

Peer Review Report

Tender Evaluation

Project Title **ICT establishment of Garda Siochána Ombudsman Commission [case management System]**

Project Sponsor **Garda Siochána Ombudsman Commission**

Sponsor Contact **Tom Maguire**

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

Date **18th May 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

Senior management team now in place.
Technical manager (on contract) in place until end of 2007.
IT Strategy in advanced stage of preparation.
Sanction for use of external IT resources received.

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

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

Comment

Senior management team now in place.
Technical manager (on contract) in place until end of 2007.
IT Strategy in advanced stage of preparation.
Sanction for use of external IT resources received.

2. Evaluation Procedure

2.1 Was the evaluation procedure implemented as documented in the RFT?

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

Comment

The GSOC project team has provided the tender evaluation report to the Peer Review team.

2.2 Has the tender evaluation process been documented sufficiently?

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

Comment

The GSOC project team has provided the tender evaluation report to the Peer Review team.

--

2.3 Has the tender evaluation process been implemented in a fair and equitable manner?

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

Comment

All tenders initially evaluated leading to shortlist of four. Following more detailed evaluation the successful tender was selected from the shortlist.

2.4 Has the evaluation process identified an outright winner?

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

Comment

3. Preferred Solution

3.1 Does the preferred solution meet all the business goals of the project?

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

Comment

The case management software proposed is due to go live in May 2007 in the office of the Police Ombudsman of Northern Ireland.

3.2 Is the proposed project plan and timescale realistic and achievable?

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

Comment

“Big bang” approach rejected by GSOC. Phased implementation (based on prototyping) agreed with successful supplier.

3.3 Are the forecasted project costs realistic?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Phased approach to project implementation will allow for ease of management and stricter control of the project by GSOC.

4. Risk Management

4.1 Have all major risks for the preferred option been identified?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Phased approach to implementation has potential to mitigate the project risks.

4.2 Have contingency plans, allowances and fallback plans been proposed/developed?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Fallback computer system in place (based on Microsoft ACCESS).
Also manual system in place.

4.3 Is there a risk register in place?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

High-level risk register in place. Needs to be expanded and updated on a regular basis.

4.4 Has sufficient emphasis been placed on the identification and management of risk?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

High-level risk register in place. Needs to be expanded and updated on a regular basis.

5. Next Stage

5.1 Should the project be piloted or prototyped prior to a major implementation?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

The successful supplier has agreed to a prototype approach to project implementation.

5.2 Is the organisation ready to proceed to the next stage?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

New senior management team in place and fully committed to the project.

6. Process Review

6.1 Has all the documentation and information required to carry out an analysis of the evaluation been provided?

Yes

☒

No

☐

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

Yes

No

√	
---	--

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

Yes	No
√	

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

Presentation made to Peer Review team by GSOC project team and by GSOC senior management.

10. Peer Review Group's Findings

10.1. 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

A formal management structure for the project should be put in place and documented. This will facilitate a formal reporting structure for the project as it progresses.

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

It is important that a formal change control mechanism is put in place to ensure (1) project cost control and (2) that the project deliverables meet the requirements as specified in the request for tender.