more likely) that at least some significant changes may require revisions to the OBC strategic, economic and financial cases.

Promoters should agree the scope of any revised appraisal with the CWLTB, but it will only need to be for any sub-objectives where there is likely to be a significant change in any of the following:

- Economic impacts;
- Environmental impacts;
- Social impacts; and
- Public accounts impacts.

Depending on the precise revisions required, the FBC may need to present updates to the following:

- WebTAG compliant appraisal;
- Value for Money Statement including confirmation of the scheme’s final BCR;
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan; and
- Benefits Realisation Strategy.

In this way, it is envisaged that the FBC will be based on a proportionate approach by only focusing on the work that needs doing.

**Management Case**

By the time of the FBC stage, the focus of the management case should be on the efficient, safe and environmentally friendly construction of the scheme. Based on the proposals provided by the preferred contractor, and agreed with the highway authority where necessary, the FBC should clearly set out the following information:

- Detailed construction programme;
- Risk management and mitigation plans;
- Proposals for traffic management during construction;
- Approach to site supervision / contractor management;
- Communications plan for construction; and
- Health & Safety and Environmental management plans.

Depending on the nature of the scheme, the FBC should also set out any necessary arrangements for the future management of the asset created – for example if there is a staffed facility. Discussions with the relevant transport operators and asset owners will be an important part of this process.

**Commercial Case**

With the procurement process complete, the FBC will need to pick up any residual commercial issues if necessary.

**Public and Stakeholder Consultation**

At FBC stage, there is no automatic need for further general public consultation unless there is a significant change to the scope that means that it would be necessary. Consultation with stakeholders who may be particularly affected by the scheme might be required, although this may have occurred as part of the detailed design. As with other stages of the business case process, it will be necessary to ensure that the relevant transport asset owners / operators and the statutory environmental bodies have given their approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Key Question / Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategic    | • Have there been any changes to the strategic case from the SOC document – perhaps because the scheme itself has changed in size and scope?  
• If not, then confirmation that there have been no changes is all that is required.                                                                                                                                |
| Economic     | The overall approach to modelling the economic and financial impacts of the scheme must be clearly set out and agreed with the CWLTB.  
• Advice is provided in WebTAG Unit 3.1: [http://www.dft.gov.uk/webtag/documents/expert/unit3.1.php](http://www.dft.gov.uk/webtag/documents/expert/unit3.1.php)  
• The Appraisal Specification Report (undertaken as part of the SOC) will set out the scope required for the OBC.  
• The promoter must undertake WebTAG compliant appraisal on all the sub-objectives, as outlined in the ASR and agreed with the CWLTB.  
• Scheme appraisal will need to be based on a credible forecast of future travel demand, with the DfT’s National Trip End Model (NTEM) being the starting point: [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/tempro](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/tempro)  
• The Transport User Benefits Appraisal (TUBA) programme should be used to produce an overall scheme Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR).  
• Where applicable, costs / benefits of changes to accidents should be assessed using the Cost Benefit Analysis (COBA) programme.  
| Financial    | • Based on outline design work, the updated scheme capital cost, and any ongoing maintenance / operational costs, must be fed into the appraisal and reflected in the BCR.                                              |
| Commercial   | • Have there been any changes to the assumptions regarding the potential income generation?  
• If so, these should be reflected in the economic and financial appraisal where appropriate.  
• What is the procurement strategy for the preferred option and how does it ensure that the optimum balance of risk is allocated between the scheme promoter and the contractor? |
| Management   | There should be an update from the SOC on issues such as design / construction methods and legal powers being sought.  
• The results of any public and stakeholder consultation should be clearly reported, along with an explanation as to how any comments have been reflected in the scheme design / appraisal work |
- A Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) and risk register / mitigation plan should be provided, taking account of the analysis undertaken at the appraisal stage.

- A detailed project governance structure, with named individuals allocated to key roles, should be provided.

- A detailed project programme, based on information from the scheme design and appraisal, should be provided in Microsoft Gantt chart format.

More detailed Benefits Realisation and Monitoring & Evaluation Plans should be provided, using the design and appraisal work to update the documents provided at SOC stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AST Category (and WebTAG Units)</th>
<th>Questions / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Economy**<br>(3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.15, 3.18) | • What are the likely sources of journey time impacts that the scheme will deliver for business users and transport providers?  
• What is the modelling package to be used?  
• How will future demand for business use be forecast?  
• What are the reliability impacts of the scheme on business users and public transport services?  
• What are the impacts on any regeneration areas?  
• What are the wider impacts on the economy? |
| **Environment**<br>(3.3) | • Will the scheme affect noise to local receptors as a result of changes to the transport network and levels of demand?  
• Is the scheme located within, or will it affect, a designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?  
• Will the scheme construction and/or operation result in a significant change in greenhouse gas emissions?  
• What are the impacts on the physical and cultural characteristics of the local area and does the scheme affect any designated areas of landscape value?  
• Are there any impacts on the setting of buildings, structures and open spaces in urban areas which are of high value (in terms of visual appearance and usage by people)?  
• What are the impacts on historic resources – such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and areas of high archaeological value?  
• Will the scheme affect the habitats of protected flora and fauna and impact on wildlife corridors?  
• Will there be a risk of water contamination and/or an increased risk of flooding as a result of the scheme? |
| **Social**<br>(3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.15, 3.17, 3.18) | • What are the likely sources of journey time impacts that the scheme will deliver for commuters?  
• What is the modelling package to be used?  
• How will future demand for commuting be forecast?  
• What are the reliability impacts of the scheme on commuters?  
• Will the scheme lead to an increase in active travel – in particular walking and cycling?  
• Is there likely to be a significant change in journey quality as a result of the scheme?  
• Will the scheme have any impact on highway safety – in particular predicted numbers of accidents?  
• Will the scheme have a positive impact on crime or the fear of crime?  
• Will public transport access to services such employment, education, health care, shopping and social networks be enhanced as a result of the scheme?  
• Will the scheme change the ability of people on low incomes to afford to travel?  
• Does the scheme generate or reduce severance for pedestrians in particular? |
| **Public Accounts (3.1, 3.2, 3.5)** | - Will the scheme create a facility which, for trips not yet possible or undertaken by other modes, would generate a willingness to pay over and above the expected value of any such use? |
| - What is the cost of the scheme within the broad transport budget available? |
| - How will the scheme affect demand for vehicle travel and hence indirect tax revenues (for example from fuel duty)? |