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**Revision history**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revision date** | **Version status** | **Author** | **Version no.** |
|  | Draft |  | 0.1 |
|  | Final draft |  |  |
|   | Final |  |  |

**About this report**

This report represents an independent review undertaken on behalf of Emphasys PTY LTD.

*Grey and square-bracketed text provides guidance or indicates the information to be added. It should be deleted before submitting the report.*

**Project and review team information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program** | [Program name] |
| **Project name** | [Project name] |
| **Delivery agency** | [Agency name] |
| **Project Sponsor** | [name of Project Sponsor] |
| **Status of report** | DRAFT Version [x]/ FINAL |
| **ICT Assurance team** | [name, Director][name, Principal Manager][name, Case Officer] |
| **Health Check dates** | Briefing [dd month YYYY]Interviews [dd – dd month YYYY] |
| **Health Check team leader** | [Insert name of team leader] |
| **Health Check team** | [Insert name of team member] [Insert name of team member] [Insert name of team member] |
| **Previous review** | [Insert review type][Insert dates][Insert Delivery Confidence Assessment – DCA] |

**Scope of the review**

This report, prepared by Emphasys Pty Ltd, presents a comprehensive Service Efficiency Health Check of SAP projects deployed by our organisation. The objective of this exercise is to assess and identify the efficiency, effectiveness, and overall health of our ongoing and completed SAP projects, either on a periodic or ad hoc basis.

The scope of this reviewincludes, but is not limited to, the examination of project planning, implementation, management, and post-implementation maintenance and review phases. We evaluate key metrics like timeliness, budget adherence, technical performance, user adoption, and business value delivered.

Through this process, we aim to identify areas of strength and areas requiring improvement. We believe this review will guide us to effectively strategise our future SAP projects, optimise our investment in SAP technology, and maximise the value we deliver to our stakeholders.

By instituting a periodic or ad hoc review system, we ensure a continuous improvement loop in our project execution and service delivery. It facilitates early detection of potential issues, enhances system and process efficiencies, and fosters an organisational culture of accountability, transparency, and continual learning.

This report, therefore, serves as a significant tool for our organisational growth, supporting our commitment to deliver efficient, cost-effective, and high-quality services to our customers. It offers valuable insights into our operational realities and provides a solid foundation for informed decision-making, strategic planning, and sustainable performance improvement.

**Delivery confidence assessment and summary**

[Provide a summary of no more than two pages that articulates the review team’s view of the likelihood of the project’s successful delivery and identifies issues that influence delivery confidence. This is top-level only; include additional evidence and recommendations in the body of the report.

Consider using the following structure:

* Describe the project/program, key deliverables, timeframes and costs;
* Reason for review;
* Review outcome:
* Demonstrated good practice;
* Areas for improvements/concerns;
* Findings against the agency self-assessment template in terms of compliance with existing strategies and policies;
* Explanations on confidence-rating/likelihood of project success;
* Summary of key recommendations; and
* Indication if the registered Project Tier needs to be changed (new)].

**Summary of report recommendations**

The review team has prioritised its recommendations as below.

Rating descriptions can be found at Appendix [E1 – Report recommendations ratings.](#bookmark51)

**Comments from Project Sponsor**

[Insert comments here.]

**Detailed findings against key review scope areas**

*Cross reference to the reference number from the ‘Summary of report recommendations’ Note that only key findings need to be detailed; it is not expected to document responses to all the expected evidence.*

*Add a key review scope area rating (high, medium, low) where applicable using the rating definitions in Appendix* [*E3 – Key*](#bookmark57)[*scope review areas (detailed findings) ratings.*](#bookmark57)

1. **Business Case and stakeholders**

[Insert brief paragraphs setting out key findings, highlighting:

* Demonstrated good practice;
* Areas for improvements/concerns;
* Recommendations linked to areas of improvement; and
* Key review scope area rating: [ Choose an item.]
1. **Review of current phase**

[Insert brief paragraphs setting out key findings, highlighting:

* Demonstrated good practice;
* Areas for improvements/concerns;
* Recommendations linked to areas of improvement; and
* Key review scope area rating: [ Choose an item.]
1. **Assessment of delivery approach**

[Insert brief paragraphs setting out key findings, highlighting:

* Demonstrated good practice;
* Areas for improvements/concerns;
* Consideration of whole-of-emphasys ICT policies, standards and priorities;
* Recommendations linked to areas of improvement; and
* Key review scope area rating: [ Choose an item.]
1. **Risk Management**

[Insert brief paragraphs setting out key findings, highlighting:

* Demonstrated good practice;
* Areas for improvements/concerns;
* Recommendations linked to areas of improvement; and
* Key review scope area rating: [Choose an item.]

**Appendix A – Project background**

**Aims of the project**

[Insert two or three paragraphs on the key aims of the project.]

**Driving force for the project**

[Describe why the project came into existence and/or is necessary. Consider, for example, the deficiency, need, issue, political imperative or opportunity that instigated the project. Also state the program to which the project contributes, if applicable.]

**Procurement/delivery status**

[Describe how far the procurement process has progressed within the project.]

**Current position regarding previous assurance reviews:**

[Describe which assurance reviews have already taken place on the project.

Note whether existing recommendations have been implemented and, if not, comment on the justification for any alternative course of action. If not in place, please indicate the reason and expected date of approval.]

[Appendix D](#bookmark47) summarises recommendations, progress and status from the previous Gateway.

**Appendix B – Stakeholders consulted.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1 Name** | **Organisation and role** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Appendix C – Documents reviewed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Author** | **1****Document name** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Appendix D – Progress against previous assurance review**

Rating descriptions can be found at Appendix [E1 – Report recommendations ratings.](#bookmark51) Progress against previous assurance review [insert review dates] recommendations:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation from previous report** | *' .. .... \***Critical / Essential / Recommended** | **Current status** |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating1 |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating 1 |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |
|  | Select Rating |  |

**Appendix E – Ratings**

**E1 – Report recommendations ratings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Criteria description** |
| **Critical (Do Now)** | This item is critical and urgent, and action must be taken immediately. DCS will not clear this Gateway until this recommendation is actioned. |
| **Essential (Do By)** | The recommendation is important but not urgent – it should be actioned before further key decisions are taken. DCS will only clear this Gateway once it has approved a plan to respond to this recommendation. |
| **Recommended** | The recommendation is not critical or urgent, but the project may benefit from addressing it. |
| **E2 – Delivery confidence level definitions** |
| The review teams provide an assessment of confidence status using the definitions below. |
| **Rating** | **Criteria description** |
| **High** | Successful delivery of the project to time, cost, quality and anticipated benefits appears **highly likely** and there are no major outstanding issues that appear to threaten delivery or overall viability. |
| **Medium-High** | Successful delivery of the project to time, cost, quality and anticipated benefits appears **likely** however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not become major issues threatening delivery. |
| **Medium** | Successful delivery of the project to time, cost, quality and anticipated benefits appears **feasible** but risks and/or issues exist that threaten delivery or overall viability. These appear resolvable if addressed promptly. |
| **Medium-Low** | Successful delivery of the project to time, cost, quality and anticipated benefits is **unlikely** with major issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to address these. |
| **Low** | Successful delivery of the project to time, cost, quality and anticipated benefits appears **unachievable** as currently planned. Major issues do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The project may need re-base lining and/or its overall viability re-assessed. |
| **E3 – Key scope review areas (detailed findings) ratings** |
| Review teams may include this additional rating for every detailed finding in the key scope review areas. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **High** | There are no major outstanding issues in this key scope review area that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly. |
| **Medium** | Some issues in this key scope review area require timely management attention. |
| **Low** | Significant issues in this key scope review area may jeopardise the project. |

**Appendix F – Seven focus areas**

The review team will indicate how each of their recommendations align with the seven focus areas noted below. These seven focus areas are guided by the Emphasys review policy.

**Focus area**

**Description**

**Affordability and value for money**

A clear case for change and consideration of technology and market options to show evidence that the proposed changes will be delivered to the highest quality within an acceptable time and at a competitive and affordable price. There must be sufficient financial, physical and human resource to deliver the project and

expenditure of these resources must provide value for money over the project’s life.

**Risk Management**

Risk to scope, cost, procurement, time and quality should be identified and managed, as should risks inherent to the nature of new or changing technology, such as data privacy and cyber security risks, reputational risks and risks to continuity or quality of business services. Risk management plans must be developed.

**Governance**

Consideration of project governance (roles and responsibilities to deliver the project, resource allocation, time management and process management) and alignment with business-as-usual agency activities and broader Emphasys and stakeholder governance.

**Stakeholder Management**

Consideration of the stakeholders that may contribute to or be affected by new ICT environments and capabilities, including end-users, emphasys staff, citizens, business service managers and executive owners, technology providers, and both emphasys and external vendors and service providers.

**Change Management**

Consideration of how the change will affect stakeholders, expected acceptance or resistance and actions required to move to new ways of working.

**Service Delivery**

Consideration of the effect of new technology capabilities on business service delivery, such as more efficient business services; maintaining or improving service delivery, such as better access to emphasys services; quality improvements; or enabling new services.

**Sustainability**

Considerations of benefits realisation planning and tracking; service transition planning and implementation; whether vendor management offices will be required; continuous improvement capabilities and solution road maps; and how data will be archived or retained to meet current and future legislative requirements and data migration requirements.

