Australian Taxation Office
Easier, Cheaper and More Personalised Change Program

Independent Assurer Report
FINAL Version 1.00
Period covering 1st November 2006 – 30th November 2006

- **Executive Summary**

- **Recommendations**

- **Assurance Findings**

  - **Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling**

  - **Release 2 Deployment**

  - **Release 3 Design**

  - **Release 3 Build and Test**

Introduction:

Based on the program schedule, November represents a substantial month for the Change Program with considerable activity planned for both Release 2 and Release 3, including:

• Business and technical deployment of the Release 2 content management solution,

• Completing Drop 3 of the Release 3 build and commencing on Drop 4, the last of the Release 3 "Core Architecturally Complete" drops

• Completing Product Testing of Release 3's Drop 2, and

• The Release 3 Deployment team finalising its assessment of the impact ICP and the associated enterprise business processes will have on the ATO's business processes.

In addition to this activity, the Change Program's work on assessing the options for introducing Superannuation Simplification into the Change Program is planned to culminate with the ATO's decision on which implementation option to adopt.

Focus:

In accordance with November being a key month for the Change Program, the Independent Assurer team focused on the following key areas:

(i)   assessing the status of the R3 design, build and test activities and the impacts on the respective plans,

(ii) a review of the Release 3 functional change request process,

(iii) participating the consideration of the options for introducing Superannuation Simplification, and

(iv) continuing an overall watch on the program health with particular emphasis on program reporting, resourcing and scheduling.

Key Findings:

Based on this month's review, the IA is concerned that while significant activity is taking place across the Program, both the Release 2 and Release 3 activities are continuing to slip and that this trend is not being arrested.

In fact, based on our assessment, the IA considers that a number of issues with the current R3 coupled with the fact that the work to consider the options for Superannuation Simplification is drawing upon key R3 resources required for R3 Design and Build activities and is also starting to distract a number of the R3 development staff, that the current Program delivery plans are in jeopardy.

Of particular concern for IA regarding Release 3 are:

- Key elements of the R3 Design are not complete, which in addition to consuming time for key resources and creating uncertainty around the R3 solution, is also hindering the efficient operation of the R3 Build, Conversion and Test

- The time taken to establish and fully staff the R3 Design team along with the demands on a small group of staff with key design knowledge, and the difficulty in retaining and obtaining design resources – meaning the critical elements of design (those that the current Build are dependent on), may not be complete until early to mid 2007. Further compounding this issue is uncertainty in the roles and responsibilities for the various design teams

- R3 Build activities falling further behind schedule and the pushing of some core architectural build activities into 2007

- Release 3 Product Test has not commenced and is now not expected to start until mid-December 2006 at the earliest – constituting almost a six week delay

Further compounding the IA concerns with the schedule slippage are our observations that the management and status information provided to the Executive does not provide a simple and clear view of the Program's status, the size and the business functionality of the work left to complete and the impact of the slippage on schedule, functionality and resources

As part of Capgemini's ongoing monitoring and analysis we contacted senior members of the business to gain their perspective on the effectiveness of R3 business engagement and the state of R2 to date. The feedback to date is generally positive, however the approach to deploying R3 and the issues with the remaining R2 deployments and slippage in the deployment dates is damaging the business confidence and support for the Change Program.

With the completion of the "core" ICP Build, the R3 development will transition into a 'fix' phase where the build / fix and testing activities and solution functionality being developed are driven by the level of available resources and the level of effort required to implement Change Requests (internal and external). The accuracy of information pertaining to the estimated effort and categories of Change Requests will be critical to effective and efficient management of the build and test activities in 2007. Based on our assessment of the CR process, the IA has identified that

1. The CR current process does not drive the capture of data that would allow accurate understanding and management of the CRs, and

2. The impact assessment stage is the major bottleneck in timely turnaround of CRs, which in turn is a result of the number of key resources required for this activity already being stretched to the limit.

The summary ratings for each of the work streams are indicated below:

Overall Workstream Ratings Summary	
Workstream	**Overall Rating**
Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling	Red
Release 2 Deployment	Red
Release 3 Design	Red
Release 3 Build and Test	Red

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

- **Executive Summary**

- **Recommendations**

- **Assurance Findings**

  - **Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling**

  - **Release 2 Deployment**

  - **Release 3 Design**

  - **Release 3 Build and Test**

Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling

<u>Status Reporting</u>

PMO 1: The current status reports are reviewed and streamlined. All reports and their information should be evaluated for their role in the management of the Program, including a review of the audience and their information needs. Reports and information not required should be discarded and the reports and information that is to be retained should be refreshed. **Influencer for action:** CP

PMO 2: Key development milestones are documented in a single page, and information is provided about the milestones in such a way that allows progress to be tracked and slippage to be highlighted (the assurer can provide a template to assist in this process). **Influencer for action:** CP

<u>Build Status</u>

PMO 3:   The R3 Build deliverable matrix document is a useful management tool. In order to maximise its effectiveness, additional information required for reporting Build and Testing status should be added, and the matrix should be updated on a regular basis. **Influencer for action:** CP

<u>Management and Scheduling of Change Requests</u>

PMO 4:   Those CRs that have a primary category of "Cost/benefit" be reviewed to determine if CPSC approval is required. If not, the CR category should be changed to something more appropriate or the Program Charter revised to reflect the changed process. **Influencer for action:** CP

PMO 5:   The Charter and CR management tool are updated to reflect the required CR process (including Action item 4.1), and that this is communicated clearly to all teams involved in the CR process. **Influencer for action:** CP

<u>**Key:**</u>

Influencer for Action (i.e. the group that could make it happen) can be one of, or a combination of:
- BAU
- CP
- ATO (P&P, ICT)

Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling

PMO 6: **PMO 6:** The CP consider making additional data (such as work effort, scheduled date for example) mandatory following approval, and adding a small number of new fields to allow summary information on the scope, work effort and implementation of CRs. **Influencer for action:** CP

PMO 7: A mechanism that allows the tracking of internal vs external CRs (within the existing CR tool) be implemented. **Influencer for action:** CP

PMO 8: A more thorough review of the content of the CRs be undertaken, and the results used to improve the quality of the process going forward. **Influencer for action:** CP

Demand on Key Resources

PMO 9: Identify key bottlenecks and develop a management plan to reduce their workload. **Influencer for action:** CP

Release 2 Deployment

R2 1: Review the causes of slippage in recent R2 releases and revise the R2 deployment plan to ensure that the deployment dates are feasible and can accommodate the types of recurring issues.. **Influencer for action:** CP

Key:

Influencer for Action (i.e. the group that could make it happen) can be one of, or a combination of:
- BAU
- CP
- ATO (P&P, ICT)

Release 2 Deployment

R2 3: Review the list of things that went wrong on previous releases and build those into the planning for each future release. **Influencer for action:** CP

Release 3

R3 Design – Completion of Design

R3 1: The results of the design review are documented, and the remaining work agreed and prioritised, governance agreed and communicated, key milestones documented in line with the available resources. This needs executive focus to ensure resolution and completion within the next 2 weeks. **Influencer for action:** CP

R3 2: The reporting of design status be extended to include key functional areas of design still to be completed, to inform management of the complexity and functional scope of the remaining work. **Influencer for action:** CP

R3 3: The CP gives further consideration to the design completion criteria for the January 2007 stage gate. **Influencer for action:** CP

Build and Test

R3 4: Ensure that the ICP Design and Analysis team is operational at full capacity to avoid a further delay in delivering the technical design documents to the build team for implementation. **Influencer for action:** CP

R3 5: Complete and sign-off the Test Strategy and Test Approach documents as a matter of priority in order to ensure a managed, agreed and consistent approach to the testing. **Influencer for action:** CP

R3 6: **R3 6:** Identify the total resourcing profile and requirements for the Product Test team and assign the outstanding resources. **Influencer for action:** CP

R3 7: Identify and assign the outstanding resources for the Fix team to avoid delay. **Influencer for action:** CP

Key:

Influencer for Action (i.e. the group that could make it happen) can be one of, or a combination of:
- BAU
- CP
- ATO (P&P, ICT)

- **Executive Summary**

- **Recommendations**

- **Assurance Findings**

  - **Program Management, Resourcing and Scheduling**

  - **Release 2 Deployment**

  - **Release 3 Design**

  - **Release 3 Build and Test**

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating: **Red**		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Status Reporting	**Red**	As a very large and complex systems delivery program, it is essential for the Change Program to provide accurate, current, and easily accessible status information to enable the Executive to properly guide and govern the Program.
		Accordingly, the IA has reviewed the current level and content of Status Reports in order to assess their effectiveness as a management tool for the CP.
		Overall, this review has identified that while the current reporting provides substantial detail on the status of delivery, the reporting is not effective in providing the right information for accurate management of the program – meaning the Change Program Executive does not have the means to easily and accurately assess Program progress and performance.
		This assessment is based on the following observations:
		•Key information about the health of the program is not highlighted appropriately, and sufficient detail is not provided about the impact of key risks and issues.
		•The delivery milestone list is not complete – it does not cover the key program level milestones. This makes it difficult to acquire a high-level, complete view of the progress of the program against key delivery milestones (that is, there is little information to easily and confidently assess "where we are now" compared to "where we should be").
		•There is no representation of the critical path (we understand that this is in the process of being developed, but are yet to see the final product).

Green = On Track   **Amber** = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan   = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating:	Red	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Status Reporting (continued)	Red	•There is too much detail and the detailed information is not always current. Much of the information is skipped over by executives and key points are not given the emphasis the information requires – rather they are obscured by less important or less relevant text. •There are a number of different reports with different formats, reporting essentially the same information in a slightly different way leading to uncertainty on which information is to be used for decision making. •The information in the text of the reports is not reflected appropriately in the schedule (for example, the current information shows slippage which is not reflected in the milestone dates or the schedule). •With a few exceptions, reports do not provide clear start and end dates for key delivery phases making it difficult to track progress against expected start and completion dates and determine whether schedule slippage has occurred. •Task scheduling and resourcing requirements are being planned immediately prior to the work commencing, which in turn limits the accuracy and value of advanced forecasting of resource levels and requirements.

Green = On Track   Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan   = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Status Reporting (continued)	Red	Recommendations **PMO 1**: The current status reports are reviewed and streamlined. All reports and their information should be evaluated for their role in the management of the Program, including a review of the audience and their information needs. Reports and information not required should be discarded and the reports and information that is to be retained should be refreshed. **PMO 2**: Key development milestones are documented in a single page, and information is provided about the milestones in such a way that allows progress to be tracked and slippage to be highlighted (the assurer can provide a template to assist in this process).

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating:	Red	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Build Status	Red	Build continues to progress for the "core" ICP, and the task of managing the scope of each of the "core" drops as well as the "CR" drops continues to increase in complexity. It is critical that each of the teams (design, build and test) understands the scope of each of the drops, in order to maximise their efficiency and use of resources.
		Our analysis this month has highlighted some misalignment between the status reports and tools being used to manage the build activity:
		The R3 build deliverable matrix document (as of 04/12/2006) reports current Release 3 progress as approximately 53% and the ICP progress was approximately 90%. We note the matrix does not contain comprehensive information, therefore this number does not accurately represent the Release 3 program status. The matrix document may be missing some information – for example there is no detail about Product Test, design and other R3 elements, which should also be recorded to support more accurate progress tracking.
		Analysis of the current data provided in the matrix indicates that the productivity rate of the build team for the 3 weeks from 13 November – 04 December 2006 was constrained mainly due to dependencies with other team activities, for example, the delay in completing the Technical Design specifications and designs. If the bottleneck is not resolved and the productivity rate stays the same, the remaining work (approximately 1907 of 4061 components) could take up to 7 months to complete.

Green = On Track   Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan   = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Build Status (continued)	Red	In addition, the number of outstanding resources continues to be a challenge for the build team. Based on the weekly status reports, there are approximately 89 resources (71 from ATO and 18 from Accenture) still outstanding across the Release 3 team (as at 1 December 2006):

Within the Key Findings cell:

- There are 40 resources required from ATO out of 65 required for Product Test, 19 resources are overdue, 21 resources will be required in early 2007.
- There are 19 resources required for Performance Test, 3 future resources have been filled, 5 resources from ATO are required to be filled by 22 January 2007.
- There are 14 resources (8 from Accenture and 6 from ATO) currently outstanding for the Interfaces team.
- There are 15 resources (4 from Accenture and 11 from ATO) currently outstanding for the Assembly Test team.
- There are 4 resources (1 from Accenture and 3 from ATO) currently outstanding for the Fix team.
- There are 2 resources from ATO currently outstanding for the OA team.
- There are 8 resources (4 from Accenture and 4 from ATO) currently outstanding for the Reporting team.

<u>Recommendations</u>

PMO 3: The R3 Build deliverable matrix document is a useful management tool. In order to maximise its effectiveness, additional information required for reporting Build and Testing status should be added, and the matrix should be updated on a regular basis.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating:	Red	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Management and Scheduling of Change Requests	Amber	The volume and scope of the internal and external Change Requests (CRs) along with management, resourcing and scheduling the work to address these CRs presents a substantial risk to the Release 3 delivery. If used properly, the CR process can provide information that would be very valuable to the management of the CP. Accordingly, this month, the IA conducted a high-level review of the CR process (from a governance perspective) and our analysis identified two key findings:
		Firstly, the CR current process does not drive the capture of data that would allow accurate understanding and management of the CRs. At present, the Program would not be able to easily provide accurate information on:
		- The estimated number of effort days to complete all known CRs
		- The actual number of effort days to complete CRs
		- The estimated and actual number of effort days by each CR "drop"
		- A comparison of the work estimates compared to the actual effort by drop
		- Which CRs (and therefore which functionality) are implemented in a drop
		Our assessment indicated the tool used to capture information has recently been changed to allow for this data to be entered, but entry of this data is not mandatory and team leaders have different perspectives on providing this data. Entry of this data would help to provide a clear view of the effort involved in implementing the CRs, which should then be used as input into the scheduling and planning processes. Initially it could allow for assurance of the current CR work schedule.
		Secondly, the impact assessment stage is the major bottleneck in timely turnaround of CRs, which in turn is a result of the number of key resources required for this activity already being stretched to the limit.

Green = On Track   Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan   = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
Management and Scheduling of Change Requests (continued)	Amber	In addition, the IA made the following observations: • The majority of CRs (77%) have a primary category of Design. Given that build is not yet complete, this is likely to be a reflection of the approach taken to start build before design is completed, and manage with changes and completed designs via the CR process. • The current process differs from the process documented in the Program Charter. The most notable example is that the Charter states that "Any changes to the business case (cost or benefits) must be approved by CPSC." There are 23 Release 3 CRs with the primary category "Cost/Benefits". Of these, only 15 are designated as requiring CPSC approval. The IA understands that this may be the result of mis-categorisation of the CR and may be a deviation from what was originally intended for the CR process, however this process needs to be brought back into line. • There does not appear to be a simple way of tracking "internal" vs "external" CRs in the current CR management tool. • There could be an improvement in both the quality and completeness of the data in the CRs.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating:	Red	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Management and Scheduling of Change Requests (continued)	Amber	•We did not see any evidence that Action item 4.1 from the CP Status Workshop meeting of 18-19 September (see below) has been implemented. *"Finalise and communicate the governance for design within the overall Change Program governance framework. Ensure the design trade off process covers all types of design changes, that is:* *•External Change (i.e. funded) - includes changes arising from legislative change, approved business priority change; will be approved by the CP Exec/CPSC* *•Internal Change that is required for outcome; these changes are to just be done* *•Internal Change that is not needed for outcome; put it on a list for delivery post R3* *•Internal Change where the impact on the outcomes is unclear* *•Escalate the change to relevant ATO Exec Sponsor/BAE and/or the DIM* *•Internal Change where this is a conflict with an outcome; escalate to the DIM which will provide direction to the CP Exec/CPSC* *•May result in the Outcome being deferred)* *<u>R3 extensions/deferrals</u>* *As we add more external change, we may reach a point where more external change will require something to be removed -> deferred outcomes* *Anything that is included in the outcomes that is deferred must have a clear plan for delivery, including estimates, resourcing, schedule and funding* *<u>CPSC is the only authority that can approve this</u>* *<u>This should be flagged in the external change request that causes it</u>* *<u>Pre filter the CR's based on the 6 categories listed above before committing to a full impact analysis of all Change /requests. </u>"* •Our understanding is that this action item will change the CR process, which should also be reflected in the Charter. The due date for this action item was 2/11/06.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating:	Red	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Management and Scheduling of Change Requests (continued)	Amber	Some other Release 3 statistics we found during our analysis indicate that the CRs may prove to be a major drain on resources and further impact the R3 delviery schedule in 2007 (based on the CR log as at 21/11/06) are: • There are currently 764 Release 3 CRs • 103 (13%) have been actioned • 173 (23%) are in progress (detailed analysis, further action required, impact assessment or new) • 15 include a date in "scheduled drop date" • 54 include a figure in "total estimate of workdays to complete" Our analysis this month was on the high-level effectiveness of the CR process. We believe that a more in-depth analysis is now required, with focus on the following areas: • The process for managing functional items that are deemed "out of scope" • The process for managing CRs and functional items that will not be delivered in R3, but are still requirements • A detailed review of the quality of information documented for CRs • The effectiveness of the tracking and reporting of CRs • Business/subject matter expert involvement in the CR process

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating:	**Red**	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Management and Scheduling of Change Requests (continued)	Amber	<u>Recommendations</u> **PMO 4:** Those CRs that have a primary category of "Cost/benefit" be reviewed to determine if CPSC approval is required. If not, the CR category should be changed to something more appropriate or the Program Charter revised to reflect the changed process. **PMO 5:** The Charter and CR management tool are updated to reflect the required CR process (including Action item 4.1), and that this is communicated clearly to all teams involved in the CR process. **PMO 6:** The CP consider making additional data (such as work effort, scheduled date for example) mandatory following approval, and adding a small number of new fields to allow summary information on the scope, work effort and implementation of CRs. **PMO 7:** A mechanism that allows the tracking of internal vs external CRs (within the existing CR tool) be implemented. **PMO 8:** A more thorough review of the content of the CRs be undertaken, and the results used to improve the quality of the process going forward.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating:	**Red**	
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
Demands on Key Resources	**Red**	There is a core group of ATO and Accenture staff who are key to the successful delivery of the Program. This group is responsible for day-to-day delivery of key components, providing executive direction and management, and designing and directing the introduction of new policy measures and associated changes. The volume and level of work this group is required to complete, as well as the associated tight timeframes are concerning for the IA as:
		•Many of these staff are in key management and leadership positions.
		•Many of these key staff are stretched to the limit, and are increasingly becoming bottlenecks. For example, there is one R3 resource who is responsible for 120 open issues in the R3 issue register. If there is no further action on some of those issues, next week a further 70 issues will become overdue.
		•This is going to be impacted further by the difficulty in obtaining key resources, as well as the significant time taken to on-board staff in key areas (up to 3 months). Burn-out, illness and the holiday period are likely to have an impact as the program continues into 2007.
		Recommendations
		PMO 9: Identify key bottlenecks and develop a management plan to reduce their workload.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R2 Deployment	Red	Despite replanning of the remaining Release 2 deployments, R2 deployment dates are still slipping. The IA understands that a number of the changes in dates are due to third parties and outside the control of the Release 2 management, however our assessment indicates some contributing factors that could be addressed to help mitigate the impact of changes or issues that arise.
		While the likelihood, impact and consequence of these slippages has improved with improvements in governance and the R2 DMD process in October and November, the improvements have plateaued and the IA considers some further improvements could be introduced that would assist in addressing declining business confidence in Release 2.
		Specifically, the IA has observed:
		- Aggressive planning means that there are still key tasks being completed at the last minute
		- There appears to be limited co-ordination and control over the disparate development and deployment activities, apart from the co-ordination that is provided through the DMD process.
		- The involvement of/communication to key stakeholders does not occur until too close to the planned release
		Recommendations
		R2 1: Review the causes of slippage in recent R2 releases and revise the R2 deployment plan to ensure that the deployment dates are feasible and can accommodate the types of recurring issues.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
R3 Design – Completion of Design	Red	There continues to be the need for the CP to provide clear and current information on the completion of design – including the work remaining to complete the design, as well as the governance, schedule, resourcing and processes for completing that work.
		The fact that: i) the Stage Gate - Release 3 Design Review 3 (including "Release 3 Design Complete"), was completed in June 2006; ii) the design work was originally scheduled to be completed in June 2006; and iii) there are indications that the design may not be complete until June 2007; are all key reasons to ensure that this receives management focus to ensure that the remaining work is completed as effectively and efficiently as possible.
		Capgemini continues to report on the need for a review of the status of the remaining design work (see for example our August monthly report, Recommendation R3 3). In addition, the CP Exec workshop of 18-19 September 2006, action item "4.6 " is to "Have CDT's identify and report the outstanding issues that are delaying closure of the design."
		This month, we are unable to report on either the status of the governance of design, or the full status of the remaining design work due to the unavailability of this information, however we have reported what information we have below:

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating:　Red

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Design – Completion of Design (continued)	Red	• Release 3 design is still continuing, and our analysis indicates a diverse range of views on when the design will be completed. For example, some advice indicated design may not complete until early to mid 2007. • Despite verbal advice provided by Accenture in the CP status meetings that there is to be 70-80 staff working on Design, as at the end of November and despite repeated requests for this information, the IA has not seen any management information identifying the work remaining on design, the resources (available and/or required), the governance approach and the strategies planned for gaining closure. • Furthermore, we understand that key design staff are no longer providing written status reports on their progress against outstanding design deliverables, and that with two exceptions CDTs are being either returned to the business or directed to focus on deployment. • There continues to be reports of good relationships between design staff and the forms and build teams. • For Lodge and Pay, the list of outstanding design items includes amendments, consolidated entities, and instalments. We understand that there are still fundamental design issues around Activity statements, IT returns and Excise. • There are 10-15 key outstanding design issues around Registration. This includes items such as backdated registrations, account period start date, PKI/EOI, and security.

Green　= On Track

Amber　= Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red　= Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Capgemini
CONSULTING.TECHNOLOGY.OUTSOURCING

Overall Workstream Rating: **Red**		
Criteria	**Rating**	**Key Findings**
R3 Design – Completion of Design (continued)	**Red**	• Correspondence – is not expected to complete until May 2007 (though the schedule is not yet completed). Active compliance is one area that is still outstanding. Recommendations **R3 1:** The results of the design review are documented, and the remaining work agreed and prioritised, governance agreed and communicated, key milestones documented in line with the available resources. This needs executive focus to ensure resolution and completion within the next 2 weeks. **R3 2:** The reporting of design status be extended to include key functional areas of design still to be completed, to inform management of the complexity and functional scope of the remaining work. **R3 3:** The CP gives further consideration to the design completion criteria for the January 2007 stage gate.

Green = On Track   **Amber** = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan   = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Build	Red	The Build team includes a technical design team (which is referred to as the R3 Design and Analysis team). This team is not yet operating at full capacity, delaying delivery of the Technical Design specifications to the Build team for implementation.
		There is a test data and test configuration issue causing misalignment of the test data between Siebel and the ICP clients. This issue has delayed completion of the Disconnected Test activity, which also delayed the hand-over of the Drop 2 and 3 package to the Assembly Test team.
		The R3 Build Deliverables Matrix document is a useful tool for sharing release scope information between the teams, but it does not accurately reflect the current status of the Release 3 program.
		Conclusion
		If the R3 Design and Analysis team is still not operational at full capacity and the R3 build deliverable matrix document does not provide accurate information on the status of the Build work, making it increasingly difficult to understand and manage the build to schedule.
		Recommendations
		R3 4: Ensure that the R3 Design and Analysis team is operational at full capacity to avoid a further delay in delivering the technical design documents to the build team for implementation.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Product Test	Red	The IA is concerned that some build and test activities on the critical path are behind schedule, and that this has a significant impact on further "down-stream" activities. Some key delays we have noted are:

- Delay in deploying the code in to the Assembly Test environment for testing due to a migration issue. This continues to delay the start of Product Test.
- Delay in completing and signing off the Test Strategy document. This has delayed the completion of the Test Approach document.
- Product Test script preparation is significantly behind schedule. The weekly status report of 01/12/2006 indicates that there are only 20 scripts complete out of 63 for drop 2; 13 scripts complete out of 261 for drop 3 and 0 scripts complete out of 604 for drop 4.

There are still outstanding resources for the Product Test team. The weekly status report of 01/12/2006 states that there are 40 ATO resources still outstanding out of a total of 65 resources (46 ATO and 19 ACN).

Recommendations

R3 5: Complete and sign-off the Test Strategy and Test Approach documents as a matter of priority in order to ensure a managed and agreed approach to the testing.

R3 6: Identify the total resourcing profile and requirements for the Product Test team and assign the outstanding resources.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: **Red**

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 - Fix	Amber	•The number of resources requested by the Fix team are not in place. They are currently sourced from other teams and subject to availability and priorities in these teams. While this is currently helping smooth peaks and troughs in the work allocations for these teams (in particular Build), productive completion of fix activities will soon depend on appointment of staff to the Fix team. •Currently, there are 4 resources are outstanding reducing the capability of the team to meet SLAs in some areas. Conclusion •If the resources shortage for the Fix team is not resolved, the turnaround of fixes and the risk of SLAs not being met will increase. Recommendations **R3 7:** Identify and assign the outstanding resources for the Fix team to avoid delay.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised. Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to timeline and/or budgets