Gateway Review Report:
Gate 5 – Benefits Realisation Review

For
Systems for People (SfP)

To

This report is the property of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship and may only be distributed or reproduced with the permission of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

[Handwritten note]

8 February 2008
Gateway Review Report Details
Gate 5: Benefits Realisation Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name:</th>
<th>Department of Immigration and Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Systems for People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Responsible Official:</td>
<td>[Blacked out]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Meeting Date:</td>
<td>22 January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Review Dates:</td>
<td>4-8 February 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Report Provided to SRO:</td>
<td>8 February 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Australian Government's Gateway Review Process (Gateway) methodology as set out in the Guidance on the Gateway Review Process—A Project Assurance Methodology for the Australian Government. The report summarises the findings and recommendations of the Gateway Review Team, informed by but not limited to, an assessment against the criteria documented in the Gateway Review Process—A Handbook for Conducting Gateway Reviews.

This report is the property of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship and may only be distributed or reproduced with the permission of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Enquiries regarding the Gateway methodology are to be directed to:

Gateway Unit
Financial Management Group
Department of Finance and Administration
John Gorton Building, King Edward Terrace
PARKES ACT 2600
Email: gateway@finance.gov.au
Contents

1. Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 1
   1.1 Review Approach .......................................................................................................... 1
   1.2 Acknowledgements ....................................................................................................... 1
   1.3 Project Description ...................................................................................................... 1
   1.4 Review Conclusion ..................................................................................................... 3

2. Findings and Recommendations ..................................................................................... 4
   2.1 Previous Gateway Review ............................................................................................. 4
   2.2 Benefits Realisation Review .......................................................................................... 5
      2.2.1 Business Case and Benefits Management .............................................................. 5
      2.2.2 Review of Operating Phase .................................................................................... 6
      2.2.3 Plans for Ongoing improvements in Value for Money ............................................ 7
      2.2.4 Plans for Ongoing improvements in Performance .................................................. 7
      2.2.5 Readiness for the Future ....................................................................................... 8
      2.2.6 Review of Organisational Learning and Maturity Targets .................................... 8

APPENDIX A: Gate 5 Review—Purpose and Context .......................................................... 10

APPENDIX B - List of Interviewees ..................................................................................... 11

APPENDIX C - List of Documents Reviewed ...................................................................... 12

APPENDIX D – Summary and Recommendations .............................................................. 14

APPENDIX E – Findings and Recommendations ................................................................ 16
   Previous Gateway Review – Table of Actions Taken ......................................................... 16
1. Introduction

1.1 Review Approach
The Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review focuses on assessing whether the project delivers the identified benefits and value for money identified in the Business Case. In particular this review focused on assessing the benefits delivered in SfP Releases 1 through 4 together with an assessment of the program at the current time. It should be noted that it is being conducted at a much earlier point than usual (SfP Release 4 was only delivered on 21 January 2008 and 10 more releases are anticipated over the next 2 years) and would normally follow an agency post-implementation review or similar process. The review has been somewhat restricted in its conduct by the absence of a program business case with clear benefits and realisation measures.

In order to form an opinion in relation to this Review, the Gateway Review Team applied the Gateway methodology, interviewed relevant project stakeholders and reviewed relevant documentation. More detailed information regarding the nature of this review and its context within the Australian Government Gateway Review methodology is at Appendix A.

Stakeholders interviewed as part of this review are listed at Appendix B and the relevant project documents reviewed are listed at Appendix C.

1.2 Acknowledgements
The Review Team would like to thank all those interviewed for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team’s understanding of the Program/Project and the outcome of this review and in particular, [name redacted] and his team for their excellent logistical and administrative support.

1.3 Project Description
The Systems for People (SfP) Program is an ambitious business transformation program that is part of a broader process of business change within the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) based on the Palmer and Comrie reports and Departmental IT reviews. SfP will develop and deliver new business processes that are supported by IT systems in the form of portals and will be progressively delivered between 2006 and 2010. In the 2006 Federal Budget, the Government announced $494.6 million funding, over four years, for the SfP Program.

The Program has the following business objectives:
- Provide a single view of the client’s dealings with the Department;
- Deliver comprehensive client centric processing for all DIAC staff based on the various business roles they perform;
- Ensure dependable data quality, completeness and accuracy;
- Establish consistency in work processes and decision making;
- Underpin decision-making with effective record keeping and quality assurance processes;
- Reduce fragmentation of information, data and systems;
- Modernise systems to be more responsive to changing business needs;
• Significantly improve decision-making by ensuring staff have access to all information needed, and the appropriate tools required to do their job;
• Re-align, where appropriate to the program’s existing initiatives.

The program will improve the support available to DIAC staff so that they can streamline their decision-making processes. This will also improve the consistency and performance of DIAC client service. The Program involves wide ranging redesign of business processes and will be delivered over four years through three monthly releases. It noted that SfP is a whole business solution, not just an IT focussed solution.

Within SfP there are about 60 portal projects. The remaining projects cover services, tools, infrastructure, data management, applications and external links.

Over its lifetime SfP will deliver portals and the underlying capability that assist staff who work in roles that deal with:
  • Compliance
  • Detention
  • Border security
  • Visa
  • Citizenship
  • Settlement
  • Case management

The April 2007 release was the first major release under the Program, it contained 23 projects of which four were portals and the following major deliverables:
  • Case management
  • Compliance portal
  • Visa portal
  • Border portal

Release 4 was delivered in January 2008 and Release 5 is planned for April 2008.

In addition to portal projects, each release also includes a number of infrastructure, services and data projects that enable the portals to work.
2. Findings and Recommendations

2.1 Previous Gateway Review

Good progress made on many of the recommendations contained in the Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review. It is also noted that formal tracking processes have been implemented to ensure ongoing monitoring of progress on implementation of the recommendations. In a number of areas progress has not been as rapid and comprehensive as required and recommendations contained in the current report address some of these areas. See Appendix E.
2.2 Benefits Realisation Review

2.2.1 Business Case and Benefits Management

Findings

The rationale for the SfP program is based on addressing deficiencies in DIAC culture, processes and systems identified in the Palmer and Comrie reports and subsequent studies and reviews. No formal business case was completed at the outset of the program however nine objectives were defined in the New Policy Proposal (NPP) and the Project Management Plan (PMP).

It has been noted in previous Gateway reports that the initial scope, objectives and benefits of the program were vague and directional in nature; lacking the clarity and precision needed for a program of this size and complexity. The lack of effective program level planning has resulted in this deficiency not being fully addressed. Consequently there is no sound foundation for SfP planning and development, or a clear framework against which progress on benefits realisation can be assessed.

A benefits realisation framework has now been established to allow SfP benefits to be identified and their achievement assessed as the program proceeds. This work is promising but the Review Team considers that the work is under resourced and may lack the authority to ensure that business areas identify the efficiency benefits that could potentially be harvested from the program. The Review Team notes that the benefits framework is focused at the project level and requires further development to ensure that benefits realisation also occurs at the program level. Further work is also required to specify benefits and how they can be measured.

Benefits are currently being measured by the project teams that produce the associated deliverables and/or the business area(s) using the deliverables. This arrangement does not provide for independent verification and validation of benefits to be delivered.

Evidence indicates that SfP has delivered useful functionality in the Compliance, Case Management and Detention (CCMD) areas and the relevant business users are generally pleased with the systems delivered to date. Further deliveries are planned for these areas in later releases. Progress in the visa area however has been slow and error prone. In part this appears to be because of dependence on new, unfamiliar technology (web services) and also because the liaison with the relevant business areas does not appear to be as well developed as for CCMD.

The Review Team notes that a communication strategy exists and that a Communication and Change Task Force (CCTF) operates in parallel with the program. This team appears to be doing useful work however, anecdotal evidence exists that some users have been “oversold” on program delivery and timeframes. It is further noted that the proposed restructure which will incorporate the CCTF within the program has the potential to enable improved alignment of communication and training with the requirements of the program.
Recommendations

1. The program must ensure that the current planning process clarifies program objectives and scope, and defines requirements in sufficient detail to achieve quality development outcomes.

2. Work on benefits realisation should be strengthened by:
   - the provision of additional resources and authority;
   - the development of a statement of clearly defined program level benefits and associated measures;
   - development of more precise and quantitative benefit measures at the project level; and,
   - greater independence in definition of benefit measures and also in the measurement process.

2.2.2 Review of Operating Phase

Findings

The complex matrix structure adopted for the program has previously been identified as a problem with responsibilities being diffused and the program management group lacking authority and clear responsibility for program delivery. DIAC is now moving to restructure the program which will become a division within Borders, Compliance, Detention and Technology Group. A separate division will be responsible for all Business as Usual (BAU) support. The Review Team notes that while this restructure will bring a closer relationship between delivery responsibility and program management some separation between these responsibilities will remain within the new division.

Senior program management positions have been filled by contractors. Within the DIAC environment they have lacked the financial and other authority to exercise the required level of program responsibility. Under the new structure proposed these positions will be filled by APS staff. While the Review Team agrees that this change is needed the difficulties associated with the knowledge lost and timeframe available for new managers to become effective should not be underestimated.

The SfP program is complex with well over 100 individual projects being conducted. Each project is led by a project manager and there is evidence that the skill and experience of some project managers is deficient. Further, project managers do not always follow DIAC governance processes with documentation such as project schedules not being completed and progress data not being entered into the project recording and tracking system (Clarity).

Effective project resource estimation is a weakness of the program. There are no well developed procedures for linking resource requirements and utilisation to work progress or delivered functionality. The lack of measures such as function points or use cases makes it difficult to relate project and program progress against schedule and budget. It is understood that the program has received external advice in this area but a satisfactory solution is yet to be implemented.

The program has not focussed consistently on the issues of availability, disaster recovery and capacity management and this is reflected in a diversity of views on the required availability targets.
**Recommendations**

3. DIAC senior management should monitor the effectiveness of the new program structure closely to ensure that resources stay focussed on the program plan and program outcomes are being achieved. Timely remedial measures should be introduced if needed.

4. Stronger measures should be introduced to ensure that project managers adhere to project governance requirements.

5. The program should assess the competency of existing project managers and implement corrective action for under performance.

6. The Review Team recommends that more objective and consistent estimation methods be applied to project sizing and resource allocation.

7. Further consideration should be given to enhancing availability management, capacity planning and disaster recovery capability.

**2.2.3 Plans for Ongoing Improvements in Value for Money**

**Findings**

The ineffectiveness of the program management function within SfP has resulted in most planning activity within the program essentially occurring “bottom up”. Late last year a new planning group was established to explicitly conduct “top down” planning for the program. The “top down” planning approach has the potential to deliver significant additional value for money for the program through more efficient deployment of resources at the project level.

The program is making a concerted effort to reduce costs and lessen their reliance on high cost resources. This is evidenced in the reduction in the number of IBM resources and the transition to direct contractors and APS staff.

The program is attempting to change its engagement model with IBM from time and materials to fixed cost but this approach has just commenced.

**Recommendations**

8. The program should continue with the effort to reduce dependence on high cost resources and accelerate its move towards fixed price engagements with IBM.

**2.2.4 Plans for Ongoing Improvements in Performance**

**Findings**

In the earlier releases some applications were deployed with significant defects which resulted in unscheduled application downtime. Since that time the maturity of the release process has improved considerably and in the latest release there were no critical or high defects going into production.

The Review Team notes that no verification testing is currently undertaken in the production environment as part of the deployment. This creates a risk that deployed systems may not perform as expected. The testing environment also lacks a load and performance testing
environment so that these tests are not undertaken. There is a consequential risk that systems are deployed with performance issues—a risk that will increase as the number of deployed systems, and system interdependencies, increases. Negative performance effects have already been experienced in the production environment from at least one system.

The quality of systems documentation passed to the production support teams is variable and their level of training is often inadequate. In particular, the specification of system interdependencies and interactions is generally very poor. The establishment of the Production Control Authority should result in an improvement of the quality of the releases.

The Review Team noted that the quality of ongoing engagement with business users was variable. This has resulted in a mismatch of expectations in relation to the timing and functionality of deliverables.

**Recommendations**

9. Action should be taken to ensure that load and performance testing is completed before systems are deployed into production.

10. The program should undertake post-production testing before declaring a deployment complete.

11. A review of business stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be undertaken with a view to improving expectation management.

**2.2.5 Readiness for the Future**

**Findings**

Insufficient attention is being given to managing the risks associated with funding BAU support. There is no evidence of provision for this funding in the program budget, the expectation being that harvested benefits will provide the funding. There is no formal quantitative assessment supporting this assertion. The Review Team notes that there are a variety of views on the extent to which legacy systems will be replaced. This may reflect a risk that they will not be decommissioned as planned and result in a requirement to support them as well as the new SfP systems.

**Recommendations**

12. The program should quantify BAU requirements and confirm the validity of the assumption that funding will be provided through benefits harvesting.

13. The program must actively manage the risks associated with not decommissioning the legacy systems.

**2.2.6 Review of Organisational Learning and Maturity Targets**

**Findings**

The SfP program has developed a “lessons learnt” process that identifies and reports the findings of an internal review of each SfP Release. In addition the program has been the subject of around 21 external reviews in a period of eighteen months. These reviews have
identified a number of deficiencies in the program and recommended corrective action. The most recent of these is the BCG report which recommended major changes to the structure, governance and procedures of the program. Overall the deficiencies of the program are well known and action to address many of the deficiencies is currently underway. In order to ensure that this action is effective strong managerial oversight is required together with ongoing measures of performance improvement.

The maturity of the process for deployment into production is improving. A number of checkpoints are now in place to ensure improved likelihood of a successful release. Nevertheless, it is not clear as to what extent the practice of imaging occurs for the affected parts of the production environment prior to commencement of deployment. Without prior imaging it may not be possible to restore the production environment should the deployment fail. It would also appear that deployment rollback is not rehearsed prior to the actual deployment.

**Recommendations**

14. Strong action should be undertaken to ensure that lessons learnt findings and independent review recommendations are implemented. Implementations should be managed and monitored in a coordinated fashion.

15. The program needs to ensure that they can rollback failed deployments.
APPENDIX A: Gate 5 Review—Purpose and Context

Gateway is a project assurance methodology that involves short, intensive reviews at up to six critical stages in the lifecycle of a project. Reviews are conducted by a team of reviewers not associated with the project, and usually contain a mix of experts sourced from the public and private sectors. Reviews are designed to:

- assess the project against its specified objectives at a particular stage in the project’s lifecycle;
- provide early identification of any areas that may require corrective action; and
- increase confidence that a project is ready to progress successfully to the next stage.

The Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review assessed whether the solution was robust before delivery, and that the agency was ready for the implementation and had a basis for evaluating ongoing performance.

A Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review is not a post-implementation review. It takes place after the agency has carried out a post-implementation review or similar major review. It makes use of findings from that internal review, together with an assessment of organisational learning, as evidence of good practice but may or may not include a full review of plans for the future.

The Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review focuses on ensuring that the project delivered the benefits and value for money identified in the Business Case and Benefits Realisation plans. It should be held six to twelve months after commissioning of the product(s) or introduction of the service, when evidence of the benefits is available.

The scope and frequency of Gate 5 reviews will vary depending on the project and contract characteristics. A single Gate 5 review should be enough for most projects. For long-term contracts there should be a Gate 5 review every two to three years in accordance with the project plan schedule.

At Gate 5, the Gateway Review Team should:

- assess whether the business case for the project at Gate 3 and Gate 4 was realistic;
- assess whether the anticipated benefits are being delivered;
- confirm that the responsible agency or supplier continue to have the necessary resources to successfully manage the contract;
- confirm continuity of key personnel involved in contract management roles;
- assess the ongoing requirement for the contract to meet the business need. Ensure that if circumstances have changed, the service delivery and contract are adapting to the new situation. Changing circumstances could affect partner, relationship, service, change, contract, benefits and performance management;
- where changes have been agreed, ensure they do not compromise the original contract;
- ensure there is ongoing contract development to improve value for money;
- assess the application of the contract management procedures to date to manage the contract;
- confirm that there are plans to manage the contract to its conclusion;
- assess lessons learnt and methodology for sharing these with peers within the agency and across government; and
- confirm the validity of the exit strategy and arrangements for re-tendering, where applicable.
# APPENDIX B - List of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Position</th>
<th>Date Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Director Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Chief Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Planning &amp; Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter – Systems Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl – IT Services &amp; Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Benefits Realisation Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/g AS CCT</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/05,06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Program Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Release Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Quality &amp; Productivity Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Systems Integration Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Director Strategic Planning &amp; Comms</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Release Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Programme Manager, CCMD</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/g Assistant Secretary, Corporate &amp; Case Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Application Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booz Allen Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Deputy Programme Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS IT Programme Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Program Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Programme Manager, CCMD</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Head Visa</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated by Doug Walker (TAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director IT Project Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Programme Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C - List of Documents Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT TITLE</th>
<th>VERSION NO. AND DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SFP5)SFP April 08 Release Scope outline v1.7</td>
<td>V1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-01-25 SEC Status Report For Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT SfP5 Solution Outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR part 1,2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Schedule for Gateway Review Team - Interview Schedule February 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Risk log 20080129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA Gateway Review Recommendations Tracking - All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA Gateway Reviews Recommendations Monitoring Report for SEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA Lessons Learnt for SfP 2&amp;3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP1 project benefit reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP1 release benefit report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP2 release benefit report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP3 release benefit report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP4 Release Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfP Financial Report Dec07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfPRoadmapExecSummary(V1.7)_Annex B</td>
<td>V1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfPRoadmapExecSummary(V1.8)_Annex A</td>
<td>V1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA SfPRoadmapExecSummary(v1.8)_Annex E</td>
<td>V1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPI TRA Systems for People Benefits Realisation Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC Report 25_January_08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP5 Solution Outline - Solution Architecture v0.26</td>
<td>V0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP Finance Report December 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP Release 5 Solution Outline Summary v3</td>
<td>V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems for People Programme Management Plan_v1.0 APP</td>
<td>v1.0 APP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Divisions Org Chart</td>
<td>28 January 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Programme Management Group Functional Organisation</td>
<td>3 December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Release 3 and 4 test statistics</td>
<td>JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects listing</td>
<td>IF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP &quot;Unplugged&quot; presentation 20 December 2007</td>
<td>20 December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Risk Management Plan for Identity Services Repository</td>
<td>1.0 (SfP 2.B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCG SfP Review PowerPoint presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Release 4 deployment documentation (incl Annex K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Programme Partner Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfP Prioritisation Framework</td>
<td>V0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D – Summary and Recommendations

Overall Picture of the Project
Action in a number of key areas of the program is continuing and progress has been made against some recommendations of previous Gateway Review reports. It is noted that a significant organisational change and associated actions have been initiated. The program will need to closely monitor the impact of these changes to ensure that they deliver the improvements intended.

A comprehensive external review linked to the approval of further budget funding has recently been completed by the Boston Consulting Group (BCG). This review recommended a number of actions to be completed against a deadline of end March 2008. The Review Team notes that a number of recommendations of the BCG review are consistent with recommendations made within this and previous Gateway Review reports.

The Review Team considers that despite the progress made that significant work remains to be undertaken in critical areas of the program. The program is approaching the mid-point of its four-year timeline and action on the review recommendations is critical.

Recommendations
1. The program must ensure that the current planning process clarifies program objectives and scope, and defines requirements in sufficient detail to achieve quality development outcomes.

2. Work on benefits realisation should be strengthened by:
   - the provision of additional resources and authority;
   - the development of a statement of clearly defined program level benefits and associated measures;
   - development of more precise and quantitative benefit measures at the project level; and,
   - greater independence in definition of benefit measures and also in the measurement process.

3. DIAC senior management should monitor the effectiveness of the new program structure closely to ensure that resources stay focussed on the program plan and program outcomes are being achieved. Timely remedial measures should be introduced if needed.

4. Stronger measures should be introduced to ensure that project managers adhere to project governance requirements.

5. The program should assess the competency of existing project managers and implement corrective action for under performance.

6. The Review Team recommends that more objective and consistent estimation methods be applied to project sizing and resource allocation.

7. Further consideration should be given to enhancing availability management, capacity planning and disaster recovery capability.

8. The program should continue with the effort to reduce dependence on high cost resources and accelerate its move towards fixed price engagements with IBM.

9. Action should be taken to ensure that load and performance testing is completed before systems are deployed into production.
10. The program should undertake post-production testing before declaring a deployment complete.

11. A review of business stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be undertaken with a view to improving expectation management.

12. The program should quantify BAU requirements and confirm the validity of the assumption that funding will be provided through benefits harvesting.

13. The program must actively manage the risks associated with not decommissioning the legacy systems.

14. Strong action should be undertaken to ensure that lessons learnt findings and independent review recommendations are implemented. Implementations should be managed and monitored in a coordinated fashion.

15. The program needs to ensure that they can rollback failed deployments.

**Urgency**

It is critical to the overall success of the project that the issues raised in this review are addressed before the project proceeds. That is, the Sponsoring Agency needs to consider the issues raised in this report and determine what action it will take in response to the report.

NB: This does not suggest that the project must stop in the meantime.
APPENDIX E – Findings and Recommendations

Previous Gateway Review – Table of Actions Taken
The table below contains the significant recommendations made in the Gate 4 – Readiness for Service Review and action taken, including actions that varied from recommendations made in the review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Further work is required to define the Program requirements to a sufficient level of detail to achieve quality development outcomes and to make the scope of the program clear.</td>
<td>Following the lessons learnt workshop a top down and more intensive approach to programme planning is being adopted. Splitting of release is highly undesirable, but dictated for July by new policy and legislation considerations and priorities of the Government. Requirements Manager is in place. Centralised Architectural functions to be initiated. Implementation underway. New Programme plan being developed. Programme Planning Function and process has been put in place and is now operating. Service Oriented Architecture Governance team is being put in place in conjunction with IBM. This is stream lining service development. Requirements Manager is in place in the PMG.</td>
<td>Remains to be completed. See Recommendation 1 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A more disciplined and timely process for requirements finalisation should be introduced.</td>
<td>Following Lessons Learned, the PMG is adopting a stronger top down planning approach. This includes the development of an integrated strategic plan and greater definition from within the PMG of the agreed budgeted scope of a project or program of work. This approach includes the definition, in collaboration with business, of the prioritised requirements and the subsequent formal process to ensure continued alignment of business requirements and systems development. As a result of the recommendation the Strategic Planning and Communications team was formed in July 2007 as part of the SfP Program Management Group. The planning team has put a number of key measures in place to support the Executive's decision for a Top Down Planning process which includes;</td>
<td>A more disciplined approach has been introduced but this should be monitored to ensure that development work does not commence prior to formal acceptance of requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- 2007/2008 project review to descope non priority projects and force fit remainder to budget
- development of a top down planning process in consultation with the ITPO
- development of a project prioritisation process - still in progress
- detailed scope & cost estimate planning for 08/09 & 09/10

3. The Program Management Plan should be used to guide the development and management of the Program and hence needs to be comprehensive and regularly updated e.g. after each release.
- Create planning Section. (Complete)
- Review roles and responsibilities of PMG (Due to be complete by Friday 31 August 2007).
- Publish document on Friday 07 September 2007

Progress has been made and it is noted that a complete plan must be completed by March 2008. See Recommendation 3 of this report.

4. Business owners for each business system need to be clearly identified at the outset of any Program work on the relevant business system.
DIAC has created a Business Board structure as part of the IT project Governance process. These boards effectively "own" all IT systems, but membership of these boards comprises mainly of business representatives. All projects must be endorsed by their relevant Board before proceeding to Systems Committee approval.

Action noted.

5. The department needs to ensure that adequate resources are available to support BAU requirements.
- DIAC to scope SfP support services (April 2007, complete)
- DIAC to approach IBM, CSC through RFP for provision of services (22 May 2007, complete)
- DIAC to develop transition plan for service provision to preferred supplier (August 2007, under way)
- DIAC to select preferred supplier (July 2007, complete)
- DIAC to negotiate contract variation (July 2007, under way)
- Service Provider to commence provision of Services (August 2007, not started)

In May 2007 DIAC issued a Request for Proposal to IBM and CSC for the provision of environment and middleware support for the SfP programme. The aim of this procurement was to establish an additional work order with one of DIAC’s existing IT service providers for the provision of ongoing support for the Systems for People environment.

Progress as indicated acknowledged.
Further action required. See Recommendation 12.
The only proposal received within the lodgement period was from CSC. The CSC response was broadly compliant with the request from DIAC. The Evaluation Team reviewed the CSC proposal against the predetermined evaluation criteria.

DIAC has selected CSC as the Preferred Provider and is conducting further negotiations and due diligence with CSC in order to validate and improve value for money. This includes:

Conduct of negotiations with CSC to:
- Close out gaps between DIAC’s requirements and the proposal from CSC;
- Identify any changes to the scope that could result in significant reductions in the overall cost without compromising the integrity of the environments; and
- Further define the scope and transition plan.

In parallel, DIAC is conducting a benchmark assessment to further validate value for money of the proposal with assistance from IT Newcom.

DIAC has also extended the SfP107 Platform Lifecycle project for 3 months from the start of this financial year to provide SfP support in all environments while the above process is completed.

Systems Delivery Division has made estimates of the additional resources required to support the new products and services being delivered via the SfP Programme of work. Systems Delivery Division has also sought responses from CSC and IBM for support arrangements for some of the new technologies eg. SIEBEL, Services, WCC. CICibel. These and the other areas affected by the change have been included in the recent ‘additional budget pressures’ review and provided to FSRD for consolidation and consideration by the Executive Committee.

| 6. The overall release cycle needs to be reconsidered and restructured in order to better match resources availability | Merged from Recommendation 14 - The Program release cycle needs to be reviewed to avoid the splitting of releases. Following the lessons learnt workshop a top down and more intensive approach to | Intention to move to 3 Releases per year supported. Improvements on release management noted. Further |
7. Release planning needs to commence at a date commensurate with the time required to complete the projects associated with the release.

- Progressively increase the time for each release cycle.
- Publish release schedule early (releases 5-8)
- Strengthen the Release Management Team.
- Integrate environment team with Release Teams.
- Integrate systems integration with Release Teams.
- Release schedule for 2007 & 2008 (Releases 5-8) has been published.
- Proposal for strengthening and integrating Release teams to be presented to Systems Executive Committee on Monday 27 August 2007. The Release, Environment and Systems Integration teams were formed into a single team under the Release Director on 01 October 07.

8. The Program develop and administer a release management plan (across the Program) to ensure cohesive and achievable content across releases.

1. Establish planning team.
2. Develop Roadmaps for programme and revised processes for the development of the scope of projects to be included in the programme.
3. Match scope to budget and promulgate budgets to scope.

   Complete
2. Roadmaps 95\% complete.
3. Budget for FY 07/08 complete, but scope to match budgets may need further review. This will be managed via the Project Proposal (PP) for projects that do not already have an approved PP, and via PCR for projects that have an approved PP but require amendment to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New strengthened Programme Management arrangements to be implemented. External review not considered necessary at this point, but will be kept under review.</td>
<td>New Programme Management components being implemented.</td>
<td>BCG Review and DIAC response noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Include milestone requirements in project proposal template. (Completed)</td>
<td>2. Develop end to end procedures for project proposals and Project Management Plans (note: this will be a modification of the already well defined processes, rather than completely new processes).</td>
<td>Good progress on project accounting noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Implement SAP Project Accounting which will enforce mandatory workflow of time sheets through project managers before acceptance by cost centre manager.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Completed on 20 August 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The process for the initiation of projects is being changed to a top-down approach and a small planning team was formed Aug 07. This will result in small changes to the current PIB and Project Proposal process. These changes will be largely in place by Nov 07, are expected to be finalised by end Jan 08.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Project accounting is expected to be in place by 01 Mar 08.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>This is directly linked to strengthened “top down” approach to the Programme Planning project initiation and resourcing. This will facilitate planned skills transfers and better balance in project teams.</td>
<td>New Programme Management approach being implemented as a result of the lessons learnt workshop.</td>
<td>Noted. See recommendation 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overview of strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On the 4th of May 2007 the Systems Executive Committee (SEC) approved the:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishment by Competency Centre, target pools of resources that can be well trained in DIAC processes and deployed at short notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A centralized IT resource management function in the RMDC so that the identification, scheduling and management of resources can be undertaken in a more effective and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
efficient manner.

**Key actions to achieve outcome**

RDMC will become responsible for the end-to-end recruitment of skilled resources in order for projects to proceed efficiently.

Completed and ongoing

RDMC will be responsible for scheduling resources onto or between projects on a full or part time basis.

Completed and ongoing

RDMC will be responsible for monitoring, coordinating and providing guidance to manage on boarding activities and develop generic skill-sets in-line with workforce planning needs.

In progress

RDMC will develop workforce transition plans with the objective to ensure an appropriate level of IBM, DIAC contractor and DIAC staff mix across all IT disciplines.

In progress

Over July RDMC will begin the transition to a new centralised resource management process. RDMC are currently working with each Competency Centre on handover arrangements. Sub-Programme Managers, Programme Management Group, Project Managers and other stakeholders are being informed of any impact to the way they currently manage resources.

Transition to the new model has been completed. Resources for projects are requested through the Resource Demand mailbox, vetted and supplied through the Resource Processing team. The RDMC is almost fully staffed.

- Key stakeholders are being reminded of the new processes to follow with the centralized resourcing model.
- Workforce Planning team is holding discussions with competency center managers and strategic policy team to gather data for initial workforce transition plan. 26 November 2007
- Responsibilities for the creation of generic on boarding artefacts has been transferred to another team within RDMC who have the additional capacity to complete.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce planning strategy development is continuing and the continuation of the development of generic on boarding artefacts is on hold until the beginning of February 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13. | The Program needs to identify strategies to improve the level of risk management maturity across the Program. This should include the appointment of an appropriately skilled and senior Program risk manager. | 1. Recruit Risk Manager  
2. Include Risk Manager in Programme Team.  
4. Promulgate Plans and Strategies  
1. Completed. Candidate has been selected and on-boarded mid October 2007.  
2. Completed – Position created  
3. Expected completion end of December 2007  
4. Expect to complete mid December 2007 | Action to date noted and appointment of Risk Manager noted. |
| 14. | The Program release cycle needs to be reviewed to avoid the splitting of releases. | Closed – Merged into Recommendation 6 |
| 15. | Steps should be taken to ensure the consistent application of good project management practices across the Program. | A number of initiatives are currently undertaken to ensure good PM practices across the Program, and these include:  
- A well defined IT PM governance structure  
- A project management framework that clearly details PM artefacts and processes  
- PM artefact review by the IT Project Support team  
- A monthly PM newsletter  
- Quality reviews  
- IT PM training  
- Monthly Community of Practice sessions  
- Project mentoring services  
These processes are reviewed for consistency and currency  
This recommendation will continue to be on-going for the life of the programme as continuous improvement is a cornerstone of best practice. | See recommendations 4 and 5 of this review. Initiation of longer term action to address project manager competency within DIAC noted. |