

Peer Review Report

Contract Review

Project Title **ICT Establishment of Garda Siochana Ombudsman Commission [IT Infrastructure]**

Project Sponsor **Garda Siochana Ombudsman Commission**

Sponsor Contact **Tom Maguire**

Peer Review Group **John Murphy** **Seamus Crowe**

Sean O hAilpin **Robert Butler**

Date **March 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

Vendor selected. IT manager (on contract) in place until December 2007. IT Strategy in process of development. New senior management team in place. It is the view of the Peer Review team that the new management team fully participate in the formulation of that strategy.

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

Vendor selected. IT manager (on contract) in place until December 2007. IT Strategy in process of development. New senior management team in place. It is the view of the Peer Review team that the new management team fully participate in the formulation of that strategy.

2. Contract

2.1 Does the proposed solution still meet the business objectives?

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

Comment

The business case had a clear understanding of the importance of IT in the efficient and effective delivery of services to customers. The proposed solution will underpin that strategy through the deployment of an appropriate ICT infrastructure.

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

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

Comment

The Peer Review team has been advised that legal advice has been sought and that appropriate changes to the contract have been recommended and accepted.

2.3 Is the contract a fixed price?

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

Comment

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

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

Comment

Not fully clear from the contract document. Needs to be clarified.

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

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

Comment

The Peer Review team has been provided with an extract from the revised contract concerning potential penalty payments to GSOC in the event of delays attributable to the vendor. However, the document does not appear to be finalised at this stage. It is important that the contract be finalised as soon as possible and any ambiguity removed.

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

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

The Peer Review team recognise that the GSOC Project Team has been successful in reducing the cost.

2.6 Has a detailed project plan and timescale been defined?

Yes

No

☐☒

Comment

The project plan does not take any account of slippage and there is little or no contingency built in.

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

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

3.3 Are the proposed decision making structures, including change control, adequate?

Yes

No

☐☒

Comment

No obvious allowance for change control. Procedures should be 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 and dedicated project team in place.

3.5 Are all necessary reporting and communication mechanisms in place?

Yes

No

☐☒

Comment

Need to have clear statement of reporting and communication arrangements.

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

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

When ICT infrastructure is in place and commissioned.

3.7 Has an approach to benefits realisation measurement been developed?

Yes

No

☒☐

Comment

New IT infrastructure will allow business benefits to be realised.

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

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

Comment

Eircom are the lead contractor and a single point of contact for the project team.

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

Comment

NOT APPLICABLE

4. Risk Management

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

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

Comment

Risks identified but no fallback plans agreed that Peer Review team are aware of.

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

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

Comment

The Peer Review team raised concerns regarding suitable contingency plans to be developed.

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

Yes

☐

No

☒

N/A

☐

Comment

The Peer Review team has not seen a detailed Risk Register.

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

Yes

☐

No

☒

N/A

☐

Comment

The Peer Review team has not seen a detailed Risk Register.

5. Next Stage

5.1 Is the contractor ready to begin the project?

Comment

Contractor already engaged.

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

Yes

☒

No

☐

Comment

Yes, but GSOC need to ensure that any outstanding issues are agreed and covered by the contract. The successful vendor has already started work on the project on the basis of a letter of comfort. This is not considered entirely satisfactory and the contract should be finalised as soon as possible.

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

☐

Comment

However, the Peer Review team have not seen the final contract.

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

☐

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

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

Contract to be finalised.

Risk register to be completed.

Contingency plans to be documented and actioned.

IT Strategy to be finalised.

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