

Australian Transport Assessment and Planning Guidelines

F7 Review and Post Completion Evaluation



This publication was prepared by the Australian Transport Assessment and Planning (ATAP) Guidelines Steering Committee and approved by the Transport and Infrastructure Senior Officials' Committee. The Committees cannot accept responsibility for any consequences arising from the use of this information. Readers should rely on their own skill and judgment when applying any information or analysis to particular issues or circumstances.

ISBN 978-1-925401-55-4

INFRA-2921

© Commonwealth of Australia 2016

August 2016

For enquiries or feedback about this publication please contact:

ATAP Steering Committee Secretariat
Australian Transport Assessment and Planning
Guidelines
Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure and
Regional Development
GPO Box 594 CANBERRA ACT 2601
Email: atap@infrastructure.gov.au

This publication is available in PDF format from the website <http://atap.gov.au/>

Contents

Step 7: Performance review and post-completion evaluation	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Benefits	6
3. Performance review principles	7
4. Evaluation of specific initiatives and programs	9
5. Evaluation of planning	10
5.1 Corridor and area	10
5.2 Network	10
5.3 Integration across transport and land use	11
6. Review against transport system objectives	12
7. Review and improvement of the ATAP Framework and Guidelines	13
8. Data for evaluation	14
9. Evaluation process	15
9.1 Determine what is to be evaluated	15
9.2 Determine the standards of comparison	15
9.3 Determine the depth and frequency of post-completion evaluation	16
9.4 Appoint evaluators	17
9.5 Collect and assess data, prepare report	17
9.6 Undertake ex-post CBAs of selected initiatives	17
9.7 Example evaluations	18
Appendix A Example evaluations	19
A.1 Adelaide’s O- Bahn Busway	19
A.2 Road upgrades at Lauderdale, Margate and Devonport (Tasmania)	21
A.3 Department for Transport trunk road schemes	22
A.4 The effectiveness of black spot treatment	24
Appendix B Proposed steps in undertaking an ex-post CBA	26
Appendix C Review and post-completion evaluation – transport focus vs detailed engineering focus	27
Appendix D Review, evaluation and benefits evaluation	28
References	29


Figures

Figure 1	The plan, deliver, learn cycle.....	6
Figure 2	Post-completion evaluation	8
Figure 4	Actual and predicted weighted Net Present Values	23

Tables

Table 1	Table 1: Process and outcome review stages.....	16
Table 2	Issues encountered during post-completion reviews conducted by DIER	21
Table 3	Summary of stages in calculation of actual benefits of trunk road schemes.....	22

Step 7: Performance review and post-completion evaluation



At a glance

Step 7 of the Framework covers performance review and post-completion evaluation. The process covers consideration of:

- Actual versus desired outcomes
- Effectiveness of strategies, policies, plans and individual initiatives in achieving performance targets
- Effectiveness of the entire Transport System Management Framework.

It is important to assess whether each individual initiative met its specific objectives and whether it helped or hindered the pursuit of stated transport system objectives and targets. This should be complemented by a progressive review of the achievement of objectives at each planning level: link/route, corridor/area, network, city/region.

Evaluation should consider questions such as:

- Was the correct strategy chosen and did the defined network contain the most appropriate corridors or areas?
- Were the best initiatives selected for the program?
- Were the initiatives correctly implemented?

Evaluation can identify significant factors that have contributed to differences between actual and desired outcomes. Where these factors reflect the underlying methodology, the Guidelines should be reviewed.

Regular review of the Guidelines and associated methodologies will provide a basis for continuous improvement and development. Any reviews should be undertaken in close consultation with users of the Guidelines.

1. Introduction

The entire ATAP Framework and its various components are aimed at the achievement of high level jurisdiction goals, transport (and land use) system objectives and the expressed targets associated with the objectives.

The question of whether these objectives and targets are being met is the driver of Step 7. This step of the Framework proposes a system of reviews (evaluations) that compare the expressed targets (i.e. preferred outcomes) with actual outcomes to judge how successful we have been.

This process supports one of the key principles of the ATAP Framework: that there should be a culture of continuous learning and improvement to ensure that future decisions can take account of lessons from past experience. For this to occur, a process of reviews is required right across the Framework.

As the ATAP Framework chart shows (see the figure at the start of this Part), reviews should ideally occur after each individual step of the Framework - for example, reviews of:

- Transport planning processes
- Processes used in identifying and assessing problems and options, and whether the proposed initiatives actually reduced the problem(s) they were targeting
- Various types of analyses that are undertaken
- The entire life-cycle of initiatives
- The degree of achievement of transport system objectives and targets
- The entire ATAP Framework.

The following points on terminology should be noted:

- ‘Review’ and ‘evaluation’ are used here interchangeably. Both involve an assessment ‘after the event’, with specific consideration of how well actual outcomes match expected outcomes predicted ‘before the event’.
- ‘Evaluation’ and ‘post-completion evaluation’ are also assumed here to have the same meaning, with the term ‘post-completion evaluation’ used here in cases where practitioners are most likely to be currently using it.
- ‘Evaluation’ contrasts with ‘appraisal’, with the latter being assessment ‘before the event’.
- ‘Evaluation’ and ‘post-completion evaluation’ are broader than ‘benefits management’ and ‘benefits evaluation’. Evaluation provides learnings across multiple facets of an initiative. Benefits evaluation provides findings on benefits performance or outcomes achieved, which can be used to enhance an evaluation.

2. Benefits

The benefits of undertaking review processes (and the feedback arising from these processes) are:

- In the delivery step, cases can be identified where expected costs and benefits may not be realised, and corrective action developed.
- Future decisions can take account of lessons from past experience (see Figure 1).
- As a result, the effectiveness of future decisions (from planning to delivery) can be enhanced.
- These processes enable stakeholders to be provided with evidence-based explanations of why actual outcomes may have varied from expected outcomes.

Figure 1 The plan, deliver, learn cycle



VicRoads (2014)

3. Performance review principles

Resource limitations prevent all decisions, processes and outcomes from being reviewed, so careful thought must be given to how best to spend limited evaluation resources. This includes ensuring reviews are fit-for-purpose, scaled to size and complexity, and designed for the purpose and audience.

Reviews should be undertaken once a sufficient period of time has passed for a step to have taken effect, for benefits to be realised and for review data to become available. They should also take account of seasonal and other relevant factors. The review should also look at how transition to the operational state is progressing.

If the actual outcomes are markedly different from the desired outcomes, the evaluation should explore factors contributing to the variation.

Comparisons of actual outcomes with desired outcomes should be conducted within consistent timeframes. For example, it is unreasonable to compare desired outcomes for an initiative running over 15 years with actual outcomes after five years. Actual outcomes after five years should be compared with stated desired outcomes after five years.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the post-completion evaluation process. It shows that reviews should be undertaken at the various levels of the Framework. At each level, both process and outcome reviews should ideally be undertaken. In addition, reviews should consider both effectiveness and efficiency perspectives.


Box 1 Post-completion evaluation overview.

A post-completion evaluation seeks to broadly answer the following three key questions:

- **Did we do the right thing?**
This addresses the justification for an investment and whether the investment is still valid for the transport system objectives it set out to meet.
- **Did we do it the right way?**
This addresses all the components of how expected outcomes are being achieved, delivery aspects and implementation.
- **Were there better ways of achieving the results?**
This addresses good practices, lessons learned and ensuring continuous learning in transport system management.

This information from a post-completion evaluation can help inform the selection, design, delivery and operation processes of future initiatives and wider transport system management. The lessons learned can be disseminated to those responsible for planning and investment, and to the wider industry and public in general.

Figure 2 Post-completion evaluation



4. Evaluation of specific initiatives and programs

Post-completion evaluation of individual initiatives may consist of reviews of:

- How successfully the initiative/program was managed
- Whether the initiative was well delivered (e.g. timeliness, within budget, within scope)
- How the initiative influenced key performance indicators
- How well were initiative-specific transport related objectives achieved
- Whether the initiative helped or hindered the process of pursuing agreed transport system objectives and targets
- Whether the identified problem has been resolved or reduced as a result of an initiative, and whether the selected initiative was an effective way to address the problem
- Whether the best option was selected
- How actual benefits compared to expected performance
- Whether there were any unintended outcomes and whether the outcomes achieved more or less than expected
- The extent to which forecasts in the CBA were realised (e.g. construction costs, operating costs, demand levels, accident rates, other benefits)
- How the decision to proceed with the initiative was made.

Post-completion evaluations can be undertaken at different stages following completion of an initiative. Depending on the time elapsed, the focus of the review will change and the findings and lessons learnt will differ. For example, early reviews (6 to 12 months) could focus on ensuring that operations are running smoothly and that no barriers exist for benefits achievement.

The post-completion evaluation may extend to a full ex-post CBA and may also extend to reviewing wider impact assessments, such as environmental, regional, family and other impacts.

5. Evaluation of planning

After reviews at the initiative and program levels are completed, reviews at the various planning levels should be undertaken: link and route, corridor and area, network, transport and land use.

5.1 Corridor and area

For example, at the corridor or area level, the first step in the review should be to assess whether corridor or area objectives have been achieved. This analysis should be undertaken on a corridor-by-corridor or area-by-area basis, and consider all the initiatives implemented within each corridor or area.

For each corridor or area, actual outcomes should be measured and compared with the desired outcomes reflected in corridor or area objectives or targets. Where there is under- or over-performance, contributing factors should be considered in terms such as:

- Did the assumptions reflect ultimate reality?
- Was the analysis based on suitable and reliable data?
- What were the within-corridor or within-area impacts?
- What were the off-corridor or out-of-area impacts?
- Did off-corridor or out-of-area developments have an unexpected impact on outcomes?
- What were the cross-modal impacts?
- Did the corridor or area strategy help or hinder the attainment of agreed transport system objectives and targets?

5.2 Network

A similar review process should also be undertaken at the network level through comparing actual network performance with desired outcomes as stated in network targets, and through exploration for causes of under- or over-performance. This requires consideration of all actual outcomes across all corridors and areas.

If actual network performance does not meet the network targets, and hence does not contribute to meeting transport system objectives, several questions should be asked:

- Were sufficient corridor or area options identified and assessed?
- Was the focus across corridors or areas prioritised?
- Was this the best network?
- Is there a need to review the policy or program (e.g. review the national land transport program)?
- Is the set of transport system objectives appropriate?

- Did the network strategy help or hinder the attainment of agreed transport system objectives and targets?

5.3 Integration across transport and land use

In all planning reviews, integrated transport and land use objectives need to be taken into account in an explicit manner. This can be done by considering wider community outcomes such as housing availability and job creation in the areas or corridors under consideration.

6. Review against transport system objectives

A further important review step is to assess system performance against each system objective (e.g. efficiency, safety, security, environment, equity) and its performance targets. This requires the measurement of actual outcomes and comparing them with the stated, desired outcomes. For example, consider the reduction of fatalities as an objective. Any reduction in fatalities is clearly desirable. However, if a safety performance target of a 20 per cent reduction in the number of recorded fatalities over a ten-year period has been set, it is necessary to determine whether or not the initiative delivered against this target.

Once performance against each objective has been assessed, the review should assess the causes of any under- or over-performance.

The set of integrated objectives shown in Figure 3 in F1 provides an effective mechanism for reviewing the success of programs and their components. A review should progress through these objectives in reverse order from bottom to top - that is, from initiatives to the network (see Figure 2).

A final step in the review process may be to assess whether individual transport system objectives were conflicting and, if so, how that affected actual outcomes. Transport system objectives are often interrelated: achieving one objective may influence the degree to which another objective can be achieved.

Over time, as governments change or the emphasis of government objectives and priorities varies, there will need to be a review of transport system objectives, policy directions and strategies. This will be particularly important if there are gaps emerging in long-term strategic policy.

Review of the overall performance of the transport system aims to assess whether 'we are doing things right' (a technical or process efficiency question) and whether 'we are doing the right things' (an effectiveness question) to achieve the agreed, desired objectives and outcomes.

Together with ongoing stakeholder engagement and the evaluation of changing funding scenarios, the review process should guide the refinement of all steps of transport system development — from objective setting through to program delivery. The entire process relies on the presence of strong feedback loops between the Framework steps as well as two-way dialogue between agencies and their governments, communities and stakeholders.

Key questions would include:

- What were the actual transport system outcomes that eventuated?
- How do they compare with the desired transport system performance targets stated at the start of the process?

7. Review and improvement of the ATAP Framework and Guidelines

As discussed above, the review and evaluation of the overall collection of policies, strategies, plans, programs and individual initiatives should provide valuable insights into explaining why any differences between actual and desired outcomes are observed, and the contributing factors. These factors may include cost estimates, projected benefits, land use changes, timing of impacts and unintended impacts (positive or negative).

A further consideration is whether some of the differences between actual and desired outcomes are attributable to the underlying methodology in the Transport System Management Framework. To address this possibility, the Guidelines should be independently reviewed at appropriate intervals. Key questions would include:

- Did the Framework prove effective?
- What revisions to the Framework should be made to improve transport planning and assessment?

8. Data for evaluation

To undertake effective performance reviews and post-completion evaluations, the availability of necessary data is critical. This requires advanced planning of data needs, specific mention of evaluation data needs in planning documents, and then scheduling and collecting the required data (which may involve stakeholder consultation). This will ensure that the required data is available when the evaluation is actually undertaken.

It may also require data collection before initiative delivery to ensure baseline data is available.

9. Evaluation process

Note: This section comes directly from NGTSM06, Volume 3, section 2.20

Steps

1. Determine what is to be evaluated, the purpose and audience of the evaluation
2. Determine the standards of comparison
3. Determine the depth and frequency of post-completion evaluation
4. Appoint evaluators
5. Collect and assess data, prepare report
6. Undertake ex-post CBAs of selected initiatives

9.1 Determine what is to be evaluated

First, determine the subject of the evaluation. It could be a single initiative, a group of initiatives that have something in common, or an entire program of initiatives. It is also important to be clear on the purpose of the evaluation and the audience.

Second, decide on the stage, or stages, of the decision and implementation processes that are to be evaluated. Table 1 lists stages that might be evaluated.

9.2 Determine the standards of comparison

Post-completion evaluations can be applied to the process that led to the outcomes and to the outcomes themselves.

Process reviews look at how the outcomes were achieved. The outcome reviews can point to whether or not a process has worked well. But bear in mind that a faulty process can still produce a good outcome, due to luck.

Outcome reviews involve comparing actual with predicted outcomes. For an outcome review, the standards of comparison are external standards of desirable attributes of outcomes (e.g. correct CBA methodology) and benchmarks or forecasts established during a previous process. To streamline post-completion evaluations, set the benchmark levels during the appraisal and design stages (e.g. construction costs, physical quantities and unit costs of inputs, timing of construction, operating costs, demand levels, revenues, benefits, environmental impacts).

Carry out process and outcome reviews simultaneously for a single stage so that any process-related reasons for successes or failures can be explored. The outcome review at one stage can point to process issues in earlier stages.

Table 1 lists the stages at which process and outcome reviews can be undertaken and shows sources for standards of comparison for outcome reviews.

Table 1 Table 1: Process and outcome review stages

Process review	Outcome review	
	Actual outcome	Source of predicted outcomes
Identification, consideration of options	Initiatives identified	Government strategy documents, stakeholder views of options
Appraisal	CBA, SMT, other analyses, Business Case	Guidelines, knowledge of correct methodologies, technical publications, government strategy documents
Recommendation	Recommendation for or against	Business Case
Planning and design, budget development	Detailed specification of initiative, scope, cost estimates, risks during implementation stage	Business Case, design guidelines
Delivery	Initiative in place, actual costs	Business Case, plans and designs, budget
Operation	Performance	Business Case
Benefit evaluation	Benefit achievement	Business Case, Benefits Management Plan

The timing of the evaluation matters. A stage in Table 1 can be evaluated only after the stage has been completed.

As also shown in Table 1, review and evaluation activities are undertaken both ex-ante (prior to commencing delivery) and ex-post (from delivery to the end of an initiative's lifecycle). Post-completion evaluations are undertaken on an ex-post basis.

For the initiative operation stage, allow time to establish levels and trends with adequate certainty, and be selective about the variables assessed so as to avoid premature comparisons.

Following the initiative development stage, benefits evaluation can be undertaken to manage the realisation of planned benefits, as part of the post-completion evaluation. A benefit evaluation provides a comprehensive overview of both what an initiative has achieved and how this compares to what was expected (see Appendix D for a comparison of reviews, post-completion evaluation and benefits evaluation).

9.3 Determine the depth and frequency of post-completion evaluation

Subject all initiatives to some basic level of post-completion evaluation using benchmarks set during the appraisal and design phases.

To make best use of limited resources available for post-completion evaluation, for detailed evaluations select initiatives that are:

- Large

- Appear to have gone badly or exceptionally well
- A recurring type of initiative
- Particularly risky, including pilot initiatives for testing innovations
- Strategically important
- Long-term, undertaking interim evaluations (such as annually)
- Staged, undertaking evaluations of each stage
- Programs involving a series of smaller initiatives.¹

9.4 Appoint evaluators

Independent evaluators should be appointed to avoid bias and create objectivity and credibility. For smaller initiatives, it may be reasonable to use internal resources to undertake the evaluation.

Do not allow those responsible for the initiative to evaluate their own work.

9.5 Collect and assess data, prepare report

Having discovered where process or outcomes are good or poor, look for the reasons for the results. Separate consequences of internal management and planning processes from impacts of external factors. The aim is to identify lessons for the future: do not allocate blame for past mistakes or state what should have been done with the benefit of hindsight. Where external factors had an adverse impact, consider whether actions should be taken in the future to mitigate such occurrences.

Be wary of making recommendations for major changes to processes based on a single post-completion evaluation. Keep the recommendations in broad terms, suggesting a direction for change.

9.6 Undertake ex-post CBAs of selected initiatives

A post-completion evaluation may extend to an ex-post CBA. An ex-post CBA compares the actual outcome with a hypothetical base case in which the initiative does not exist. The central question is: 'With hindsight, how strong was the economic justification for the initiative?'

An ex-post CBA can seek to address the following questions:

- Have the forecast benefits been realised?
- What are the magnitudes of deviations between forecasts and actual outcomes?

¹ Based on Austroads (2005d, p.4)

- What caused the deviations?
- What lessons can be learned to improve future CBAs and thereby make it a more effective decision-making tool?

The following points are important in undertaking an ex-post CBA:

- Ex-post CBAs are concerned with the overall outcome of the initiative, not individual components.
- In ex-post CBAs, the base case is no longer observable. Challenges remain in constructing a plausible base case. The base case is not the 'state of the world' before the initiative commenced, although pre-implementation information is used for estimating base case characteristics.
- Ex-post CBAs involve analytical effort to estimate benefits and costs. Some elements are already known with complete certainty because they have occurred in the past. Planning, design and construction costs, infrastructure operating costs, demand levels, accident rates and physical levels of externalities are known with certainty up to the present time for the project case of an ex-post CBAs. With the exception of planning, design and construction costs, these all have to be estimated for the base case and projected into the future for both the base and project cases.

The original CBA could be used as the basis for the ex-post analysis by replacing the assumptions (costs, demand forecasts) with actual outcomes or updated forecasts. This type of exercise serves a secondary purpose of providing a review of the original CBA.

An ex-post CBA may be accompanied by an assessment of the broader regional, environmental, social and financial impacts of the initiative.

Findings from ex-post CBAs can be useful in improving the practice of CBAs of future initiatives.

Benefits evaluation can provide an input to ex-post CBAs by enabling access to the necessary information.

Appendix B provides an overview of the methodology for undertaking an ex-post CBA.

9.7 Example evaluations

Appendix A discusses specific evaluation examples drawn from Austroads (2005).


Appendix A Example evaluations

Each of the examples cited in this appendix has been developed for a different purpose and, as such, none of them includes all of the elements that ideally would be incorporated into a comprehensive post-completion evaluation report. Nonetheless, the examples highlight the types of variables that are investigated during post-completion evaluations and what lessons can be learned from the process.

A.1 Adelaide's O- Bahn Busway

The Adelaide O-Bahn Busway (pictured below) opened in 1986. The O-Bahn system involves the fitting of guide rollers to the front wheels of a conventional bus, which can then be driven either normally or on a guide-rail track that bypasses, for example, points of traffic congestion. A total of 12 km of Busway track were constructed, running between the edge of the Adelaide CBD and the north-eastern suburbs.

Figure 3 Adelaide's O-Bahn Busway



Source: *Wayte and Wilson (1989)*

The main objectives of the initiative were to:

- Increase accessibility between the north-eastern suburbs and the CBD by significantly reducing travel times and improving the reliability of bus schedules
- Reduce congestion on the existing road network.

The O-Bahn post-completion evaluations as described by Wayte (1991) were focused on the performance of the O-Bahn system and the outcomes of the initiative. In addition to the performance of the O-Bahn system, a series of before and after studies were conducted to assess user responses to the system (Pak-Poy & Kneebone Pty Ltd, 1990; Denis Johnston & Associates Pty Ltd, 1988, as cited in Wayte, 1991). Specifically, the following variables were assessed:

Technical performance of the O-Bahn system. The technical performance of the O-Bahn system was evaluated against design expectations. Events such as stoppages caused by the guidance technology, ride quality and vehicle breakdown were considered.

Safety performance of the O-Bahn system. The number of accidents that occurred per kilometre of travel on the O-Bahn system was compared with the accident rate of conventional buses. This is similar to the 'comparison of different groups' method described earlier (Austroads, 2005), whereby conventional buses (a group among which no initiative implementation had taken place) were compared with O-Bahn buses (a group among which the initiative was implemented).

Financial performance of the O-Bahn system. The budget set for the initiative was compared with actual expenditure, and the estimated costs of some elements of a conventional Busway were compared with the costs of the O-Bahn to evaluate the financial performance of the initiative.

Patronage. One of the variables measured in the assessment of patronage impacts was passenger volumes on the Busway corridor prior to its conversion to the O-Bahn system compared with passenger volumes after the conversion. In order to account for exogenous impacts on these figures (such as population growth), changes in bus patronage in Adelaide during the same time period were used as a comparison benchmark.

In defining the focus of attention (purpose) for the evaluation, it was noted that it is important for post-completion evaluations to provide clues as to why measured initiative outcomes have occurred. To investigate why new passengers were attracted to the Busway, a survey of Busway passengers was undertaken.

Reductions in motor vehicle volumes. An objective of the O-Bahn initiative was to reduce congestion on the existing road network. Congestion was not investigated directly, but factors assumed to be related to traffic congestion were investigated. Based upon observed increases in patronage before and after the implementation of the O-Bahn system on the route, and on passenger reports of prior mode of transport, the decrease in the number of vehicles travelling the route was calculated.

Changes in travel time. An objective of the O-Bahn initiative was to reduce the time taken to travel between the north-eastern suburbs and the Adelaide CBD. Bus travel time measurements were taken before and after the implementation of the O-Bahn system so that it could be determined whether this objective had been met.

The post-completion evaluation of the O-Bahn, as described by Wayte (1991) employed comparisons of factors at different points in time (patronage and travel time before and after O-Bahn implementation) and for different groups (accident rates of O-Bahn and conventional buses). An attempt was also made to determine the reasons for some of the changes that took place (opinion survey of O-Bahn passengers) and to address initiative objectives (travel times and traffic congestion).

A.2 Road upgrades at Lauderdale, Margate and Devonport (Tasmania)

The former Tasmanian Department of Infrastructure Energy and Resources (DIER) undertook ‘debriefs’ up to six key initiatives each financial year, a process that involved a range of stakeholders, including initiative managers, contract staff, initiative designers and initiative sponsors. The aim of the DIER debrief process was to seek and communicate the learning opportunities that arose during the implementation of the department's initiatives.

The table below presents a summary of the implementation issues, identified through the debrief process, that were encountered during three road upgrade initiatives undertaken by DIER. Adherence to the predicted timelines, budget and technical specifications were considered key initiative success factors (DIER, 2004).

Table 2 Issues encountered during post-completion reviews conducted by DIER

Aspect of implementation	Issue encountered	Learning opportunity identified
Initiative definition	Initiatives are poorly defined at inception	Initiatives should be well defined at the planning stage
Financial performance	Initiative budgets exceeded	As above
Design and technical specifications	Difficulties working with service authorities	Closer relationships between service authorities, designers and the department are required, and these relationships should be embodied under a memorandum of agreement executed at the planning stages of each initiative
Management of landowner issues	No clear process for consultation with landowners	Define the roles and responsibilities of various team members in relation to consultation with landowners within each phase of an initiative
Procurement	Late award of contract date	Review processes to bring works forward and take advantage of the full construction season

Maintenance	Poor handover of initiative from construction to maintenance phases	Departmental standard design brief to include maintenance requirements/ objectives during the design phase Departmental maintenance personnel to be a part of the initiative team and attend initiative inception meetings
-------------	---	---

These post-completion reviews have been used to provide learning opportunities that can guide improvements in the conduct of other initiatives - an important application of post-completion evaluations. For example, DIER - and its successor, the Department of State Growth - have used the learning opportunities provided by these post-completion reviews to improve the programming and delivery processes of all subsequent initiatives.

A.3 Department for Transport trunk road schemes

The United Kingdom Department for Transport (DfT) uses a cost-benefit analysis computer program (COBA) to establish the net present value of proposed trunk road schemes compared with a traffic scenario without the road scheme. The COBA program measures the benefits of road schemes as savings in journey time, vehicle operating costs and the value of reduced accidents. These benefits are assigned a monetary value which is then compared with the capital and operation costs of the scheme (Swift, 2001).

Knight et al. (1996) describe the post-completion evaluation of 11 trunk road schemes during which the actual Net Present Value (NPV) was compared with the NPV predicted using the COBA program, prior to the opening of the schemes. Unlike the two examples presented above, this post-completion evaluation was aimed more at assessing the initiative evaluation technique (that is, the COBA program) than the outcomes of the initiative or the initiative implementation process.

The difference between predicted and actual NPV was calculated by updating original COBA parameters (such as the value of time and of accidents) and substituting predicted traffic data - including traffic volumes, accident numbers and journey times - with measured data. The table below shows the stages involved in comparing actual NPV with the NPV of the initiatives as predicted by COBA prior to their implementation.

Table 3 Summary of stages in calculation of actual benefits of trunk road schemes


Stage	Description
COBA replication	Replicate the original COBA results, as obtained prior to trunk road initiative implementation
COBA rebasing	Change the discount rate and manually rebase predicted benefits to the latest Present Value Year (1988)
COBA updating	Update COBA economic values relating to time and vehicle operating costs, accidents, annual compound growth rates and maintenance costs

Updating traffic parameters	Update accident rates, occupancy rates and vehicle category proportions
Application of actual traffic data	Input observed traffic flow, observed vehicle category proportions, observed accident rates and adjust for factors such as road type Adjust COBA speed-flow curves and junction configurations to reflect observed journey time savings

Source: Knight et al. (1996)

This post-completion evaluation is an example of a comparison between real and predicted situations. Through the steps outlined above, it was possible to determine how some of the actual outcomes of trunk road initiatives, such as reductions in journey times, traffic congestion and accident rates, compared with the outcomes modelled by COBA. The following figure shows the predicted and actual NPV of each of the trunk road initiatives selected for post-completion evaluation as arrived at through the post-completion evaluation process. For example, NPV for Initiative A achieved more than three times the predicted value. The NPV predictions when considered in total were within 6 per cent of the NPV line of best fit. While results were found to be variable across different initiatives, it was found that the main source of inaccuracy came from difficulties in estimating initiative costs.

Figure 4 Actual and predicted weighted Net Present Values



Source: Knight et al. (1996)

A.4 The effectiveness of black spot treatment

The Bureau of Infrastructure Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE) has undertaken three evaluations of Federal Government black spot programs, the last being released in 2012 (BITRE 2012).

The Program's objective is to reduce the social and economic costs of road trauma by improving the physical condition and management of black spots. This is done by implementing traffic management techniques and other road safety measures that have proven road safety value. The purpose of the evaluations was to provide information to the Australian Government about the merits of continuing to fund black spot treatment.

The most recent evaluation aimed to include all Australian Government funded black spot projects approved during the seven-year period 1996-97 to 2002-03 inclusive and that had been completed. The final database used for the regression analysis contained 1599 projects, which was 62 per cent of the 2578 projects in scope. Crash data from project sites covered periods up to seven years before and after project implementation. The database contained 31 522 casualty crashes and 40 302 property damage only (PDO) crashes.

The evaluation addressed three principle questions.

1. How effective are black spot treatments in reducing crash rates?
2. How many crashes are avoided and lives saved annually as result of the program?
3. Is the program a good use of resources compared with alternatives?

The first two questions were answered using statistical analysis — Poisson regression — which compares crash counts before and after black spot projects. Crash reduction factors were estimated for 20 categories of treatment type for different crash severity groups. The National Black Spot Program was estimated to be reducing fatal and casualty crashes in total at treated sites by 30 per cent and property damage only (PDO) crashes by 26 per cent. Roundabouts were the most effective treatment, reducing casualty crashes by over 70 per cent and PDO crashes by 50 per cent. New signals during daylight hours and altering the traffic flow direction were the next most highly effective treatments for most severity levels, reducing crashes by more than 50 per cent. No treatment types were found to systematically increase crashes.

Using the statistical model to predict expected crashes with and without the treatments in a given year (2006), each project was estimated to be saving 1.7 reported crashes per year on average. For individual severity levels, average reported crashes avoided per project per annum were 0.01 fatal, 0.11 serious injury, 0.55 minor injury, 0.61 injury, 0.62 casualty and 1.1 PDO.

The third question, which concerns the economic worth of the program, was answered using cost–benefit analysis. The estimated numbers of crashes avoided over the lives of treatments were multiplied by unit crash costs to obtain the annual benefits and these were discounted over the lives of the treatments. In economic terms, the National Black Spot Program was found to have performed well overall, achieving an estimated benefit–cost ratio (BCR) of 7.7 at a 3 per cent discount rate and 4.7 at a 7 per cent discount rate based on estimated casualty crashes avoided and project construction, operating and maintenance costs. Subtracting costs from benefits, the average net present value per project was \$1.4 million at a 3 per cent discount rate and \$0.7 million at a 7 per cent discount rate.

Appendix B Proposed steps in undertaking an ex-post CBA

BITRE's ex-post CBAs are undertaken as follows:

1. Provide a description of the project (design, cost, timing and history of the project)
2. Locate and review ex-ante or initial CBA(s)
3. Identify issues in ex-post evaluation (mostly emerging from the review of ex-ante CBAs)
4. Replicate the ex-ante CBA
5. Collect data for the ex-post CBA (for example, traffic and crash data)
6. Update traffic and crash forecasts
7. Undertake the ex-post CBA (including adjusting model inputs, updating model parameters and making other project-specific corrections)
8. Compare results between ex-ante and ex-post CBAs
9. Explain the difference
10. Draw lessons.

An important consideration in undertaking an ex-post CBA is the potential timeframe associated with the process. This may be quite lengthy for larger scale initiatives and may not be cost effective for small scale initiatives.

For published examples applying the methodology, see BITRE (2007a and b).

Appendix C Review and post-completion evaluation – transport focus vs detailed engineering focus

The ATAP Guidelines focus on best practice for transport system management. This includes system planning and the associated identification and justification of initiatives to solve priority problems (which in turn contributes to achieving transport system objectives).

The post-completion evaluation or review guidelines (described in this document, F7) seek to evaluate how effective a selected strategy, policy, plan or initiative has been in achieving set targets and goals. The findings seek to inform future decision-making in planning and initiative selection, and provide a basis for continuous improvement and development in transport system management.

The purpose of this appendix is to note that some post-completion evaluations and reviews focus specifically on detailed engineering aspects of individual initiatives, rather than their transport aspects. These reviews cover specific engineering aspects of an initiative, such as design, construction and project management. There can also be a specific design review, which considers specialist design discipline aspects, such as structural, civil, fire engineering, building services/mechanical, architectural, network architecture, etc. The purpose of these reviews is to critically assess the achievement of an initiative's engineering outcomes and provide feedback that allows for continuous improvement in the project management, design, construction and delivery processes.

These engineering reviews seek to achieve the following:

- Ascertain whether the initiative has delivered and met the original user requirements, design philosophy and instructions as well as efficiency of design and functionality
- Ascertain whether the user groups are satisfied with the end product (specific high points) or not (specific low points – what and why?). This should also include design, engineering and project management consultant feedback
- Advise on any general or specific project control, management, health and safety, cost and design efficiency observations
- Provide details on the achievement against project budgets
- Provide details on the effective and efficient use of contingency funds
- Review the effectiveness of the contract in mitigating risk and contributing to a successful project outcome, consistent with the project scope.

Appendix D Review, evaluation and benefits evaluation

Throughout the ATAP Guidelines, reviews can be carried out of processes undertaken in each particular step. A post-completion evaluation provides key learnings in various facets of an initiative including implementation, project management, design and cost.

Benefits management is an overarching framework to ensure benefits are monitored and achieved post-delivery. It ensures that the identification, tracking, monitoring and realisation of benefits is undertaken in a structured, transparent format with accountability defined. It is a holistic approach that spans across the ATAP Framework lifecycle. Benefits evaluation forms one aspect of benefits management and provides essential information comparing the target benefits for an initiative, which are set prior to a decision to proceed, against actual performance once an initiative is implemented.

There is some synergy between benefits evaluation and post-completion evaluation. Benefits evaluation provides findings on actual benefits performance or outcomes achievement that can be used to enhance a post-completion review exercise.

Further, the data used in benefits evaluation can provide input into an ex-post CBA in a post-completion evaluation.

It is important to note that timing of benefits evaluation and post-completion evaluation can be different in some instances. In some situations, a post-completion evaluation can be undertaken 6 to 12 months following delivery and implementation of an initiative. Depending on the scale of the initiative, not all of the benefits identified may have been achieved within this timeframe and consideration needs to be given to allowing some time in benefits evaluation for the ramp-up of some benefits. Alternatively, the findings of benefits evaluation and post-completion evaluation should reflect this appropriately.

The concept and process of benefits management/realisation is discussed in T6.

References

- ATC 2006, National Guidelines for Transport System Management in Australia, Vol 2, Australian Transport Council, Canberra
- ATC 2006, National Guidelines for Transport System Management in Australia, Vol 5, Australian Transport Council, Canberra
- Austrroads 2005, Guide to Project Evaluation – Part 7: Post-completion Evaluation
- BITRE 2007a, Ex-post economic evaluation of National Highway projects: Case study 1: Wallaville Bridge, Working paper 70.1, Canberra, ACT. http://bitre.gov.au/publications/2007/files/wp_070-1.pdf
- BITRE 2007b, Ex-post economic evaluation of National Highway projects: Case study 2: Northam Bypass, Working paper 70.2, Canberra, ACT. http://bitre.gov.au/publications/2007/files/wp_070-2.pdf
- BITRE 2012, Evaluation of the National Black Spot Program Volume 1 BITRE Report 126, Canberra ACT. http://bitre.gov.au/publications/2012/files/report_126_1.pdf
- BTRE 2014, Overview of project appraisal for land transport, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, Canberra, ACT. http://bitre.gov.au/publications/2014/files/overview_of_project_appraisal_for_land_transport.pdf
- BTRE 2016, Methodology for Ex-post Cost Benefit Analysis, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, unpublished internal paper, Canberra
- Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources 2004, Personal communication
- Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet 2013, Cabinet Implementation Unit Toolkit Monitoring, Review and evaluation, Canberra, available at <http://www.dpmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/pmc/implementation-toolkit-5-monitoring.pdf>
- Infrastructure Australia 2011, National Public Private Partnership Guidelines Volume 7: Commercial Principles for Economic Infrastructure, Canberra, available at http://infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/policy-publications/public-private-partnerships/files/Vol_7_Commercial_Principles_Economic_Infrastructure_Feb_2011.pdf
- Knight P, Powell G, Faber O and Whittaker B 1996, Post-completion scheme evaluations: where the COBA assessments accurate? Proceedings of Seminar D&E-Part 2 Transportation Planning Methods2-6 September 1996.
- Massey University 2014, Capital development post completion review policy, available at <https://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/fms/PolicyGuide/Documents/Finance/Capital%20Development%20Post%20Completion%20Reviews%20Policy.pdf>
- Swift S 2001, The public sector: The new approach to transport appraisal. British Economy Survey, Vol 30 at http://www.ac777.dial.pipex.com/bes/bes_spring2001/toc.htm
- Transport for NSW 2013, Principles and Guidelines for Economic Appraisal of Transport Investment and Initiatives
- VicRoads 2014, Investment Evaluation Framework– Post Completion Evaluation
- Wayte A 1991, 'O-Bahn Bus Way Post Evaluation'. Proceedings of the Australian Institute of Traffic Planning and Management National Conference: Adelaide, SA

Wayte A and Wilson T 1989, Northeast Busway, Adelaide: Operating system and Performance. Proceedings of the International Seminar on Guided Bus Rapid Transit, p. 26 – 40.

