

Peer Review Report

Contract Review

Project Title **Courts Service Digital Audio Recording Project**

Project Title: Digital Audio Recording (DAR)

Project Sponsor: **Courts Services**

Sponsor Contact: **Mr. John Coyle**

Project Team: **Darach Green, Project Manager**
 Diarmaid MacDiarmada

Peer Review Group **Conan McKenna** **Tim Willoughby**
 (Chairperson)

Joan Connolly **Brian Curtis**

Date **3 December 2007**

1. Previous Review

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

Comment

Yes. The previous review concluded that there was a need to identify clear benefits in order to quantify the success of the project. The Courts Service have very adequately addressed this issue.

1.2 Have any changes taken place since the last review that significantly impact on this project? **NO**

Comment

Tender and contract review were simultaneous

2. Contract

2.1 Does the proposed solution still meet the business objectives? **YES**

Comment

The proposed solution at contract stage is still fully focused on the original business objectives.

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

Comment

Courts Service assured the review team that they have a major solicitors firm on board and are covering all identified legal issues in the contract.

2.3 Is the contract a fixed price? **YES**

Comment

The review team were fully assured that the contractor is locked into a fixed price and is carrying the risk at each different stage.

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

Comment

Progress milestones have been set out in a detailed project plan and will not progress beyond pilot unless pilot successful.

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

YES

Comment

Penalties in place and Courts Service and Contractor used to outsourcing relationship.

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

YES

Comment

2.6 Has a detailed project plan and timescale been defined? **YES**

Comment

This is really focused on the pilot for the time being following which, as per review team recommendation on the Tender stage, there should be a further peer review intervention.

3. Project Management

3.1. Has the Steering Group / MAC approved the proposed project plan and schedule?

YES

Comment

MAC involvement was set out to the review team by the Courts Service

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

Comment

As presented to the review team by the Courts Service there has been full internal involvement.

--

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

Comment

Courts Service assured the project team on stakeholder involvement.

3.4 Are the proposed decision making structures, including change control, adequate? **YES**

Comment

Proposed decision making structures, including change control are adequately provided for though Courts Service emphasise that risk on costs is transferred to the Contractor.

3.5 Are the roles and responsibilities for the governance of the project clearly defined? **YES**

Comment

Review team satisfied that these are very clearly defined.

3.6 Are all necessary reporting and communication mechanisms in place? **YES**

Comment

Reporting and communication mechanisms provided for.

3.7 Has an approach to benefits realisation measurement been developed? **YES**

Comment

Courts Service hardened up considerably on benefits realisation issue since the previous stage as requested by the review team.

3.8 Is the approach being adopted to the management of a consortium suitable? **YES**

Comment

Adequately addressed. The main Contractor takes full responsibility and there is no direct relationship with subcontractors.

--

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**

Comment

This is adequately addressed by the Courts Service for 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**

Comment

Comprehensive risk identification and management strategy demonstrated.

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

Comment

Yes. The Courts Service will firm up on these during the pilot stage

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

Comment

The Risk Register will be a standing item at all meetings of the Project Delivery Team (weekly) and Project Board (monthly).

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

Comment

As per 4.3

5. Next Stage

5.1 Is the contractor ready to begin the project? **YES**

Comment

The Courts Service have satisfied the review team that the Contractor and the Courts Service are now ready to proceed.

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

Comment

The Courts Service have satisfied the review team that the Contractor and the Courts Service are now ready to proceed.

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

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

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).

Comment

Yes. The project team provided a very comprehensive and clear set of documents to the review group and met with the group to present the main points and deal with any questions. The review group has been very satisfied with the project and the cooperation and documentation and information provided by the Courts Service and the thoroughness of the processes conducted by the Service.

7. Peer Review Group's Findings

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

Yes

No

X

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

Issues to be addressed

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

The review team has been very satisfied with the cooperation and presentation/information provided by the Courts Service in relation to the Contract issues.

Peer Review Group

Signed:

(Chairperson)

Date:
