Member Major Projects Board – 27th March 2024

Post project evaluations – proposed change to agreed process

Background

- At its meeting in June 2022, the Member Major Projects Board (MMPB) agreed a process for evaluations of projects designated by Cabinet as 'Major Projects'.
- The Major Projects are, by their nature, long-term projects.
- Officers have been working on the first post project evaluation report to bring to MMPB, the NORA 4 project.
- It has become clear that the process agreed in June 2022, is not practical and therefore this paper provides an update to that process.
- The June 2022 paper is appended for ease of reference at Appendix 1.

Key Facts

- The process for post project evaluations agreed two years ago, involved elected members in determining the terms of reference for each evaluation. The process involved officers working to 'core' terms of reference for each review, and also involved bringing the draft terms of reference to MMPB to confirm the precise terms of reference;
- Whilst this seemed to be a good process 'on paper' / in theory, in practice, the Officer Major Projects Board (OMPB) believe the agreed process is overly complex, with too many steps making it overly resource intensive;
- MMPB currently receive regular detailed updates on the position of projects through Project Highlight Reports to ensure early engagement;
- MMPB can request presentations focused on particular projects through the lifetime of a project if there are any issues / concerns, or to help with understanding in more detail;
- OMPB have considered what the Council needs to be achieving by evaluating projects as:
  - an overall view of the project's effectiveness in delivery;
  - analysis of the project's outcomes
  - identification of successes and areas for improvement, and
  - continual improvement through learning and assurance around project management and delivery.

Proposal

The OMPB believes it is not practical or best practice to conduct evaluations in the complex way set out previously and requests MMPB agree a change to the process.

The most expedient and beneficial way to identify lessons will be for officers to gather key information and present that to members to review. Members will be able to request further information on aspects when the report is presented, if they wish, which can then be brought back to the following meeting.

- The revised process is proposed to be agreed is:
    - Towards the end stages of a designated Major Project, the Project Manager will write a brief terms of reference for the Post Project Evaluation. This will capture project specific issues and nuances.

    - This initial terms of reference will be taken through the Officer Major Projects Board
        - for input
        - a decision on who/which function will undertake the evaluation[1], and
        - to also consider the appropriate time frame for the review to take place[2].

- Once the Terms of Reference has been agreed, the Post Project Evaluation will be undertaken by the nominated person/team/function, to the timescales determined, using the template shown at Appendix 2.

- On completion, the Post Project Review will be taken through the OMPB, then on to the MMPB.

Decision required

MMPB is asked to agree the simplified process outlined above, for reasons given within the report.

---

[1] This may be another relevant project officer within the council, the internal audit team, or an external person, as determined on a case-by-case basis

[2] Although some of the evaluation should commence shortly after the project has been delivered, to adequately assess the quality of the implementation and complete the process, it may be appropriate to wait long enough for the changes caused by the project to take effect. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Member Major Projects Board – 15 June 2022

Post Project Review process for designated 'Major Projects'

Background

- It was agreed at the Cabinet meeting on 16 November 2021 that projects Cabinet designated as a 'Major Project' would be monitored by the Member Major Projects Board (MMPB), as a sub-committee of Cabinet. The current list of 'Major Projects' is shown below:

No.	Heading	Scheme
1	Carbon Reduction Strategy	RE:Fit Scheme
2	NORA & Enterprise Zone	Road infrastructure and utilities
3	NORA & Enterprise Zone	Development of spec units
4	Major Housing	NORA 4
5	Major Housing	Parkway, Western side, KL
6	Major Housing	Salters Road, King's Lynn (also known as Columbia Way)
7	Major Housing	Bus Station and NCC Library Site, Hunstanton
8	Major Housing	Southend Road coach / car park, Hunstanton
9	West Winch Growth Area	West Winch.
10	Regeneration	South Gate area regeneration
11	Town Deal	St George's Guildhall Complex
12	Town Deal	Active and clean connectivity
13	Town Deal	Town centre repurposing
14	Town Deal	Riverfront regeneration
15	Town Deal	Public realm
16	Town Deal	Multi-User Community Hub (accountable body role only)
17	Town Deal	School of Nursing (accountable body role only)
18	Town Deal	Youth and Retraining Pledge (accountable body role only)
19	Sports facilities	3G pitch

- As part of the resources available to the council due to being a 'Town Deal' town, a Project Closedown template has been drawn up, to help evaluate Town Deal projects. This template is provided at Appendix 1.

Facts

- It is believed that this new evaluation template could be a useful addition to strengthen the Council's Major Projects processes and governance, and therefore this is being brought to the Officer Major Project Board (OMPB) for consideration.
- The internal process within which the Council will undertake Post Project Reviews, also needs to be strengthened to ensure Members have the opportunity to contribute prior to the evaluation being undertaken.

Proposal

- The proposed process is to confirm the precise Terms of Reference (TOR) of a post project review (core terms already being established)

  - Towards the end stages of a designated Major Project, the Project Manager will write a brief TOR for the Post Project review. This will capture project specific issues and nuances, and propose who/which function will undertake the evaluation.

  - The TOR will be taken through the Officer Major Projects Board
    - for input
    - a decision on who/which function will undertake the evaluation[3], and
    - to also consider the appropriate time frame for the review to take place[4].

  - The TOR will then be taken to the MMPB to confirm the precise TOR for a post project review (core terms already being established). This will mean scrutiny panels can, if they wish, call-in the TOR, and propose specific additions or amendments.

  - Once the Terms of Reference has been agreed, the Post Project Review will be undertaken by the nominated person/team/function, to the timescales determined.

  - On completion, the Post Project Review will be taken through the Officer Major Projects Board initially, then on to the MMPB. After considering the Project Closedown Report, the MMPB will report to Cabinet, with recommendations (if any) and propose to remove the project from the 'Major Projects' list. Any further scrutiny/reviews of the project will be dealt with under the normal democratic processes, under existing terms of references.

  - Once Cabinet has considered the MMPB recommendations, the Officer Major Projects Board will record the Cabinet agreed changes/lessons learnt that will be adopted for current and/or future Major Projects, as applicable.

- The draft template (not yet 'liveried' into BCKLWN style) needs to be considered and agreed as appropriate.

---

[3] This may be another relevant project officer within the council, the internal audit team, or an external person, as determined on a case-by-case basis
[4] Although some of the evaluation should commence shortly after the project has been delivered, to adequately assess the quality of the implementation and complete the process, it may be appropriate to wait long enough for the changes caused by the project to take effect. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Decision required

The ~~Officer~~ Member Major Projects Board is asked to :

1. Agree the process to be used for Post Project Reviews of the designated Major Projects

2. Agree the proposed template is used as a basis for the reviews undertaken

Vanessa Dunmall
10th June 2022

Appendix 2

POST PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Purpose

This template is to be used in the project closure phase of a project. The post project evaluation report draws on all the documents and logs used during the project lifecycle. The terms of reference may need to be agreed by OMPB and MMPB prior to commencement – please check this requirement with the PMO before starting. The project team should contribute to the report content however, ultimate responsibility rests with the project manager.

Sections may be added, removed or amended to suit the project and project methodology.
*All italic text should be **removed** prior to using the template for your own purpose.*

PROJECT NAME:

PROJECT MANAGER: *named individual who is managing the project delivery.*

SPONSOR: *named individual with ultimate accountability for delivery of the project and benefits.*

Version control
Draft will commence 0.1 until final first live is confirmed at 1.0 – incidental changes 1.1, 1.2 etc, major changes 2.0. The person making the changes should track them and write a brief description of what has changed – or see track changes if major changes. The version with the track changes should be saved before any are accepted or rejected. Once saved it will be the next version up.

Version	Date	Description of change	Author

Contributors/Reviewers

Name	Role	Date

Authorisation/Approval

Date	Version	Approved by	Role/Organisation

The report will require approval and sign off by the Sponsor / Senior Responsible Owner (SRO).
Note: you don't need an actual signature, but you should have an email agreement or an alternative method of audit trail to refer to.

Distribution

Role	Name	Organisation/Dept

For BCKLWN projects, it is recommended to include the following individuals (as a minimum) on the distribution list to this report:

Relevant Executive / Assistant Director
Project Sponsor
S151 Officer
PMO Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to assess the project, provide evidence that the outcomes defined in the Business Case have been achieved and that the project has been successfully handed over. It is also an opportunity to capture and derive any lessons learned and best practices to be applied to future projects. This report should be endorsed by governance through a final review by the Officer Major Projects Board.

Note that the contents of this report should be proportional to the nature of the Programme / Project being reported on. Lower value / less complex packages of delivery are not expected to require the same level of input and detail as those on the opposite end of the spectrum (barring any exceptional circumstances).

2. SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF APPROACH

Outline the scope of the project. Has the project scope materially changed from the initial approval to project closure? Include a high-level summary of how the project was carried out, e.g. what PM tools and methodologies were used, procurement route etc.

3. PROJECT MANAGER'S SUMMARY

Summary of the project's performance and team performance (recognition for good performance) and any other key points of note that the Project Manager would like to communicate.

4. OUTPUTS

Review of how the project's outputs have been delivered as defined in the Business Case.

4.1 OUTPUTS ACHIEVED

Output Description	Evidence of delivery	Date

4.2 OUTPUTS NOT ACHIEVED

Output Description	Reason not achieved	Impact

4.3 RESIDUAL OUTPUTS EXPECTED

Output Description	Expected evidence of delivery	Date Expected

4.4 UNEXPECTED OUTPUTS

Output Description	Evidence of delivery	Date

5. OUTCOMES

If the Programme or Project has delivered outcomes defined in the Business Case, these should be captured in this section.

5.1 OUTCOMES ACHIEVED

Outcome Description	Evidence of realisation	Date

5.2 OUTCOMES NOT ACHIEVED

Outcome Description	Reason not achieved	Impact

5.3 RESIDUAL OUTCOMES EXPECTED

Outcome Description	Expected evidence of realisation	Date Expected

5.4 UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES

Outcome Description	Evidence of realisation	Date

6. RISKS AND ISSUES

Provide information on the top (five) risks and issues and how they were resolved, or if they remain open what the next steps are (see examples given).

Risk or issue	Outcome	Status
Risk: The detailed design for the community hub was completed 4-weeks late and £10k over budget due to Client instructed changes.	*Opportunities were identified with the build contractor to start on site 2-weeks earlier than planned and complete works 1-week early resulting in the community hub being brought into public use 1-week behind schedule. A storage facility was de-scoped from the build contract to reduce the final cost by £12k bringing the total cost £2k under budget.*	*Closed*
Issue: The community hub storage facility has not been delivered as per the original requirements due to budget constraints.	*The community hub is functional without the storage facility (identified as a 'could have' in project requirements) and is available for public use. The storage design has been completed and it will therefore be possible to complete this in future should funding be secured.*	*Forward action / open*

7. FORWARD ACTIONS

Provide a list of forward actions including the management of the expected benefits – how benefits realisation and monitoring will be taken forward by the business, and any outstanding actions required to transition the project outputs to business-as-usual ways of working (e.g. end user training, documenting new processes, any other activities to take the product to the next stage of its life)

Area	Description	Owner	Status	Delivery date
Project Team	*Complete build of community hub storage facility*	*J. Doe (Project Manager)*	*Decision required by Board following completion of other local projects and availability of any residual budget*	*December 2022*

8. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN

	Estimated	Actual	Comment
Costs	*750,000*	*750,000*	*Community hub delivered to budget (storage facility de-scoped).*
Staff Resource	*1x Project Manager; 1 x Construction Manager*	*1x Project Manager; 1 x Construction Manager 0.5 x Assistant Project Manager*	*An Assistant Project Manager was utilised for 2.5 days per week to assist with administering the contract during the delivery phase of the project.*
Timescales	*46 weeks*	*47 weeks*	*The community hub was delivered one week behind schedule due to design delays resulting from Client instructed changes.*

9. LESSONS IDENTIFIED

Provide details of the main lessons identified and any forward actions as a result. For a large project, it should be possible to provide a link to the lessons identified log or send as appendices.

Area of work	Description of lesson learned	Recommendation / Action	Responsibility

10. POST PROJECT REVIEW

To agree a date for a review of the project and an outline agenda. Usual practice of approximately 6 months following the closure.
Examples of what the agenda should include:
- *Open issues*
- *Forward actions.*
- *Benefits measurement*
- *Resource management*
- *Training and documentation review*
- *Costs – were there further costs incurred following closure*
- *Supplier relationship (if applicable)*
- *Internal or external SLA (service level agreement) (if applicable)*