## Auckland Council Quality Advice Standards



Focus on the decision-makers	
Purpose, context and recommendations	<ul> <li>Is the purpose of the report clearly stated?</li> <li>Is it clear why this issue needs attention from decision-makers at this point?</li> <li>Is there sufficient background/context to inform the discussion and decision(s)?</li> <li>Are previous resolutions referenced?</li> <li>Does it explain linkages to wider issues, including relevant strategy?</li> <li>Are the recommendation(s) clear and concise? Will they achieve the purpose?</li> <li>Could the purpose, executive summary and recommendation sections stand alone?</li> </ul>
Anticipation of needs and responsiveness to priorities	<ul> <li>Does the item relate to a topic on the approved forward work programme? If not, why?</li> <li>Does the report anticipate, and address, the needs and priorities of the decision-makers?</li> <li>Are the next steps clear and supported?</li> </ul>
Risk and mitigation	Does the report identify the relevant risks and indicate how they will be managed?
Credible analysis	
Problem definition	<ul><li>Is the problem or opportunity clearly defined?</li><li>Is the scale of the problem or opportunity clear?</li></ul>
Framework, options and impact assessment	<ul> <li>Are all practicable options identified, including the status quo?</li> <li>Are the options analysed using an appropriate model and assessment criteria?</li> <li>Is the level of analysis in proportion to the problem?</li> <li>Are there compelling and logical reasons for the preferred/dismissed options?</li> <li>Have the relevant impacts of the options been assessed, including any trade-offs?</li> <li>Has implementation been addressed?</li> <li>Does the analysis/discussion lead logically to the recommendations?</li> </ul>
Data and evidence	<ul> <li>Are the results of appropriate stakeholder engagement clear?</li> <li>Does the analysis include relevant data and evidence?</li> <li>Is the data and analysis accurate?</li> <li>Is the report explicit about the strengths, sensitivities, and limitations of the evidence?</li> </ul>
Clear and concise	
Language	<ul> <li>Does the report use plain English without jargon?</li> <li>Are any acronyms defined up front?</li> <li>Are key terms used consistently throughout the report?</li> <li>Does the report use short, active sentences and paragraphs?</li> <li>Is it easy to read and understand? Is any of the writing awkward or clumsy?</li> <li>Is it free of spelling or grammatical errors, and consistent with <i>Our Voice</i>?</li> </ul>
Structure	<ul> <li>Is the structure concise and uncluttered?</li> <li>Is the story told in a logical sequence?</li> <li>Does it use meaningful subheadings?</li> <li>Does the executive summary cover the key points of the report?</li> </ul>
Format	<ul> <li>Is the format appropriate for the situation and audience?</li> <li>Are tables and charts used to make it easy to understand?</li> </ul>