

Peer Review Report

Contract Review

Project Title **ICT establishment of Garda Siochána Ombudsman Commission [Case Management System]**

Project Sponsor **Garda Siochána Ombudsman Commission**

Sponsor Contact **Anthony Duggan – GSOC Director of Administration**

Peer Review Group **John Murphy** **Seamus Crowe**
 Sean O hAilpín **Robert Butler**

Date **October 2007.**

1. Context

1.1 Have all issues raised by the review team in previous reviews been adequately addressed?

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

Comment

A formal management structure for the project has been put in place and documented.

Draft formal IT Strategy for GSOC developed.

1.2 Have any changes taken place since the last review that significantly impact on this project?

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

Comment

The timeline for a Phase 1 partial delivery has been moved from Nov. 2007 to March 2008 to take delivery of a fully functional Case Management System in one release.

2. Contract

2.1 Does the proposed solution still meet the business objectives?

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

Comment

New requirements concerning data migration from the existing interim system to the new Case Management system has been addressed.

2.2 Was appropriate legal expertise available to the project team in the contract negotiations?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

GSOC's legal advisers have been involved in the entire contract negotiation process.

2.3 Is the contract a fixed price?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

2.4 i) Have payments to the contractor been tied specifically to stated deliverables?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Schedule of deliverables and associated payments set out in Project Initiation Document.

ii) Are appropriate penalties in place for failure to meet stated deliverables?

Yes

☐

No

☒

Comment

GSOC have stated that penalties have not been included although retention at end of Project and delay of payment throughout will ensue for incomplete/inadequate or late delivery.

2.5 Has a detailed schedule of costs, including possible changes, been developed?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Schedule of deliverables and associated payments set out in Project Initiation Document.

2.6 Has a detailed project plan and timescale been defined?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Project Initiation Document (PID) has detailed project plan and timescale defined.

3. Project Management

3.1. Has there been an adequate level of project team involvement in the proposed project plan and schedule?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Project plan identifies key players and their roles.

3.2 Has there been an adequate level of stakeholder involvement in the proposed project plan and schedule?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Senior management team are members of the Project Implementation Board.

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Change Control procedures have been agreed and documented.

3.4 Are the roles, responsibilities and performance criteria for the governance of the project clearly defined?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Project plan, project board and dedicated project team in place.

3.5 Are all necessary reporting and communication mechanisms in place?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Reporting and communication mechanisms defined and documented.

3.6 Have performance measures been put in place to cover all aspects of the contract?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Phased delivery with clear deliverables defined.

3.7 Has an approach to benefits realisation measurement been developed?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Identifiable benefits defined in Project Initiation Document.

3.8 Is the approach being adopted to the management of a consortium suitable (where applicable)?

Yes

No

N/A

☐☐☒

Comment

3.9 Are mechanisms in place to ensure that the experience and quality of the developers assigned remains the same throughout the life of the project?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Documented in the Project Initiation Document. The Peer Review team have been informed by GSOC that ICS (the contractor) have committed named individuals to the life of the project.

4. Risk Management

4.1 Have all major risks to the development and implementation of the project been identified?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

Risk Register in place. The Peer Review team agree with the keys risks identified

by the project board.

4.2 Have contingency plans, allowances and fallback plans been agreed?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

Comment

Interim system will continue to function.

4.3 Is there a comprehensive and detailed risk register in existence?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

Comment

Risk Register in place. The Peer Review team agree with the keys risks identified by the project board.

4.4 Is there an appropriate schedule for review of this register?

Yes

No

N/A

☒☐☐

Comment

Reviewed at monthly Steering Committee meeting.

5. Next Stage

5.1 Is the contractor ready to begin the project?

Comment

Yes.

5.2 Is the organisation ready to sign the contract and proceed to development?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

6. Process Review

6.1 Has all the documentation and information required to carry out an analysis of the business case been provided by the project team?

Yes

☒

No

☐

6.2 Was documentation available in a timely manner in advance of briefing sessions?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment: In the case of the latest meeting it would have been beneficial if documentation could have been circulated earlier.

6.3 Have requests for clarifications been dealt with promptly and in a manner which engenders confidence in the project team?

Yes

☒

No

☐

N/A

☐

6.4 Has the project team co-operated fully with the review group? (Please comment here if there were any aspects of the conduct of the review which had an adverse impact on the group's capacity to carry out an effective review).

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

The positive affect of an in-house project team has become apparent to the Peer Review team.

7. Peer Review Group's Findings

7.1 i) The project, as presented, should continue to the next stage.

Yes

☒

No

☐

ii) The project, as presented, should continue to the next stage. However, the following issues should be addressed:

Issues to be addressed

The Quality Assurance role of the full-time Testing Manager needs to be clearly defined and documented

iii) The project, as presented, should not continue to the next stage until the following issues have been addressed:

Issues to be addressed before proceeding to the next stage

iv) The project, as presented, should not continue to the next stage due to the following:

Reasons for discontinuing the project

Any other comments

Comment