# Overview

## Objective

To ensure that MCP results across the City are developed to the same quality standard.

This procedure defines that quality standard

## Roles, Responsibility and Authority

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role | Responsibility | Authority |
| Asset Manager | To follow the procedure if an individual other than the Asset Manager enters data into the MCP template |  |

# Procedure details

### **Benefit Scoring and Residual Risk Assessment**

#### **Objective**

To ensure that MCP results are consistent and accurate.

#### QC steps

* Check random projects to validate the benefit scoring and residual risk assessment
* If inconsistencies are found, determine who performed the scoring and/or risk assessment and review all other MCP entries done by the individual.
* If many inconsistencies are found, expand the sample size of the QC review to the entire data population.

#### QA Step

* Discuss with a specific BC author or IP planner any consistent scoring or risk assessment with noted issues. Based on that discussion, determine if of existing BCE or MCP scoring procedures need review or further training is required.
* Present any consistent QC issues to the Corporate Asset Manager to ensure that processes and procedures can be revised to address the noted issues.

# References and/or Resources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Title | Description | Document Location |
| Investment Planning Manual |  | SharePoint |
|  |  |  |