

Peer Review Report

Tender Evaluation

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?

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?

Comment

The Courts Service indicated that demand for DAR services is expected to grow, increasing the need for roll-out of the system and accelerating the payback..

2. Evaluation Procedure

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

Comment

Yes. The procedure was implemented as documented in the RFT. The review team was impressed with the evaluation process applied.

2.2 Has the tender evaluation process been documented sufficiently?

Comment

Yes. The process has been documented very comprehensively and clearly.

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

Comment

Yes. The documentation clearly indicates that the process was implemented in a fair and equitable manner.

2.4 Has the evaluation process identified an outright winner?

Comment

Yes. Two tenders were received. One of the tenderers scored a significantly greater total number of marks than the other under the agreed marking scheme. Slight risk identified that only two tenders received.

3. Preferred Solution

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

Comment

Yes. The preferred solution meets all of the business goals of the project.

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

Comment

Yes. Both the plan and the timescale will be reviewed during pilot evaluation stage.

3.3 Are the forecasted project costs realistic?

Comment

Yes. The forecasted costs will be reviewed during pilot evaluation stage.

4. Risk Management

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

Comment

Yes. A comprehensive list of risks has been produced. Key risk as identified above (2.4) relates to the presence of only two tenders but review group is satisfied that this risk is being managed.

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

Comment

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

4.3 Is there a risk register in place?

Yes

☒

No

☐

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

Comment

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

5. Next Stage

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

Comment

Yes. The Courts Services propose to pilot the system in four locations for up to four months.

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

Comment

Yes. The organisation is ready to proceed to the next stage.

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

X	
---	--

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 evaluation which it conducted.

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

Peer Review Group

Signed:

(Chairperson)

Date:
