

TITLE OF PROJECT

Email and Directory Services

OGC Gateway review: Gateway 4 – Readiness for Service

Status of report: Final Version 1.0

Senior Responsible Owner: <Text Redacted>

Review Date: 14th-16th and 19/20th May 2003

Review team:

<Text Redacted>



Office of Government Commerce

This report is the outcome of a Gate 4 Review on the NHS Email and Directory Services Project (OGC Project 375) conducted between the 14th and 16th of May 2003 with finalisation of the report for the SRO on the 19/20th May 2003.

Background

Email in the NHS has been run locally, with thousands of separately managed email systems (interconnected by NHSnet and a backbone switch called the NHS Messaging Service). This has two shortcomings that predicate key drivers for the project:

- It is impossible to achieve the required levels of service across thousands of systems, many of which are not well-managed individually; this problem will get worse as the NHS introduces more complicated functions, such as directories, encryption, group-working and so on.
- Running so many systems is expensive. By the end of 2002, around 650,000 people used email in the NHS; the Government's vision calls for this number to be doubled and connectivity to be extended to additional communities in support of "more joined-up government". Providing extra capacity by investing in local systems would be much more expensive than providing centrally managed capacity (and would compound the operational problems).

The aim of the project is to create capabilities that address the shortcomings by commissioning a new national email and directory service, and to ensure that everything is in place to allow the service to be taken-up by NHS organisations in line with DoH targets. Whilst the service should run for ten years the current project is limited to implementation in which:

- The service will be commissioned.
- The directory will be populated with feeds from existing national systems.
- Take-up of the email service by at least 10% of NHS organisations will be achieved.
- Plans, processes, and support materials will be produced to enable widespread take-up of the service in line with NHS targets.

On completion of the current project, which includes the achievement of the DoH target for population of the directory by the end of March 2004, responsibility for the service will pass to a service management function within the NHSIA; a separate project will be established to manage the take-up of email services. The specific objectives of the project are to:

- Provide a national service, proven, before release, through initial use at Early Adopter sites.
- Establish policies, procedures, and best practice for the implementation and use of the service by NHS organisations.
- Populate the directory from specific national sources.
- Develop a range of robust and effective directory 'connectors'.
- Convince NHS organisations to take-up the directory and mail service.
- Support the achievement of the benefits defined in the Full Business Case.
- Ensure a smooth transition and handover from project to service.

Status of Project

The status of the project is at the point of transition from pilot operations serving some 10,000 email users to a programme of full rollout and take-up project and has been

assessed as being ready for an OGC "Ready For Service" Gate 4 Review in order to take the project towards its goal of reaching 100,000 users. The project has been the subject of a previous Gate 3 Review and the Review Team has examined the report from that review

Purpose and Conduct of the Review

- Check that the current phase of the contract is properly completed and documentation completed.
- Ensure that the contractual arrangements are up to date.
- Check that the business case is still valid and unaffected by internal and external events or changes.
- Check that the original projected business benefit is likely to be achieved.
- Ensure that there are processes and procedures to ensure long-term success of the project.
- Confirm that all necessary testing is done (e.g. commissioning of buildings, business integration and user acceptance testing) to the client's satisfaction and that the client is ready to approve implementation.
- Check that there are feasible and tested contingency and reversion arrangements.
- Ensure that all ongoing risks and issues are being managed effectively and do not threaten implementation.
- Evaluate the risk of proceeding with the implementation with any unresolved issues.
- Confirm the business has the necessary resources and that it is ready to implement the services and the business change.
- Confirm that the client and supplier implementation plans are still achievable.
- Confirm that there are management and organisational controls to manage the project through implementation and operation.
- Confirm that all parties have agreed plans for training, communication, rollout, production release and support as required.
- Confirm that all parties have agreed plans for managing risk.
- Confirm that there are client-side plans for managing the working relationship, with reporting arrangements at appropriate levels in the organisation, reciprocated on the supplier side.
- Check that lessons for future projects are identified and recorded.

Conduct of the Review

The Gate 4 review was carried out from the 14th – 16th May at Euston Plaza Hotel, 17-18 Upper Woburn Place, Bloomsbury, LONDON, WC1H 0HT and through a follow-up meeting with the SRO. The team leader was <Text Redacted> and the team members were <Text Redacted>. The draft of the report was reviewed with the SRO late on the 16th May 2003 and followed up through email resolution of feedback during the 18-19th May with a final report emailed to the SRO on 20th May 2003.

The people interviewed are listed at the Appendix A and documentation reviewed in Appendix B.

The Review Team would like to thank the Email/Directory Project Team and all of the stakeholders interviewed for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Project and the outcome of this review. In particular, thanks are due to <Text Redacted> for the organisation of all of the documentation and logistics that enabled the review to be both timely and effective.

Assessment of Project

The status of the Email/Directory Project is assessed to be AMBER on the basis that there are a number of key recommendations that need attention by the next Gate Review. The following recommendations are derived from the findings of the review documented in a later section.

There is no need for further OGC involvement in addressing these recommendations. The SRO may amend the assessed status of the project when satisfied that these recommendations have been appropriately addressed.

It has to be said that many of the issues raised in this report should be easily fixed and the Project Team should be congratulated for what it has achieved.

Recommendations For Action Before Next Gate Review

The Review Team further finds that the following recommendations need to be addressed before engaging in the next hybrid Gate 4/5 Review. The recommendations have been divided into two strands:

Relationship of the Project to the National Programme

- 1. Ensure that the governance arrangements between the new Project Board and the National Programme Board are clearly documented.**
- 2. Encourage the National Programme to publish a "Statement of Direction" about the role of the Directory and/or Email System aimed at curbing any planning blight.**
- 3. If the Directory is confirmed as the central source of data underpinning the security and confidentiality policy of the National Programme then revisit the terms of reference and PID for the current project to:**
 - a. Ensure that the expectations of the National Programme for compliance with security and confidentiality policies are reflected in the future plans for the rigour of the Registration Processes and the detail of the LOA responsibilities**
 - b. Clarify who (e.g. LSPs) will have responsibility for overseeing submissions to the National Directory, but that organisations should continue to work to meet the target in the meantime**
 - c. Re-assess the issue of a separate fail-over Disaster Recovery site, seeking alternative options from the supplier**
 - d. Clarify the OBS requirements on LSPs concerning their role in the implementation of the National email system**

The Email and Directory Project

4. Carry out a further hybrid Gate 4 /Gate 5 review immediately prior to the hand-over to the NHSIA. It should ensure that the readiness for service (Gate 4) criteria are met to take the service to a potential of 1.2 million users and to evaluate the benefits of the project (Gate 5) to the initial 100,000 users.
5. Expand the initial Project Board as soon as possible to include key stakeholders (i.e. CIO, BMA, PCT/Acute, Doctor/Nurse, National Programme, Finance and Supplier).
6. Notwithstanding the recommendations with regards to the role of the directory in the National Programme, further define the role and responsibilities of the LOAs and implement the project products to serve them. In particular, give consideration to whether the LOA role would be better positioned within the HR areas of the business given its emphasis on high quality data about people and their roles.
7. Implement a Policies register that gives management a clear picture of the status of their definition and approval.
8. Ensure that the communications and take-up functions are reinforced and better targeted with appropriate products (including timetables) to each of the audiences at different levels.
9. Review the testing processes and the size of the Model Office to ensure that (a) the level of bugs that get through to the User Evaluation Tests (where the brand of the products can be damaged) is reduced and (b) that bugs reported by users on the production services are resolved in a more timely manner.

Potential Improvements

The Review Team further finds that the following recommendations may enhance the potential for success of the Project:

10. Set up a joint project team between this project and the DTS project to plan for positive action to manage-out the MTAs and the EDI burden.
11. Ensure that Highlight Reporting to the new Project Board is improved to include financial control and meet its needs whilst fitting into the new KBR reporting framework at the National Programme level.
12. Build resource profiles for all of the roles critical to the future operation of the service (including Succession Planning).

Review Findings

Although the goal for the project being assessed is to reach 100,000 users, the end goal for the service (as opposed to the project) is to reach about 1.2 million users, many of whom will be new users. In assessing readiness for service, the Review Team have taken this to mean going from the 10,000 users in the early adopter sites up to 100,000 users. The transition from the project's goal 100,000 users to the ultimate service goals would need further developed arrangements (e.g. relevant NHSIA organisational capabilities), and there should be an opportunity to take stock before national rollout.

We would therefore recommend that a further review is carried out immediately prior to the hand-over to the NHSIA which would be a hybrid Gate 4 /Gate 5

review. It should ensure that the readiness for service (Gate 4) criteria are met to take the service to a potential of 1.2 million users and to evaluate the benefits of the project (Gate 5) to the initial 100,000 users.

Within the above context, our findings address the project goals but also give some pointers to areas that would be the prime focus in any further review.

The Review Team finds that:

Contractual Arrangements

1. The products of the project have reached 10,000 users, but there is still a remaining phase of development work before full contractual acceptance is achieved, covered in the sections below on testing. The technical enablers of the envisaged business benefits have been created as contracted.
2. There is no evidence to suggest that the contractual arrangements are not up-to-date, and there is a change control process in place, with the first significant change being the provisions for Scotland coming within the scope of the project.
3. Although Disaster Recovery within site is addressed through thorough resilience, this did not amount to full (site wipe-out) Disaster Recovery. We recognise that this was a conscious decision prior to BAFO (April 2002) on grounds of affordability. We were assured that later provision of Disaster Recovery could be addressed by a contract variation with EDS and we felt that the EDS leveraged approach could provide an attractive option amongst others.

Business Case and Benefits

4. Notwithstanding some of the observations about benefit realisation made in later paragraphs, the most significant change external to the project that is likely to affect the business case, the costs and the scope and accountabilities for realisation of benefits, is the emergence of the National (IT) Programme. There may be some element of planning blight in the period leading up to the adoption of this infrastructure into the National Programme and in the absence of any interim "Statements of Direction" (about Email, the Directory and related systems such as ESR) from the National Programme. Therefore, it is difficult to postulate any impacts during this transitional period.
5. The National Programme appear to be keen to adopt the Directory Infrastructure as part of their OBS architectural requirements (e.g. it is a pre-requisite for roles-based access controls, single sign-on) for the services from the new Local Service Providers, albeit recognising that this will require modifications to directory data submission and registration processes.
6. Acute Trusts, previously without Email and for PCT staff who tend to be mobile, the Email system was viewed as a real benefit and had the potential to positively transform the way that they work. Indeed, several people said that it already had done. Moreover, the BMA cited the benefits to be got from the secure Email capabilities. Also, although some users recognised that the software was occasionally fragile, they were confident of its ability to evolve. The ability of existing users to use the Outlook client was seen as a big plus, yet there was little awareness about this and it was not sufficiently emphasised in the help screens, which are biased towards browser usage
7. The pace and achievement of take-up may well be degraded (or the population most likely to proceed may veer off plan), thus affecting the benefits to be realised

(e.g. MTA and EDI retirement savings, and transmission of some classes of information), by any of the following areas that have been raised during interviews:

- (a) The current processes for registration would not meet the standards of the National Programme for IT Confidentiality Policy that is currently in development. Directory registrations which will be used to support user authentication, access control and digital signatures will need to comply with registration policies and enhanced Local Organisation Administration (LOA) practices once these have been defined.
- (b) A reaction from some existing users who feel that features imposed on the service for security reasons which are not present on local email services may reduce the fitness for purpose in terms of behaviour and “look and feel” paradigms (e.g. timeouts, password failures, shutting windows causing logoff), thus affecting the ability of the email service to be “office-capable”.
- (c) Poor performance (e.g. as a consequence of local bandwidth limitations).
- (d) As the definition of the LOA roles is clarified it will be difficult to staff effectively as the volume of users grows.
- (e) Fear that in the longer-term the Service Management and Delivery may suffer in the transition beyond the first 100K users to an NHSIA-managed environment that is less energetic and focused than the current project team.
- (f) Insufficient communication and marketing.

Comment [c1]: I appreciate that you interviewed several users, but I think the word substantial is a little strong. I would prefer it to be deleted and substituted with “some”.

Business Process and Resource Readiness

8. We note that there is currently an Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) as well as guidelines jointly agreed with the BMA IT Committee on the use of the service for clinical email. The AUP places considerable emphasis on the individual user (“you”) to document local processes, with a risk that different counter-parties might unwittingly adopt different practices that leave confidentiality gaps. Work is to take place during the summer to bring into line the existing approach of the project (e.g. to LOA practices and procedures) and the emerging requirements of the National Programme Confidentiality Policy and standards for registration that have yet to be agreed. It is not clear to us that local organisations are ready to implement the resulting policies, which will require significant change and coordination at the local level.
9. We could not get assurances that task-specific connector guidelines for local IT departments were in place for meeting NHS Security Requirements – merely an assertion that ploughing through all the relevant bulky manuals would meet the need.
10. The processes for analysis of the most frequent incidents and guidelines on how to diagnose them and appropriate responses are scripted to enable informative and effective re-direction of user support calls to the most appropriate place and there was evidence of good-practice and scalable service support logging processes and systems being used.
11. There was some concern that user feedback is not sufficiently granular to be effective (e.g. by user type and deeper usage types). We note that a process is being established to correct this for Build 4.

Comment [c2]: I really do feel that this would be a fair finding if the decision had already been taken by the National Programme to adopt the directory as the keystone of user authentication and that the National Confidentiality Policy was a published policy and the national standards for directory registration were published standards. All of this is still work in progress. We would prefer the alternative paragraph suggested.

12. There is joint acceptance of the Service and Problem Management roles and their workflow implications but a lingering concern that the user experience and EDS resources could be affected by LOAs who abrogate work to EDS, especially if they can't directly access Problem and System Management system functions (e.g. password reset).
13. Levels of LOA effort may not be properly appreciated until greater detail on the full set of responsibilities related to growing user populations. Some of the work can also arise from the need to consolidate data for Directory feeds. We have not seen organisation and effort-sizing templates, although there is a pan-UK series of workshops to address what is required of the LOA roles.
14. Communications has focused on implementers until now and preparations for getting to segmented take-up targets and influencers are only just starting.

Testing and Contingency Arrangements

15. The customisation of the integrated solution (rather than of the individual embedded COTS products) is mostly around the Distribution List Management and Administrative functions where the requirements have been evolving through a series of clarifications. This and other integration issues resulted in:
 16. Build 3 having some problems around logon (including replication issues), Directory connector operational issues and Internet access issues. Because of the need to run the User Evaluation Tests clean for a month, there must be a delay of at least 2 months – we are assured that these issues are under control and that Build 3 sign-off is not believed to be a problem.
 17. The scope of build 4 will not be locked down in detail until completion of design reviews in June, leading to some timing uncertainty for its release (there are varying inputs about the importance of this on the pace of take-up).
 18. Although assured otherwise, some project documentation shows security testing and assurance is not yet complete and Build 4 will need to repeat security testing and assurance in the areas of Intrusion, Penetration and Denial of Service. Also, the independent NHS.net security accreditation has met some resistance from EDS (now overcome) and would not be completed until post build 4 (September/October) - of itself, this is not considered as a barrier to take-up by the Security Board.
19. There is acceptance that the model office arrangements for testing need significant beefing-up.
20. There have been instances where configuration changes made in release N did not feed through into release N+1. Given this and the nature of a number of bugs that have got through from EDS testing into the User Evaluation Tests, testing and configuration management processes in the past are acknowledged to have been less than satisfactory. Both NHSIA and EDS are convinced that adequate improvements had now been made.
21. Evidence from talking to users suggests that functions and processes around passwords are not yet robust.
22. There is some concern about the total reliance on a modelling approach to performance and capacity right sizing as opposed to traffic-driven testing.

Comment [c3]: I think I would need some more technical background to this. Is this one of the review team's concern? Or was it voiced by a user, tester or EDS? I appreciate the previous concerns about the model office – the main COTS product is load tested by Sun One, so I assume this refers to load testing on the EDS bespoke development work?

23. Considerable work has been done to assess the quality of data being submitted from local systems to the directory (since this is known to have problems in the various sources), which are being addressed through a number of continuously operating reconciliation tests (e.g. validation filters and tests on whether email addresses are routable). However, local data quality processes are key to the success of the project – quite apart from the issues that will become evident once national registration standards are adopted as discussed earlier.
24. The Email facilities are not mandatory and can be used alongside the user's existing Email arrangements with their associated Address Books. However, for new users with no legacy Email facilities, there are no reversion arrangements that are relevant (since they had nothing before) and in the event of non-availability of the Directory, manual addressing of Emails would be necessary. That said, the Directory components and infrastructure are stable, well used COTS products, implemented in configurations with good attention to resilience.
25. All agree that resilience has been addressed in the OBS for the Data Centre and Call Centre but there is considerable concern about the lack of full Disaster Recovery provisions, especially when a central role for the Directory in the National Programme is confirmed. The audit trail for decisions in this area was not seen, although we are assured this exists.

Risks and Issues

26. The risk analysis on the project is very comprehensive and is regularly reviewed, although the standard Highlight Reporting style may make obscure those risks and issues that ought to be attention grabbing. We understand that the Programme Management consultants (KBR) are introducing new weekly and monthly standard reporting templates for all projects in the National Programme.
27. The NHSIA and EDS have regular meetings at which risks are reviewed. However, as transition towards the National Programme occurs, there will be an increasing need for the senior risks from this project to be visible within the National Programme and for senior risk and dependencies from the National Programme that are related to this project to be reflected downwards.
28. The risks of LOA costs escalating as the real nature of the role becomes clear may be much higher than anticipated.
29. Lack of clarity about locally defined confidentially provisions (as per Acceptable Use Policy) may result in unwitting transmissions of confidential data arising from users interpretation of the embedded secure mail transmission features. Also, the LOA processes and administrative access controls have not been subjected to a Trust (in the security sense) Management assessment yet.
30. We have not seen a process by which the assessed business risks with each of several options for security provisions is captured in an audit trail together with the decisions and rationale for accepting the business risks for chosen security provisions. It is accepted there is not a formal approach in this area yet.
31. The project recognises that there may be resistance from local organisations.

Plans and Management Controls

32. The project is about to convene an initial project board – the Review Team are concerned that this has not been in place since October 2002. Such a board should include several key stakeholders to ensure alignment with delivery of the benefits

through a process of full cooperation during implementation. The project has survived to-date on a Joint Governance Board that is more a partnership management arrangement with EDS without effective user representation. Also, there are Terms of Reference for the imminent establishment of User Groups. The lack of user representation until now is recognised as a risk, especially given some of the user feedback mentioned elsewhere.

33. Generally, the project documentation and organisation has been of a high calibre. However, Highlight Reports don't include much financial information (e.g. cost tracking) and those seen do not form a good basis for grabbing the attention of hard-pressed senior managers in a focused way.
34. Accountability for the project up to 100K users is clearly with the SRO, but thereafter we have concerns about NHSIA organisational focus, accountability, project plans, formally agreed hand-over pre-requisites and team strength for growing rapidly to a robust 1.2M-plus user services. Service Management saw a 1-year support hand-over period into NHSIA control. Although these things are Gate 4b Review dependencies, it is surprising that they are not more advanced at this stage, although understandably the National Programme may affect them.
35. The definition of formally agreed hand-over pre-requisites for achieving savings based on withdrawal of 5.5K MTAs and removal of EDI burdens is not clear. Moreover, there was no visibility of "managing-out" plans to make these savings.
36. The project team is working in partnership with EDS on the plans, communications, rollout and production releases; however, success will be very dependent upon the successful establishment of effective LOA roles in the broader NHS, and the products and plans for assuring this are not scheduled for completion until later in the summer.
37. The project has received and responded to many hundreds of individual items of feedback from users via a special mailbox established for this purpose. However, we have seen no evidence that the outcomes (e.g. perceptions, understandings and satisfaction of users, LOAs, IT Managers and CIOs in the food-chain) have been formally assessed (e.g. by survey). There does seem to be plenty of on the ground contact that is workable for 10,000 users and a relatively small population of sites, but the Review team is not convinced about the adequacy of the products and plans in this area when ramping up to 100,000 users and many hundreds of sites.
38. Although partnership performance had a shaky start, all parties agreed that an effective partnership was now operating. The EDS team appeared very committed (right from the top) to the success of what they see as a strategic project and the management approach and accountabilities to assure this were clearly articulated with sound logic.
39. Comprehensive management reporting has been set-up to a Service Excellence dashboard that is being made available to the SRO as well as to senior EDS executives.
40. The service and capacity management approaches for both EDS systems and call centres looks sound and is based on good practice staffing arrangements and service management systems, within properly managed utilisation envelopes.
41. EDS acknowledge their responsibility for take-up and were able to articulate a wide variety of approaches, although the rigour of the targeting strategies was less convincing.

42. EDS have specifically asked for more user involvement as early as possible in the new gated-process for Build 4 and is working with the NHSIA to this end.
43. Cost tracking of project resources (other than external contractors and suppliers) is done by NHSIA Finance Department.
44. It seems unusual that there is not direct Finance participation in monitoring the contract implementation, although we were told that this appears to be the standard approach within the NHSIA.
45. We were assured that current year financial provisions and future line items for servicing the EDS contract have been made.
46. The ability to scale reliably is dependent on effective cost tracking, across internal and external NHSIA resources, EDS and LOA efforts, where possible against the numbers of users made operational, but this is not done.
47. No documentary evidence of lessons for other projects has been made available to the Review Team. However, the lesson that comes through in the interviews is that although user representation early in a project is not always easy to manage, it is ignored at peril. The PID identifies a "Lessons Learned Report" to be delivered later on in the current project stage.

Exemplars of Good Practice

- Thorough Service Management framework – although testing of SLA and Management reports yet to be completed
- Great efforts to maintain the transfer of risk in the solution design area
- Comprehensive sources and screening for population of Directory Entries
- NHSIA visibility of a "Service Excellence Dashboard" with EDS

Appendix A – List Of Interviewees

<Text Redacted>

Appendix B – Documents Reviewed

1.	Email and Directory Services Project Overview
2.	The Strategic Outline Case for Infrastructure within the NHS
3.	The report of findings from the 'Health check' (equivalent to Gateway 3)
4.	The full business case
5.	The contract and its schedules
6.	Project Initiation Document
7.	The project plan
8.	Contract document index (NHS0076)
9.	Detailed roles and responsibilities of the Project Team
10.	Joint Governance Board- sample meeting minutes
11.	Project Implementation Group- sample meeting minutes
12.	Monthly Service Review- sample meeting minutes
13.	Project Weekly Report- sample
14.	Project Monthly Report- sample
15.	Project resource forecast for 2003/4
16.	Acceptance test scripts
17.	Results of Functional Acceptance testing- sample
18.	Results of user evaluation testing- sample
19.	The Communications Plan
20.	The Risk Management Register
21.	Product description for The Service Management Handbook
22.	The Service Management Handbook
23.	Benefits Realisation Strategy
24.	Take-up Strategy
25.	Extracts from pipeline management database
26.	The NHS Directory Schema
27.	The NHS Directory Content and Formatting Guidelines
28.	The NHS Directory Presentation
29.	Terms of Reference for the Service Review
30.	LOA guidelines
31.	User guidelines
32.	The Acceptable Use Policy
33.	Joint BMA/NHSIA statement on clinical email
34.	Terms of Reference for the National NHSmail User Group

SRO - REVIEW FEEDBACK FORM

Once completed please send to, Office Manager, Gateway Team, Fleetbank House,
2-6 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8AE

<p>OGC Reference Number for Review:</p> <p>Programme/Project Title:</p> <p>Department:</p> <p>Gateway Review: 0 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>Project Risk Level (please indicate) High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Date of Review:</p> <p>Your name:</p> <p>Your Role in the Project:</p>
--	--

Your feedback on various aspects of the Review are an important aspect of ensuring that Best Practice is maintained and that OGC can learn from your experiences. Please respond to the questions below, and add any further comments at the end of this form.

STATEMENT	Disagree Strongly 1	Disagree Somewhat 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree somewhat 4	Agree Strongly 5
<p><u>IMPACT ON THE PROJECT</u> Overall, this review was beneficial and will impact positively on the outcome of the project</p>					
<p><u>THE REVIEW REPORT</u> The Report's conclusions and recommendations were clear, concise and understandable</p> <p>The Report recommendations will enable me to achieve improvements in project outcomes (i.e. cost, schedule, functionality)</p>					
<p><u>THE REVIEW ITSELF</u> The Review was conducted on a timely basis</p> <p>The time taken for the Review was appropriate for the Risk level and stage of the Project</p> <p>The Review met my needs</p> <p>The Review exceeded my expectations</p>					

<p><u>THE REVIEW TEAM</u></p> <p>The skill and experience levels were appropriate</p> <p>The approach used was appropriate (i.e. style, method, pace)</p> <p>Review Team members related well to the Project Team</p> <p>Ideas, concepts and suggestions were effectively presented</p>					
<p><u>THE REVIEW TEAM (continued)</u></p> <p>Satisfactory responses were given to issues raised</p> <p>The Review Team Leader fulfilled his/her role effectively</p> <p>Overall, the Review Team were an effective team</p>					
<p><u>GATEWAY PLANNING MEETING</u></p> <p>(Please answer the questions below if a Planning Meeting was conducted prior to the Project Review)</p> <p>This meeting was worthwhile</p> <p>This event increased the effectiveness of the Review</p> <p>The session facilitator's style, method and pace reinforced learning amongst the group</p> <p>I would recommend such a meeting to others</p>					
<p><u>QUALITY OF SERVICE FROM OGC</u></p> <p>OGC personnel were easy to contact and provided a satisfactory service with timely and helpful responses to my queries</p>					

FURTHER COMMENTS

Please use this section to comment more broadly on the Project Review and/or Planning Meeting

- What comments do you have about the Review and/or Planning Meeting content (e.g. what you liked, what should be added, or removed)?
- What comments do you have about the Review Team Leader, Review Team Members or facilitator for the Planning Meeting?

- What comments do you have about Project Review or Planning Meeting administration/logistics?

Describe any requirements for further help, or concerns that might hinder you in successfully applying the results of this Review to your project.

Name.....Signature

Date.....