

Peer Review Report

The RFT

Project Title: Integrated Ticketing System (ITS)

Project Sponsor: Railway Procurement Agency

Sponsor Contact: Mr. Tim Gaston

Peer Review Group: Eric Embleton
(Chairperson) Séan Connolly

Brendan Healy Pat Granahan

Date: 19 September 2007

1. Previous Review

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

Comment

Yes; the principal recommendations set out in the Team's Report of May 2006 have been implemented; in particular the new governance structures were put in place and are operating very satisfactorily.

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

Comment

Yes, the new governance structures have resulted in better direction and management of the project and ensured greater buy-in by the participating transport bodies.

2. Procurement Approach

2.1 Have all options for the type and method of procurement been fully evaluated and documented?

Comment

Yes; in line with the previously recommended and agreed approach, the current RFT is for the build phase of the project; an operate contract will be the subject of a later procurement exercise in 2008

2.2 Does the procurement approach comply with all national and EU procurement rules?

Comment

Yes; following a successful pre-qualification process some 7 prospective bidders have been selected to whom the RFT documentation will be issued; a negotiated procedure will apply.

2.3 With respect to the RFT documentation:

i) have all business objectives been clearly defined?

Yes, in relation to the build phase

ii) has a realistic timeframe been defined for expected delivery of solution?

Comment

The timeframe of 18 months is ambitious and challenging and will require very careful and active management and monitoring; the RPA acknowledges this but is confident on foot of the market consultation process it engaged in that prospective bidders will be able to deliver on schedule. Moreover, there could be significant “off-the-shelf” elements available. It may be noted also that timeframe could be an area for negotiation with the preferred bidder(s). RPA is taking steps to ensure that the build contract will be actively managed and monitored.

iii) are the qualification criteria clearly defined and prioritised?

Comment

Yes; following a successful pre-qualification process some 7 prospective bidders have been selected to whom the RFT documentation will be issued; a negotiated procedure will apply.

iv) are the selection criteria clearly defined and prioritised?

Comment

Yes; see comment at 2.3 (iii) above.

v) is the evaluation approach fully documented?

Comment

Yes

vi) is a detailed structure or template for responses defined?

Comment

Yes, a structure and template/matrix are defined

vii) is the documentation presented in a logical and comprehensible fashion?

Comment

Yes; there is a considerable volume of documentation which it is envisaged will be of assistance to bidders in preparing their tenders and clarifying requirements.

--

2.4 Does the RFT constitute a fair and reasonable request to the marketplace?

Comment

Yes; as indicated above it is fully in line with the previously recommended and agreed phased approach to the design, build and operation of the ITS

2.5 Is the procurement conducive to fixed price tenders?

Comment

Yes, but allows for a change control procedure, and possible variations on VFM grounds, in the event that changes may be necessary.

3. Next Stage

3.1 Should the project be piloted or prototyped prior to a major implementation and if so, does the RFT reflect this?

Comment

The development phase will be marked by a series of milestone deliveries and their subsequent integration; on roll-out, the ITS will be implemented on a phased basis involving 3 transport operators initially.

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

Comment

Yes

4. Process Review

4.1 Has all the documentation and information required to carry out an analysis of the procurement exercise been provided by the project team?

Yes

X

No

--

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

Yes

No

☒☐

NOTE: *Because of time pressures, and the volume of documentation involved, the Peer Review Team has had to review the documentation in a compressed timeframe; nevertheless, the Team is satisfied that it has identified, and received clarification on, all relevant issues.*

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

Yes

No

☒☐

4.4 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

5. Peer Review Group's Findings

5.1 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

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 Team would restate the absolute need for very active management and monitoring of the build phase contract given that, in its view, the timeframe is ambitious and challenging. In this context, it is noted that the RPA has recruited an experienced IT Manager whose primary task will be to manage the build contract and seek to mitigate the risks involved. It will be necessary also for the ITP Project Board (set up as recommended in the Team's Report of May 2006) to continue to oversee and direct the project as heretofore and to continue to report regularly to the Minister for Transport and Marine.

Peer Review Group

Signed:

(Chairperson)

Date:
