

PROJECT POST COMPLETION REVIEW POLICY

Section	Strategic Project Management Office
Contact	Director SPMO
Last Review	December 2015
Next Review	December 2018
Approval	C16/52
Effective Date	6 th May 2016

Purpose:

To ensure projects, and or significant phases of a project, are reviewed against University plans and objectives and that:

- There is an objective evaluation of how successfully the objectives were met and how effective governance and project management practices were;
- Lessons learned and previously unidentified shortfalls are captured;
- Elements of lessons learned are then available to assist in planning, managing and meeting the objectives of future phases or projects; and
- Project closure is consistent across Massey University.

Policy:

All major projects must undertake a Project Post Completion Review (PCR) as specified in Table 1 of this policy. Reviews should be undertaken after the material project activities and deliverables have been in place long enough to allow for objective judgments to be made about quality or performance. Interviews, focus groups and surveys, and artefacts specified in the 'Related Procedures and Documents' section of this policy will be used as a basis for helping form objective judgments.

This policy is mandatory for all construction projects over \$5.0 million, Information & Communication Technology (ICT) Projects over \$2.0 million and other projects¹ over \$2.0 million. The policy will also apply to all projects which do not reach these financial thresholds, but have been assessed as extreme risk or high risk in accordance with the Business Case Policy and Project Management Policy.

¹ Other projects include operating projects, business developments, new programmes, and business change initiatives

A tiered review framework based on the risk and financial thresholds of the project will be adopted to undertake the PCR's as specified in Table 1 below.

- Extreme risk or high risk or high value projects will be subject to independent external review.
- Review from suitably qualified independent Massey Employee or the Strategic Project Management Office (SPMO) for medium risk or medium value projects is acceptable.
- Peer review for low risk and low value projects is acceptable.

Table 1 - The type of review to be completed for any given project.

Review Type	Risk Threshold	Or, Financial Threshold	Requirement
Independent External Review	Any case assessed as extreme risk or high risk	Construction projects in excess of \$5.0 m ICT Project in excess of \$2.0m Other projects exceeding \$2.0m	Mandatory
Independent Internal Review	Any case assessed as moderate risk	Construction projects between \$1.0m and \$5.0 m ICT Projects between \$1.0m and \$2.0m Other projects between \$1.0m and \$2.0M	As specified by the SPMO or Risk Management Office
Peer Review	Any case assessed as low risk	All projects between \$0.15m and 1.0m	As specified by the SPMO or Risk Management Office

Note: The Risk Threshold is determined by completion of a risk profile assessment. Refer to Related Business Case Procedures. The Financial Threshold is the approved project budget or final project cost whichever is greatest in financial value.

Provision is to be made in general ledger or project operating budgets to cover the internal and external² cost of any Post Completion Reviews. Business cases should make provision for PCR operating costs in the project budget.

The Project Post Completion Review must address:

- alignment with University strategy
- project governance and management,
- outcomes, benefits and benefit's realisations,
- alignment with the business case ,
- review of financial benefits, costs and value for money
- briefing by users specification and, design including options, coordination and delivery,
- procurement strategy, options, methodology and delivery
- construction or implementation, including variations, timelines, team performance and risk management
- satisfaction of occupants/users
- the requirements of *Post Completion Review Parameters* as defined below

² External costs are those costs for engagement of external specialists to undertake independent PCR's or to provide specialist advice for internal reviews.

Review Management

Projects shall be reviewed and closed in accordance with the 'Related Procedures and Documents' referenced in this policy. Reviews will be led by the Strategic Project Management Office (SPMO) in consultation with the National Capital Manager, Director of Risk and Assurance, Chief Procurement and Contract Officer, project governance boards, project steering groups and project control groups where these groups are still in place and full projects have been completed.. The SPMO will have responsibility for:

- Effective management of the PCR programme, systems and processes
- Preparing the review scope and manage the selection of an appropriate *Reviewer* for each project with input from the internal stakeholders above.
- Scheduling reviews, ensuring the timing of reviews considers the period for benefits realisation, and the operational and seasonal utilisation cycles of the activity for which the asset/solution was implemented.
- Ensuring *Reviewers* are appropriately trained to undertake PCR's and facilitate the training of University staff to undertake Independent Internal Reviews and Peer Reviews. It is the intent of the University to:
 - Lift the capability of University staff in relation to Post Completion Reviews.
 - Utilise internal resources whenever it is appropriate to do so.

Reporting

Post Completion Reviews will be prepared in draft for review by the project governance board or steering group. The final report will be submitted to the Senior Leadership Team, thereafter to the Audit and Risk Committee before submission to University Council for information. However, smaller projects defined as low risk or low value are not required to be provided to SLT, the Audit and Risk Committee or University Council.

Communication and distribution of PCR reports shall be managed through the SPMO in accordance with the agreed review scope. The SPMO will actively disseminate learnings to project governance boards and management teams during the preparation of business cases and at project establishment.

The SPMO will maintain a library of PCR reports ensuring project learnings are available to provide guidance for governance and management of future projects.

Definitions:

Post Completion Review (PCR)

The purpose of a PCR is to critically assess the achievement of project outcomes and provide feedback that allows for continuous improvement in the project governance, project management, design, construction and implementation processes. This leads to improved performance for users, and improved management and financial outcomes across the University.

Post Completion Reviews Parameters

Post completion reviews should ascertain the following:

Strategy

- Alignment with the Strategic Plan and sub-strategies, Investment Plan, Campus Development Plan, Information Systems Strategic Plan and Capital Asset Management Plan.

- Highlight what changes (if any) had occurred in the tertiary education sector since the project was briefed, designed, completed and up to the present time, and what needs to be changed/recovered.

Governance and Management

- The effectiveness of the governance and project management in mitigating risk and contributing to a successful project outcome.
- Change management controls and approval of variations, including the scope and cost variations within the context of the project.
- Comment on audit processes including independent qualified audits (IQA's), health checks, risk reviews and progress reporting.

Planning

- Project initiation including feasibility, strategic assessment, risk assessment, scoping and development of the business case.
- The level and appropriateness of stakeholder engagement in development of the business case, user briefing's, and the specification of high level and detailed user requirements.
- The planning and design processes for development of the solution. E.g. ICT, building, equipment, business initiative.
- Advise on any general or specific matters of design efficiency or inefficiency observations.

Delivery

- Review of the procurement methodology, including adherence to policy, procedures, tender processes and recommendations, identification of risks and improvement opportunities.
- Review of construction or implementation, including variations, timelines, consultant and contractor performance, delivery team performance and risk management.
- Determine any remedial work required for consideration/action.

Financial

- Provide details on the achievement against project budgets and financial benefits stated in the business case.
- Final project cost and financial analysis with comparison to project estimates through all design and implementation stages, including rough order of cost, preliminary assessment of cost, final estimate of cost, tender price and completed cost.
- Provide details on the effective and efficient use of contingency funds.

Health & Safety

- Advise on any health and safety duties (see sections in Health and Safety at Work Act for specifics) of: project control (S:38), design (S:39), manufacture or importation of plant or structures (S:40,41), supply (S:42), installation, construction and commissioning (S:43).
- Provide a statement of Health and Safety compliance with Building Act requirements .

Design Performance

- Comprehensive review of value for money against sector key performance indicators (KPI's).
- Measure solution performance against sector KPI's for space design, space utilisation, utilities, business processes and ICT.

- Final spatial information for building projects including proportions/ratios and spatial efficiency data – using TEFMA standards. This must include at least Gross Floor Area (GFA), Usable Floor Area (UFA), Design Efficiency (UFA/GFA), Office Space/FTE, Teaching Space/EFTS.

Outcomes and Benefits

- Provides details on the realisation of outcomes and benefits stated in the business case.
- If the project has delivered and met the original user requirements, design philosophy and client instructions/facility specifications as well as efficiency of design, functionality and buildability.
- Whether the completed project meet the defined user brief and whether the user groups and *stakeholders* are satisfied with the end product (specific high points), or not (specific low points – what and why?).

Reviewers

Reviewers shall be suitably qualified and experienced in project completion reviews and meet the following requirements.

- “Independent External Review ” means the appointment of a company or person, who;
 - Shall not be an employee of Massey University
 - Shall not be a company or person that has been associated with the development or management of the project
- “Independent Internal Review” means the appointment of a company or person, who;
 - May be a Massey University employee. The reviewer must not be a member of the governance board, project steering group, project board, and project control group or within the project sponsors reporting line.
 - Shall not be a company or person that has been associated with the development or management of the project.
- “Peer Review” means the appointment of a company or person, who;
 - May be a Massey University employee for peer reviews of projects but must not be within the project sponsor’s reporting line
 - Shall not be a company or person that has been associated with the development or management of the project.

Stakeholders

Individuals, users or groups with a vested interest in the project outcomes. These may include students, academic staff and colleges, professional staff and services groups, governance groups, and specific external individuals or organisations.

Audience:

All staff

Relevant Legislation:

Health and Safety at Work Act 2015

Building Act 2004

Legal Compliance:

The Tertiary Education Commission capital asset management (CAM) and financial reporting requirements.

Office of the Auditor-General New Zealand, audit and financial reporting requirements

Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) Workplace Safety Management Programme audit (8.6) that “*health and safety component is part of any post contract evaluation*”.

Related Procedures and Documents:

Business Case Policy and Procedure

Capital Investment Policy

Capital Planning Framework and Procedures

[Delegations of Authority Policy and Documents](#)

Financial Monitoring and Control Policy

Information Services Strategic Plan

[Procurement Policy and Procedures](#)

[Project Management Policy and Framework](#)

Request for Financial Authority (RFA) Procedure

[Risk Management Policy](#)

Tenders Board Terms of Reference and Procedure

University Campus Development Plans

[Post Completion Review Templates](#)

Project Business Cases and Project Terms of Reference

Project Documentation and Contracts

Document Management Control:

Prepared by: National Capital Manager for the SPMO

Authorised by: Assistant Vice-Chancellor Strategy, Finance IT and Commercial Operations

Approved by: Audit and Risk Committee

Date issued: 5 August 2003

Last review: February 2016

Next review: February 2019