Project Assurance Review

Prepared for the Department of Treasury and Finance

[Insert project name] [Insert date]

The Secretary

Department of Treasury and Finance

1 Treasury Place

Melbourne Victoria 3002

Australia

Telephone: +61 3 9651 5111

Facsimile: +61 3 9651 2062

dtf.vic.gov.au

Authorised by the Victorian Government

1 Treasury Place, Melbourne, 3002

Printed by XXXXXXXXXXX

Printers address XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Printed on recycled paper.

© State of Victoria 2018



You are free to re-use this work under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), provided you credit the State of Victoria (Department of Treasury and Finance) as author, indicate if changes were made and comply with the other licence terms. The licence does not apply to any branding, including Government logos.

Copyright queries may be directed to IPpolicy@dtf.vic.gov.au

ISBN 978-1-925551-18-1 (pdf/online/MS word)

Published September 2018

If you would like to receive this publication in an accessible format please email information@dtf.vic.gov.au

This document is also available in Word and PDF format at [dtf.vic.gov.au](http://www.dtf.vic.gov.au)

Contents

[1. Report information 1](#_Toc525741599)

[1.1 Review details 1](#_Toc525741600)

[1.2 Review team 1](#_Toc525741601)

[1.3 The purpose of a Project Assurance Review 1](#_Toc525741602)

[1.4 Conduct of the Review 2](#_Toc525741603)

[2. Assurance assessment summary as at [insert date] 2](#_Toc525741604)

[2.1 Review team findings 2](#_Toc525741605)

[2.2 Observations of good practice 2](#_Toc525741606)

[2.3 Overall delivery confidence assessment 2](#_Toc525741607)

[2.4 Red rated Individual recommendations 3](#_Toc525741608)

[2.5 Recommendations from previous reviews (including Gateway Reviews) and the Recommendation Action Plan (RAP) 3](#_Toc525741609)

[3. Findings and recommendations 4](#_Toc525741610)

[3.1 Coherence of the Project 4](#_Toc525741611)

[3.2 Project management 4](#_Toc525741612)

[3.3 Risk management and governance 4](#_Toc525741613)

[3.4 Interdependencies, interfaces with other activities and stakeholder engagement 5](#_Toc525741614)

[3.5 Resources and capability 5](#_Toc525741615)

[3.6 Benefits realisation 5](#_Toc525741616)

[3.7 Readiness for next phase 6](#_Toc525741617)

[4. Planning for the next Review 6](#_Toc525741618)

[Appendix A 7](#_Toc525741619)

[Purpose of a Project Assurance Review 7](#_Toc525741620)

[Terms of Reference 7](#_Toc525741621)

[Appendix B 8](#_Toc525741622)

[Summary of individual recommendations 8](#_Toc525741623)

[Appendix C 9](#_Toc525741624)

[Interviewees 9](#_Toc525741625)

[Appendix D 10](#_Toc525741626)

[Documents reviewed 10](#_Toc525741627)

[Appendix E 11](#_Toc525741628)

[Red Amber Green (RAG) definition 11](#_Toc525741629)

[Individual recommendations (criticality) 11](#_Toc525741630)

[Overall assessment (delivery confidence) 11](#_Toc525741631)

* + 1. Report information
			1. Review details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Version number:** | **[Insert Draft 0.1,0.2,0.3 or Final 1.0]** |
| **SRO Name:** | **[Insert SRO name]** |
| **Date of issue to SRO:** | **[Insert date]** |
| **Department:** | **[Insert name]** |
| **Agency or PNFC:** | **[Insert name]** |
| **Review dates:** | **[Insert dates dd/mm/yyyy to dd/mm/yyyy]** |

* + - 1. Review team

|  |
| --- |
| Review Team members: |
| **[Insert name of team leader]** |
| **[Insert name of team member]** |
| **[Insert name of team member]** |
| **[Insert name of team member]** |

* + - 1. The purpose of a Project Assurance Review

**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) and departments or agency (as the deliverer), 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.**

**The intended audience for the report has been identified in the Terms of Reference (ToR). A copy of the report will be provided to DTF.**

**Appendix A gives the full purpose statement for a PAR and ToR.**

* + - 1. Conduct of the Review

**This Project Assurance Review was carried out from [Insert: Date 1] to [Insert: Date 2] at [Insert: location of review].**

**The stakeholders interviewed are listed in Appendix B.**

**Delete where not applicable: Appendix C shows a list of documents received and reviewed by the review team.**

**[Insert a note of thanks to the SRO and the client team. e.g. The Review Team would like to thank the Client X Project Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team’s understanding of the Project and the outcome of this review].**

* + 1. Assurance assessment summary as at [insert date]
			1. Review team findings

The Review Team finds that [Insert a brief statement outlining the Review Team’s view of the status of the project].

* + - 1. Observations of good practice

[Insert instances of significant good practice found, especially those that may be transferable to other programs and projects.]

|  |
| --- |
| Good practice examples |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

* + - 1. Overall delivery confidence assessment

Overall delivery confidence assessment:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **R** | **A** | **G** |

* + - 1. Red rated Individual recommendations

All individual recommendations arising from Program Assurance reviews, are to be reported to the Treasurer outlining the risk mitigation/s utilising a Recommendation Action Plan (RAP). Click on the hyperlink to download a Recommendation Action Plan.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

* + - 1. Recommendations from previous reviews (including Gateway Reviews) and the Recommendation Action Plan (RAP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes/No/NA |
| The previous review reports were provided to the review team. |  |
| The Review Team considered the previous reports during the conduct of the review. |  |
| The Recommendations from previous reviews were appropriately actioned? |  |
| A Recommendation Action Plan (RAP) was prepared as a result of previous reviews. |  |
| The RAPs were provided to the review team for consideration. |  |
| The RAPs have been implemented (where applicable)? |  |

The Review Team finds that [Insert a brief statement commenting on the adequacy of the actions taken in regard to all of the individual recommendations (Red and Amber) from previous reviews, and specifically the mitigation responses to and implementation of any Red recommendations as identified within a RAP].

* + 1. Findings and recommendations

A summary of all the individual recommendations can be found in Appendix B.

* + - 1. Coherence of the Project

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Is the delivery approach coherent in terms of structure, staging, engagement and control?**
		- **Is the project still aligned with the approved Business Case?**
		- **Have the recommendations from the previous review been addressed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Project management

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Are estimates for the program costs and benefits reasonable?**
		- **Are there appropriate plans that include procurement approach, risk management, change management and program control to enable the transition to the development stage?**
		- **Is there a program schedule? Are the key milestone dates achievable?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Risk management and governance

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Are there appropriate plans for risk management, contract management and Governance to enable the transition to the development stage?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Interdependencies, interfaces with other activities and stakeholder engagement

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.]**

* + - **Has the full range of interdependencies, and interfaces with stakeholders and activities been mapped out, and planned for?**
		- **Is there support from stakeholders for the program? And are they engaged?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Resources and capability

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Is there adequate capability and capacity (internal/external resources) to enable transition to the development stage?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Benefits realisation

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Have clearly defined objectives and outcomes been articulated for the next stage against which progress and performance can be monitored?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Readiness for next phase

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. **Where appropriate, include recommendations (in bold text) relating to individual findings including the RA assessment.**]

* + - **Is there a sufficient level of assurance that the program is strongly positioned to proceed to the next stage?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + 1. Planning for the next Review

According to the project’s current schedule, the next Program Assurance Review should occur [Insert appropriate month and year and rationale].

The Department should confirm the requirement and timing for the next Review approximately 8-10 weeks prior to the above date.

Should there be any significant changes to the project schedule that would alter the date above, please notify the Gateway Unit.

# Appendix A

## Purpose of a Project Assurance Review

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) and departments or agency (as the deliverer), 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.

The review process provides an opportunity for Government to be advised of any areas of concern regarding the program’s progress and provided with recommendations to improve its deliverability. The intended audience for the report is the [insert audience here]. A copy of the report will be provided to DTF.

## Terms of Reference

As defined in the document ‘Attachment 1: [Insert appropriate attachment details here].’

# Appendix B

## Summary of individual recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Appendix C

## Interviewees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Role |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix D

## Documents reviewed

|  |
| --- |
| Name |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

# Appendix E

## Red Amber Green (RAG) definition

There are two levels of RAG Status for a project that must be given, using the colour-coded indicators **Red**, **Amber** or **Green** described below. These include:

* Red (Critical) and Amber (Non Critical) for individual recommendations;
* Red, Amber or Green Delivery Confidence assessment for the overall project.

## Individual recommendations (criticality)

The introduction of the RAP has resulted in a change to how individual recommendations are assessed. In the past individual RAG assessments have taken criticality and urgency into consideration. For example if a project had very little time to address a critical recommendation, the recommendation was classed as red. If there was time to address the critical recommendation, then the recommendations was classed as Amber. This was even though the issue and its criticality was still identical to the red rating.

Individual recommendations are now classified as either Critical (Red) or Non Critical (Amber) as per the diagram below. Green is no longer used for individual recommendations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Non-critical recommendation** | **Critical recommendation** |
| The project would benefit from the uptake of the recommendation | Action required |

Criticality – Individual recommendations\*

## Overall assessment (delivery confidence)

An Overall Assessment (Delivery Confidence) is also required for each review based on the definitions below. When determining the Overall Assessment the Review Team should refer to the Areas Probed Assessment and their own judgement/expertise to determine the most suitable Delivery Confidence rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall report** | **Overall report** | **Overall report** |
| Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely. | Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist, requiring timely management attention | Successful delivery of the project to cost, time and/or quality does not appear achievable. |
| There are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly. | These issues appear resolvable at this stage and, if addressed promptly, should not impact on cost, time or quality | The project may need re-baselining and/or the overall viability reassessed. |

**Delivery confidence**