

Peer Review - Mandatory Review Stage One Report

Up Front Check on the Business Case and the Adequacy of Arrangements.

(To be completed before any market exercise).

Project Title: Biometrics in Passports

Project Sponsor: Mr Ray Bassett

Sponsor Contact: Mr Joe Nugent

Project Team: Peter Ryan Margaret Doherty
Liam Kidd

Guide to completing Report:

This report should be completed in electronic form only. All questions should be answered by the review team by providing a tick in the appropriate box. In the event of a negative response the comments/suggestions of the review team should be included directly beneath that question. While the review teams comments/suggestions are also welcome in the event of a positive response it is not necessary for all questions covered.

For some questions, no answer boxes will be provided. In such instances the comments of the review team are essential. The review team is also asked to include any additional general comments/suggestions/recommendations etc. in the space provided.

1. Policy and Organisational Context: preconditions for success

1.1. Does the project reflect the current policy and organisational environment?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

1.2. Is there commitment to key roles and responsibilities for this project within current corporate priorities and is there clear accountability?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

The document supplied shows an appropriate project management structure, with roles and responsibilities clearly thought out, including ownership at MAC level.

As the project develops it is important that the Project Board meet on a regularly basis, as well as the Project Team.

1.3. Does the review team feel that the strength of governance structures being proposed for the project under review is adequate?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

1.4. Are the review team satisfied that there is a clarity of vision in terms of policy, business or customer needs that will be met?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

1.5. Does the review team believe that the project may be too big and beyond the organisations current development or operational capacity?

Yes

No

N/A

☐☒☐

1.6. Does the review team consider that the project fits with other projects and with existing cultures and architectures?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

1.7. Does the review team consider that the new processes will fit with other projects and existing cultures?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

The “fit” of this project relative to existing systems and the business processes has been set out in detail by the Department, who have identified the various implications and how they ought to be addressed.

There is a concern on the part of the Group in relation to the impact of existing cultures. Those concerns are addressed in detail at 2.7 – 2.9

2. The Business Case: scope and stakeholders

2.1. Does the scope of the project fit with the Department’s business strategy?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

2.2. Is there a clear understanding within the organization of the scope of the project to ensure successful delivery?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

2.3. Does the review team consider the project objectives and requirement specifications to be complete?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

The Group consider that the project objectives are clear but the requirement specifications will not arise until the next stage

2.4. Is there a clear and agreed understanding of business goals and how the project will deliver these?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

2.5. Is the Business Case presented acceptable in terms of its contribution to customer service?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

2.6. Is the Business Case presented acceptable in terms of its contribution to fulfilling the organisations ICT strategy?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

2.7. Have all the relevant stakeholders who will be impacted by the development and implementation of the project been identified?

Yes	No	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.8. Have all likely stakeholders needs been clearly understood?

Yes	No	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.9. Are all relevant stakeholders bought-in to the project?

Yes	No	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.7 – 2.9

The Group noted that the Department has identified the relevant stakeholders. It also notes that the Department has identified the importance to the Project of public acceptance and of the need to be pro-active in gaining this. In addition to inclusion of this matter in the Risks Register, the Group is of the view that it should also be included as a critical success factor.

The Group notes that senior management in the Passport Office will be members of the Project Board, Steering Committee and Project Team. They feel that, in addition, there should be a process for consultation with key staff on the ground who will operate the system and who may have inputs that would benefit its design and integration.

2.10. Does the review team consider the project requirements to be stable?

Yes	No	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.11. Is there any evidence in the business case presented of:

ambiguity/incomplete specification?	Yes	No	N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
creeping user requirements?	Yes	No	N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
changing user requirement?	Yes	No	N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The business case is well thought out and presented. None of the factors in this question are apparent at this stage of the project.

2.12. Does the review team believe that each of the following has been identified?

All critical success factors	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
All major constraints	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
All major dependencies	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

See comment at 2.7-2.9 in relation to public acceptance.

2.13. Have all the resources needed for long term support been factored in?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

The Group notes the intention to have a separate procurement shortly for ongoing Maintenance and Support, post implementation of the new system.

2.14. Will they have any implications for existing arrangements?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

2.15. Does the review team agree with the conclusions reached in the business plan on cost effectiveness, value for money and the adequacy of the financial case, including affordability? (Review Teams Comments required here)

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

The Group believe that the business case for the Project is well presented and credible. It notes that the requirement for the Project is the result of factors over which the Department has no effective control and is driven by international developments.

There is a clear articulation of the project scope and objectives, a realistic appreciation of the risks that may be encountered and a clear understanding of the scale and likely cost.

The extensive tendering process should promote VFM, particularly as the outcome will be a fixed price contract.

2.16. Does the review team consider the outline implementation plan and associated schedule including expected costs to be adequate? (Details on how these costs were derived should also be provided here).

Yes

No

N/A

☐
☐
☒

The matter of costs has yet to be determined. Comments in relation to the high level timetable available at this stage are addressed at 4.7

2.17. How and how often will these expected costs be monitored when they occur?
(Comments of Review Team only required here)

The Group notes the proposals for fortnightly meetings of the Steering Committee at which it will be necessary to demonstrate clearly defined and quantifiable deliverables.

As the contract is to be fixed-price, a strong change control process will be important as development commences.

3. Management of intended outcomes

3.1. Does the review team believe that there is a clear understanding of the outcomes needed from the project?

Yes

No

N/A

☒
☐
☐

3.2. Does the review team feel that these are soundly based?

Yes

No

N/A

☒
☐
☐

3.3. Have the main outcomes been identified?

Yes

No

N/A

☒
☐
☐

3.4. Does the review team believe that the planned outcomes are achievable?

Yes

No

N/A

☒
☐
☐

3.5. Is there a plan for achieving the required outcomes?

Yes

No

N/A

☒
☐
☐

The high level plan that presently exists is appropriate at this stage of the projects.

However, there will be a need to broaden the plan beyond the technical, to include specific arrangements for getting stakeholder buy-in (e.g. public acceptance), for change management, resolution of issues relating to photograph quality, etc.

3.6. Are the principal stakeholders confident that outcomes will be achieved when expected?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

4. Project Management, Leadership and support

4.1. Does the review team believe that Senior Management is committed to and willing to accept and lead the necessary change?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

4.2. Is there any evidence of a lack of user involvement or executive support?

Yes
☐

No
☒

N/A
☐

4.3. Has the team and its leadership a history of making things happen and achieving results?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

The Group notes that the team has been involved in delivery of large projects in time critical situations, that many have experience of the recent APS project and that the lessons of that project will be applied to this project.

4.4. Have the individual responsibilities of the project stakeholder roles, owner, key project board members and other essential roles been clearly defined?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

4.5. Does the review team consider that all financial, time, HR, IR or legal constraints have been adequately addressed?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

4.6. Does the review team consider that the proposed project management arrangements are adequate?

Yes
☒

No
☐

N/A
☐

4.7. Does the review team believe that the proposed project plans and timescales are achievable?

Yes

☐

No

☐

N/A

☐

The Group notes that the time for delivery of the project is very tight, as a result of international requirements over which the Department has no effective control.

The Group has concerns as to whether the high level timetable can in practice be achieved – although it appreciates why the Department is obliged to pursue such an aggressive timetable. There will be a need to make provision for the Peer Review/Process and CMOD approval in accordance with the new procedures. The timeframe for the contractor team set-up looks particularly optimistic.

It will be necessary for the project managers to closely monitor progress vis-à-vis the timeline at frequent intervals in order that the project will proceed at the best possible pace.

4.8. Does the review team believe that the target business area has the ability to implement and run the solution in a live operational environment?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

4.9. Is the review team satisfied with the numbers and experience levels of the in-house team, its resilience to staff losses, staff transfers, promotions or more urgent work?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

4.10. Does the review team believe that there is proper and effective communication and co-ordination of activities between the various internal authorities associated with the project?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

The Group believe that the management structures described will facilitate proper and effective communication

5. Risk Management

5.1. Does the review team feel that sufficient emphasis has been placed on the identification of risks?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

5.2. Does the review team consider the project risk and contingency plans, allowances and fallback plans to be adequate?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

The Group notes the fallback plan set out in the supplementary material provided by the Department of Foreign Affairs

5.3. Are there processes to identify, assess, allocate and monitor current, anticipated and emerging risks?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

6. Readiness for next stage – procurement strategy

6.1. Does the project require external procurement?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

6.2. Is the review team satisfied with the expected approach to this procurement?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

The Group note that the project has been advertised in the official Journal and on the Government eTenders website. It has elicited 19 Expressions of Interest, of which 8 have been invited to tender. This approach is in line broadly with procurement requirements. It is a matter for the Department to satisfy itself that the detailed requirements of the procurement procedures are followed.

6.3. Is a draft tender document (RFT) currently available?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

6.4. Is the review team satisfied that there is a clear understanding within the organisation of the scope of what is being proposed in terms of its magnitude, forecasted cost and difficulty?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

See comments at 2.15

6.5. Does the review team believe that the project being proposed is too ambitious, too big, too complex and too reliant on new technologies? (Review teams comments only required here)

The Group believes that the project is realistic in scale and in what it sets out to achieve. There is undoubtedly some modest risk in terms of whether the technology will deliver the required result, but this risk is no greater than what would generally be present in any project that depends upon the deployment of new technologies

6.6. Does the review team believe that the project should be re-phased as a programme of smaller related projects that are individually less risky?

Yes

☐

No

☒

N/A

☐

Additional general comments/ suggestions/ recommendations of Peer Review Team: