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# The Project Assurance Review

## Executive summary

The Project Assurance Review (PAR) is part of the Department of Treasury and Finance’s (DTF) assurance framework. The PAR aims to provide timely independent advice to both Government (as the investor), departments or agency (as the deliverer) and DTF, on the current progress and the objectives, governance and readiness of a project or program. The PAR process is designed to improve delivery confidence, provide assurance, reduce ‘scope creep’ and provide a wider stakeholder engagement than other processes may allow.

PARs apply when a project requires further investigation, such as when a project is experiencing problems or requires expert review. It complements the Gateway Review Process (GRP), which is mandatory for all High-Value/High-Risk (HVHR) projects. Projects are designated as HVHR if they have:

* a total estimated investment (TEI) over $250 million;
* a TEI of $100-250 million and have been assessed as medium to high risk; or
* have been classified as high risk regardless of TEI.

PARs can apply to a range of programs and projects including policy, infrastructure, and ICT-enabled business projects. PARs involve public sector and/or private sector practitioners using their experience and expertise to examine project progress and likelihood of success.

While the GRP involves short, intensive reviews at six critical points (‘Gates’) in the project lifecycle, PARs can be applied at any point during the project or program, and commissioning of the reviews are not dependent on key milestones. Additionally, PARs involve the development of bespoke Terms of Reference (ToR) to meet the specific assurance needs of a project or program. The ToR also identifies the intended audience for the report.

The PAR process is run by DTF, in consultation with the Office of Projects Victoria (OPV), and delivery departments and agencies. OPV was established by Government in 2016 to improve planning and implementation of infrastructure projects in Victoria. A PAR can also be requested by the Treasurer, the responsible minister, department, agency, or project/program SRO.

## Background and purpose

The assurance gaps in the GRP, particularly between contract award and readiness for service, has been identified by many jurisdictions who employ the GRP.

In 2011, the UK Government introduced PARs due to the need for an additional independent assurance process beyond the GRP. The UK PAR is predominantly run by the Infrastructure and Projects Authority. In the UK, a PAR is initiated through a workshop chaired by the Review Team Leader (RTL) and attended by the Review Team, SRO and project team members, to explore key issues to be investigated during the review in a greater depth than is normally possible in the planning meeting and/or a Gate review. This includes the opportunity to develop the ToR ahead of the review.

In Victoria, PARs were introduced for ICT projects in 2016 to provide departments and agencies with relevant and appropriate advice, and to provide Government with independent review of the progress of a project.

In 2018, DTF identified several enhancements to its assurance processes through extensive consultation with SROs, review teams, senior executives of delivery agencies, as well as with other jurisdictions including New Zealand, New South Wales, and the United Kingdom.

As a result, DTF has expanded the use of PARs and they will be considered for high value high risk projects and programs following a funding decision. DTF will prepare a Project Assurance Plan (PAP) to plan the extent of assurance functions to be applied. PARs can be scheduled according to project milestones, as detailed in the project schedule. The PAP is a live document and the need for a PAR could also be identified during the course of a project’s lifecycle depending on what issues are impacting on the delivery of the project.

Summary table of the Project Assurance Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PAR key features | Summary |
| **PAR purpose** | Designed to improve delivery confidence, provide assurance, reduce ‘scope creep’ and provide wider stakeholder engagement than other processes may allow. |
| **Scope of PAR** | Based on the individual needs of a project. Examples include:   * a deeper investigation of specific issues or analysis of a project experiencing problems to determine the root cause(s) of failure; * a broad strategic analysis across several complex issues and/or cross-government dependencies; and * identification of potential cost savings.   A PAR does not replace the need to ensure that projects undertake Gateway Reviews as part of HVHR requirements. |
| **Governance** | Administered through the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF), in consultation with the Office of Projects Victoria (OPV). Reviews can be led by DTF or OPV. |
| **Identifying the need for a PAR** | PARs are scheduled through a Project Assurance Plan (PAP) prepared by DTF following a funding decision. The PAP is a live document and the need for a PAR may also be identified during a later phase of a project’s lifecycle. PARs can be conducted shortly before a decision point is reached or when the project or program is identified as being in difficulty or in need of investigation.  A PAR can also be requested by the Treasurer, the responsible minister, department, agency, or project/or program SRO. |
| **Review Team** | DTF, in consultation with OPV, and the relevant department or agency, will select a Review Team with appropriate skills and experience for the needs of the project and the PAR. Members are selected in consultation with the project team to identify and address any conflicts of interest. |
| **Terms of Reference** | DTF is responsible for developing ToR in consultation with departments and agencies as appropriate. PARs will comprise of bespoke ToR, based on specific project issues. |
| **Confidentiality** | Interviews are carried out on a non-attributable basis to encourage openness. SROs should ensure that all interviewees are informed of this to encourage full and frank discussion throughout the review. |
| **Cost of the PAR** | Costs are met by the party initiating the PAR unless negotiated otherwise. |
| **Review period** | To be defined in the ToR (approximately three to ten days). The Review Team interviews key stakeholders, with the final day to finalise and present the report. |
| **Department/agency requirements** | Project/program teams should host and provide DTF and/or OPV with as much documentation as possible to assist the Review Team to understand the project, formulate the ToR and determine the most appropriate stakeholders to interview. |
| **Report** | Review Team issues a report addressing the ToR which will be presented to the SRO at the conclusion of the PAR. The report will be circulated to DTF and to the audience as identified in the ToR. |
| **Audience** | The audience of the PAR report will be identified in the ToR and may include the SRO, DTF, OPV, project steering committees, Treasurer and any relevant ministers. |
| **Recommendation Action Plan (RAP)** | A RAP similar to that of the GRP will be required for all individual recommendations in a PAR report. |

* + 1. Project Assurance Review guidance
       1. Governance of the PAR
          1. PAR governance

The PAR report will be provided to the responsible Minister and the Treasurer assessing the performance and viability of the investment. Reports will also be provided to SROs, and DTF to allow a transparent understanding of the findings and enable an appropriate response to the recommendations.

The audience of the PAR final report will be identified in the ToR and may include the SRO, DTF, OPV, project steering committees, the Treasurer and any relevant ministers.

OPV may be consulted in establishing a PAR, and may also lead the commissioning of a PAR particularly where there are technical scope and cost issues impacting on a project.

The review team will comprise of independent members nominated by DTF and/or OPV. The team members are nominated based on their skills and experience relevant to the project or program.

* + - * 1. PAR Terms of Reference

The PARs will address bespoke ToR directed to specific issues or concerns as required. DTF will be responsible for developing the ToR for the PAR in partnership with the SRO and project teams, based on specific project issues. A ToR template is provided at **Attachment 1**.

* + - * 1. Key scope of PARs

Key scope for PARs could include:

* + - the capability, capacity, sufficiency and level of understanding of the project team (internal and external) to deliver the project (and recommend whether to change or add to the project team and its processes);
    - the adequacy of leadership committed to the project;
    - the capability, capacity and level of engagement of the governance team to achieve the investment outcomes (and recommend whether to change or add to the governance team and its processes);
    - whether the department (service delivery area) is prepared for the complexity inherent in necessary service delivery changes;
    - the effectiveness of management of major project risks, issues, stakeholders, contracts and urgent actions;
    - whether to continue, change or exit the project in the light of the operational context, dependencies, risks or any option decision points;
    - whether the project budget and schedule, and any contingency, is adequate and being managed appropriately; and
    - whether the project is on track to deliver its forecast benefits and whether the benefits remain relevant based upon any changes in service needs, context, and constraints of scope, time or budget.

Where appropriate, the PAR may need to consider and review in a structured way the adequacy of the organisation’s standard processes including (but not limited to) management of scope, costs, schedule, benefits, risks, procurement, business change, communications, and governance. **Attachment 2** provides a list of questions that can inform the scope of individual reviews. The list is not exhaustive and the questions for review should be based on the individual needs of a project.

The PAR Review Team will study previous outcomes of reviews and project documentation and will interview key stakeholders. Where available, the Review Team will consider assurance advice that has been provided by others, for example, the Department’s own assurance, audit and investment decision-making processes.

The Review Team will focus on the investigation and capture evidence for the designated audience of the PAR report. In their report, the Review Team will highlight areas for further investigation and will provide recommendations to the project team.

The key output of the PAR will be the final report, produced on a standard template. The report will provide an overview of evidence and issues identified.

All individual recommendations in a PAR report with a red rating are to be reported by the project team to the DTF outlining the risk mitigation/s in a Recommendation Action Plan (RAP) (using the standard GRP template).

* + - 1. Applying the PAR to different projects or programs

The PAR can be applied to budget-funded HVHR projects, which will capture most projects in need of additional assurance processes. Departments and Government can also nominate non-HVHR projects to undergo a PAR review, including where a project has been funded through an internal revenue source.

* + - 1. When the PAR should take place

Timing of the PAR is flexible, however a PAR should take place when a project is reaching a key milestone or when it is identified that a project requires further investigation or may be experiencing problems. DTF will work with departments and agencies to establish the need for a PAR, but DTF may also initiate the PAR based on their knowledge of the project.

A PAR can be used where the need for additional assurance is required to assist a project that is in difficulty. For example:

When a planned assurance and/or approval process has recently identified poor delivery confidence and consequently the need to carry out further investigation and analysis; and

In special circumstances, for example, when the Treasurer, responsible minister, the department, DTF and/or other key stakeholders have significant concerns about the likelihood of successful delivery and further investigation and analysis is required.

Additionally, a PAR may also be commissioned, over and above the project’s standard assurance arrangements, such as when a project has not had any independent assurance from DTF for more than twelve months. The ToR must be signed off by the SRO, DTF and, where appropriate, by OPV.

* + 1. Implementation of the PAR (Operations)
       1. Planning a PAR

DTF and OPV, in consultation with the project or program team, will identify and agree the dates for the review and the skills and experience required for the Review Team. DTF and OPV will select a Review Team with appropriate skills and experience to match the needs of the project and the PAR.

Normally the team will comprise up to 5 reviewers, a mix of public servants and consultants, who are members of the Gateway reviewer pool. In some circumstances, when this pool cannot provide a reviewer with the relevant experience and availability, DTF will source an appropriate external consultant to be included in the Review Team.

The project team should provide DTF and OPV with as much documentation as possible to assist the Review Team to understand the project, formulate the ToR and determine the most appropriate stakeholders to interview.

The SRO will be required to attend the detailed planning day and be available throughout the review period, particularly for the final feedback session.

Each PAR team is led by an experienced Review Team Leader (RTL), who is supported by the Review Team Members (RTM). This RTL is responsible for managing the Review Team to deliver an effective assurance review process, through the planning stages and the review itself, and provide the final report to the SRO and to the audience as identified in the ToR.

In arranging the PAR, DTF will address the following criteria to understand the scope of the review and the likely timing:

* + - Understand the key characteristics of the project, including the nature and scale of the risks involved, and any particular sensitivities;
    - Identify where the project is in its lifecycle, especially any upcoming approvals scheduled in the PAP;
    - Identify the purpose, parameters and priorities of the review;
    - Identify which elements of the scope cannot be covered by the standard assessment processes, and will therefore require a bespoke approach;
    - Agree who is the senior sponsor (SRO) for the review and who is the primary recipient of the report, as well as any additional report recipients;
    - Agree an initial list of interviewees and supporting documentation;
    - Agree the length (duration) of the review, size of the Review Team and the team’s required skills and experience;
    - Agree the timing for the review and any key dependencies that may affect it;
    - Agree preferred dates for the review, including the Planning Day, and;
    - Agree the logistics for the review, address security constraints and document handling requirements.

The project team will, with support from their DTF analyst and in discussion with the Gateway Unit, continue identifying suitable interviewees, arranging the timetable and logistics for the period of the review, providing appropriate pre-reading for the Review Team (e.g. relevant web-links and key project documents) and notifying the Review Team of any security implications around the documents supplied.

* + - 1. The planning day

Prior to the commencement of the PAR, a Planning Day will be held between the Review Team, SRO, Project Manager/Director and any necessary representatives from DTF or OPV.

The purpose of the planning day is to determine the exact scope and expectations of the review, including any areas of concern and any elements considered not appropriate for the PAR. The project team will provide the Review Team with a presentation on the status of the project or program. The Review Team will decide on the stakeholders they would like to meet and any additional documentation they may require. The ToR may be finalised in consultation with the project team, the Review Team, DTF and OPV at the planning day.

It is important that the scope of the PAR is defined clearly, is achievable within the review period and is agreed by the SRO before the review starts. This will enable the Review Team to deliver a report that addresses the key areas of concern and provides appropriate assurance and relevant recommendations on the way forward.

The RTL will chair the planning meeting and will liaise thereafter with the department on the detail. As they may not have met beforehand, the Review Team may need to meet before meeting the SRO and his/her colleagues. The formal meeting with the project team should include at least an hour with the SRO, including agreement of the scope and code of conduct for the review.

Establishing a code of conduct (a statement of professional principles applicable to everyone involved) at the outset of any assurance review is essential to ensure that the Review Team and their departmental contacts adopt uniform working practices and standards. Some typical items for an assurance review code of conduct include:

* + - Challenging but constructive style from the Review Team (critical friend approach);
    - Robust management of time;
    - Confidentiality and non-attribution of interview comments;
    - Openness and honesty from all participants; and
    - No surprises at the end – regular feedback to the SRO throughout the review.

It is the responsibility of the hosting department to arrange for security passes or to escort the Review Team for the planning meeting and throughout the review process and to arrange for provision of any ICT equipment required by the Review Team for drafting and presenting the PAR report.

Planning days normally run for three to five hours. They should be held one to two weeks before the review to provide sufficient time for the Review Team to examine the project or program documentation and provide sufficient notice to stakeholders that an interview will be required. The project team arranges a venue for the planning day, provides lunch and refreshments for the Review Team and organises interviews. Where required, OPV or DTF may host and facilitate the planning day.

* + - 1. The PAR Review days

The length of the PAR should be confirmed through the ToR. The Review Team spends the review period interviewing key stakeholders, usually on an individual basis. The discussions are usually held at the site of the review, however the Review Team allows for situations such as site visits, senior stakeholders with time restraints or travel restrictions, and so on. The purpose of interviews is to:

* + - build a broad picture of the project from a spectrum of key parties, e.g. different levels of seniority and role within the project team, departmental stakeholders and service providers (especially commercial/procurement), private sector suppliers, external stakeholders, etc.;
    - explore key risk and issue areas, particularly with specialists who have more detailed knowledge than the project team;
    - fill any information and knowledge gaps for the delivery confidence assessment and around the remaining areas of the agreed scope; and
    - challenge and explore, from different perspectives, the Review Team’s emerging assumptions and findings. The evidence from the document reading will be combined with the evidence from the review interviews to help reach a conclusion on the delivery confidence for the project.

PAR interviews are all carried out on a non-attributable basis to encourage openness. The SRO should support the RTL in ensuring that all interviewees are informed of this at the outset to encourage full and frank discussion throughout the review.

The SRO should be satisfied that the Review Team is there to help the project to succeed. The interview schedule and the SRO’s diary should therefore be arranged so that the Review Team can provide regular feedback to the SRO and ensure they are kept abreast of emerging findings during the course of the review and that the SRO has early opportunity to respond to any emerging findings of the Review Team.

The RTL is also responsible for keeping DTF informed of progress during the review. The RTL should also provide DTF or OPV with an opportunity to respond to any emerging findings before the review report is finalised.

On occasion, the scope of a PAR may change during the course of the review and/or as feedback is given to the SRO each day. If significant issues outside of the original scope arise during the course of the review, the RTL will discuss with the SRO and DTF/OPV whether or not to cover these in the final report. The RTL is required by DTF/OPV to record in writing any agreed change in scope, and to notify DTF/OPV of it, before implementing the change.

The SRO should be available to meet the Review Team on the final day. Other members of the SRO’s team or organisation, and DTF/OPV may also be present at this final feedback session.

* + - 1. The Report

At the end of the review, the Review Team will present the SRO with its findings and recommendations and a draft report. The RTL, in conjunction with the RTMs, will draw together the draft report, using the PAR report template provided by DTF, which reflects the findings related to the ToR, including an overall delivery confidence assessment.

The Review Team will issue the project or program with an overall deliverability confidence rating, and the individual recommendations with a red, amber or green (RAG) status, as follows:

**▶ red** critical and urgent, to achieve success the project or program should take action on recommendations immediately;

**▶ amber** critical and not urgent, the project or program should go forward with action on recommendations to be addressed before further key decisions are taken; and

**▶ green** the project or program is on target to succeed but may benefit from the uptake of recommendations.

The SRO is given the opportunity to provide their comments on the review in the report and correct any factual inaccuracies or grammatical errors. The RAG status given is non-negotiable.

Subject to the SRO making factual corrections, the RTL is responsible for completing and delivering the final report within 5 working days of the review being completed. The report and copies will be provided to the SRO, DTF and OPV. The mechanism to report on outcomes of the PAR to Government will be agreed between the SRO and DTF/OPV. Departments are encouraged to share the report with areas of their department who would benefit from lessons learnt.

The project team must advise the Review Team of the appropriate security classification of the draft and final versions of the PAR report.

The Review Team will destroy all notes, documents and materials relating to the review after the final feedback session.

* + - 1. After the PAR

DTF always seeks feedback from the SRO, RTL and RTMs after delivering a PAR. Honest feedback from review sponsors is essential in helping DTF maintain the quality of its assurance reviews, and for training, supporting and managing the accredited reviewer pool. The feedback forms and discussions are treated as confidential and are neither circulated nor published by DTF.

* + - 1. Terms of Reference

The independent PARs will likely be bespoke and directed to specific issues or concerns as required. The ToR will be initially developed by DTF in consultation with OPV.

A draft ToR will be provided to the project team and the SRO for input and amendment. DTF will ultimately be responsible for drafting and approving the ToR.

The ToR will address bespoke questions, designed to address specific characteristics of the project and/or of the assurance requirement. Questions may be framed around key decision points, current project milestones or the difficulties specific to the project at the point in time. Questions should take in to consideration the specific areas of focus of the PAR and should be designed to guide the Review Team in their interviews and assessment of documentation.

A detailed sample of the core ToR questions is provided in **Attachment 2**.

* + - 1. Review Documentation

The project team will provide the Review Team with relevant project documentation at the Planning Day and prior to the Review commencement. The required information is likely to be found in the documents suggested below, but may be located in other program or project documents, or elsewhere in the organisation’s documentation system:

* + - project management documents, including:
      * full market documents including scope of works/specification;
      * functional requirements document;
      * strategies for managing risks and issues, plus plans and a risk register showing identified and managed risks;
      * plans for implementing business change and handling future change;
      * service management documents defining how services will be managed, how performance will be measured, and outlining responsibilities for client and supplier;
      * the benefit management strategy, benefit management plans and responsibilities for delivery;
      * the delivery strategy, including a procurement strategy, if appropriate; and
      * the operational requirement and draft contract.
    - business case and benefits plans for each of the acceptable bids:
      * to confirm the delivery strategy;
      * to confirm negotiated and agreed solutions remain within the original criteria;
      * realistic supplier plans for development and implementation;
      * an evaluation report recommending the selected supplier or partner; justification of the selected supplier; details of close contenders; and plans for the debriefing of unsuccessful suppliers;
      * an outline of tender decision plans and plans for the next phase;
      * an updated time plan developed with the selected suppliers;
      * an updated communications plan; and
      * confirmation of funds and authority to proceed.
    - for construction projects, updated health and safety file operational and maintenance instructions such as maintenance and operation manuals, and warranties.

# Attachment 1 – Terms of Reference standard template

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **[Project/Program Name] Project Assurance Review**  **Context and Terms Of Reference** | **Month/Year** |

### Context

[Context and background to be advised by project team].

### Purpose of the Project Assurance Review (PAR)

This PAR aims to provide timely independent advice to Government, as the investor, on the current progress and the objectives, governance and readiness of the project.

The review process provides an opportunity for Government to be advised of any areas of concern regarding the project’s progress and provided with recommendations to improve its deliverability.

At the completion of the PAR the Review Team will distribute the PAR report to [audience to be advised].

### What the Review Team will look at

The review is to consider [main purpose of the PAR for this project], to provide advice on the project’s readiness to succeed or recommendations to improve its deliverability. This will include consideration of: [select or add as necessary]

* governance;
* outputs and outcomes for the project;
* coherence of the project;
* project management;
* procurement and contract management;
* interdependencies, interfaces with other activities and stakeholder engagement;
* risk management and governance;
* resourcing and capability ;
* costs and benefits; and
* readiness of [project] as the project moves into [phase].

The following questions have been designed to assist the Review Team:

* [see some example questions ToR at Attachment 2].

The Review Team will be expected to have a reasonable level of knowledge in technical policy domains as they relate to the public sector.

Review Team members will comply with DTF guidance regarding HVHR framework and Project Assurance Review Process, including maintaining confidentiality of all report documentation, processes and outcomes, and returning all documentation for disposal at the conclusion of the review.

### Review report, timing and location

The review will occur over [3–10 days tbc] days from [date to be advised].

The review will be held at [venue to be advised].

The Review Team will provide the SRO with a verbal and draft written report at the end of the review. The SRO will have the opportunity to comment and correct any factual inaccuracies.

The finalised report from the review will be provided to the [audience to be determined] within one week of the review (i.e. no later than close of business **[deadline to be advised]**).

### Key personnel

[Project Program] SRO is [SRO to be advised].

The Review Team will comprise independent members nominated by the Department of Treasury and Finance in consultation with the Office of Projects Victoria.

The Review Team will be provided logistical support by representatives from [Project/Program] operations team.

The DTF Executive Director is Dean Tighe.

[Project/Program] will provide the Review Team with full access to documentation, staff and stakeholders to inform the review. Comprehensive documentation will be provided to the Review Team before the review starts.

# Attachment 2 – Guidance questions for developing the ToR

### Project Assurance Review

The [insert project name] HVHR Project Assurance Review (PAR) may examine in detail key aspects of the project specific to particular stages of the project. The following questions can assist the preparation of ToR. These should be considered as guidance only.

### Business case and stakeholders

* Is there a clear understanding of the outcomes to be delivered by the project and are they sound? Is there a robust investment logic map and investment concept brief?
* Does the project demonstrate a clear link with wider government objectives?
* Is there an understanding of the scope of the project?
* Does it overlap or interface with other internal or external projects, how is this managed?
* What is the full extent of the project envisaged and why?
* Is the scope of work feasible within the constraints of the existing budget envelope?
* Is the scope of works consistent with baseline requirements for other similar facilities?
* Are estimates for the project costs and benefits reasonable? (Is there a detailed budget?).
* What will constitute success?
* Who are the stakeholders and how are they engaged with the project? Do they support it?
* What are the component sub-projects and why is it structured in this way?
* Is the proposed project affordable?
* What else could affect success?
* What assumptions is the project based on? What are the major constraints for the project?
* Have project controls been determined, especially where constituent projects will be joined with other organisations?
* Has a delivery strategy been developed?

### Management of intended outcomes

* Have the required outcomes for the project been identified?
* Are the planned outcomes still achievable, or have any changes in scope, relationship or value been properly agreed and has the business case been reviewed?
* Are key stakeholders confident that outcomes will be achieved when expected?
* Is the project time critical? Is it on track to deliver?
* Is there a plan for achieving the required outcomes?
* Does the project need to comply with broader government or departmental timing requirements?
* Is the planning and/or delivery on track?
* Confirm the business case including the benefits management plan now that the bid information has been received and assessed.
* Confirm that the objectives and desired outputs of the project are still aligned with the wider organisation’s business strategy and/or the project to which it contributes.

### Risk management and governance

* Have the major risks been identified?
* How will risks be managed?
* Are there established Governance structures in place, and have they been reviewed as the project moves into Delivery?
* Have assurance measures for the project been put in place?
* Is there a contingency plan and a business continuity plan?
* Have lessons from similar projects been considered?
* Are risks and issues associated with the implementation phase being properly identified and managed?
* Have the risks and issues identified at contract award phase been resolved?
* Have all stakeholder issues been addressed?

### Procurement and tender evaluation

* Check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement/evaluation process.
* Confirm that the recommended contract decision, if properly executed within a standard, lawful agreement, is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and will provide value for money.
* Ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion, including contract management aspects.
* Ensure there is continuing support for the project.
* Confirm that the approved procurement strategy has been followed.
* Confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the client and the supplier/partner are sound and achievable.
* Check that the business has prepared for developing new processes where needed and for implementing and operating new services or facilities, as well as the transition process.
* Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business) and that these plans are shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners.
* Confirm that the technical implications, such as ‘buildability’ for construction projects; and for IT-enabled projects information assurance and security, the impacts of e-government frameworks have been addressed.
* Confirm that the proposed procurement is within financial approvals, with adequate budget to accommodate it.

### Benefits

* Is there a process to manage and measure benefits?

### Project assurance

* Is there a process for post implementation reviews?
* Is the project under control? Is it running according to plan and budget?
* Have changes to the contract been forecast, accurately recorded and approved?

### Project management

* Are estimates for the project costs and benefits reasonable?
* Is the Project still aligned with the approved business case?
* Does the project need to comply with broader government or departmental timing requirements?
* Is the project on track in relation to planning and/or delivery?
* Have problems occurred and if so how have they been resolved?
* Have options for potential ways forward been identified?

### Operational readiness

* Are relationships occurring with stakeholders in accordance with their operating agreements?
* Is the organisation ready for business change?
* Can the organisation implement the new services and maintain existing services?
* Is the organisation ready to manage the contract?
* Is ownership after handover clearly understood?
* Is the long-term contract management process in place?

### Technical readiness

* Have all new process testing and commissioning and /or acceptance or transition procedures been completed?
* Have all parties accepted the commissioning and/or test results and any action required?
* Are there workable and tested business contingency, continuity and/or reversion plans for rollout, implementation and operation?