1. PURPOSE

Project Completion is not the end to the project management process. Finishing a project doesn't ensure that benefits from the project's outcome have been achieved. Also there is a need to ensure that the lessons learned during the project are not forgotten. More effective design and execution of future projects can be achieved when advantage of lessons learned through experience of previous projects becomes part of corporate knowledge.

Conducting a timely and thorough Post Implementation Review (PIR) will help identify lessons learned which will assist in planning, managing, and meeting the objectives of future projects. It helps by answering the following key questions:

- Did the project fully solve the problem that it was designed to address?
- Can we take things further, and deliver even bigger benefits?
- What lessons did we learn that we can apply to future projects?

The purpose of this policy is to:

- affirm WA Health's commitment to appropriate project management procedures which includes a PIR phase; and
- provide general guidance for conducting a PIR.

2. SCOPE

Post-Implementation Reviews are the last step in the project delivery process and represent closure of the feedback loop. PIR means the lessons learnt from previous projects are fed-back into the process, to benefit future projects.

A successfully completed PIR may or may not result in a recommended action plan. In its simplest form, it will provide a forum for discussion and the basis for improved understanding between members of a project team. A more complex PIR may extend the current body of knowledge.

This policy applies to all personnel of WA Health (employees, contractors, students, volunteers and agency personnel) incorporating the following entities:

- Department of Health;
- Metropolitan Health Services;
- WA Country Health Service.
This policy also applies to external organisations and their personnel who have been granted access to WA Health Information and Communications Technology (ICT) infrastructure and services.

This policy must be read in conjunction with the Acceptable Use Policy – Computing and Communication Facilities, which governs the use of ICT by WA Health personnel. This and other policies and standards are available at the HIN Intranet Site.

3. POLICY

3.1 A Post Implementation Review (PIR) should be performed for all significant\(^1\) ICT projects.

3.2 The PIR should form part of the project management methodology.

3.3 The PIR must be conducted against the projects expectations, i.e. the business plan, budget, scope, schedule, project results etc.

4. POLICY DETAILS

The PIR is the last critical step in the project life cycle, as it allows an independent party to validate the success of the project and give confidence to the stakeholders that it has met the objectives it set out to achieve.

The concept of conducting a PIR is not new to ICT as it has always been part of any System Development Methodology and forms part of any good project management governance framework. With ever increasing accountability and the need to demonstrate proper ICT governance it needs to become a more formalized, enforceable process that must be consistently applied to all ICT projects.

\(^1\) Significant ICT projects include those that have at least one of the following components:

- Funding threshold established by the organisation;
- Involves Commonwealth monies; and
- Politically sensitive.
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**Purpose:** To confirm completion, assess the extent to which the project has achieved its goals and provide an assessment of value for money. This typically occurs approximately six months following project completion. A review at this point can also catalogue the lessons learned during the project; those identified by the project group and those captured by independent reviewers.

**Review Issues.**
- Verify that the project was completed as planned and that the expected business outcomes were actually realized.
- Assess the degree of success for the transition to an ongoing service.

**Reason**
- To confirm success from a project delivery and business perspective.
- To determine what lessons might benefit the Department in future projects.

**General Review Items.**
- Project delivery measured against original objectives.
- Confirmation of the achievement of information and deliverables, as applicable.
- Confirmation of the achievement of Quality Management objectives.
- Knowledge transfer and transition to successful service.
- Completion of contractual obligations.
- Validation of business outcomes.
- Capture of lessons learned, including review process.
- Project close-out report completed.

**Typical Input to the Review.**
- Business case.
- Contract acceptance reports (if applicable)
- Project plan.
- Communication plan.
- Training plan.
- Status reports.

**Review Approach.**
- Workshops, questionnaires, interviews etc. depends on project size and complexity.

**Comment.**
- In some cases, it may be premature to definitively determine the achievement of business outcomes. If so, a plan might be developed to address further follow-up on core items.

**Post Implementation Review Concept**
The basic PIR process can be defined as having the following five components:

1. Convene a PIR team;
2. Plan the review;
3. Undertake the review;
4. Prepare PIR report;
5. Management Review and approval.

**4.1 Convene a PIR Team**

There is often a difference of opinion as to who should perform the Post-Implementation Review. Usually, members of the project team systems analyst group will complete the review as a natural extension of their responsibility to deliver optimum benefit from the solution as identified in the business case. They understand what was required, what was changed, how it was achieved, how things are supposed to work, how to fix problems, etc.

There is a converse argument that an independent team should perform the review. This reduces the risk that any errors or omissions of the project team might equally be overlooked in their review. This independent team may be part of or controlled by the Project Management Office (PMO).

A solution is to do both. An independent audit team, working in consultation with the business users and project team, could examine whether the results are satisfactory. The project team might then reconvene to consider that input and also to examine how to generate further value from the solution.

Any approach taken must be cost justified and larger, more expensive projects having greater scrutiny.

**4.2 Plan the Review**

All elements of the operational solution should be considered. The review should include such things as:

- Current situation
- Is the required functionality available?
- Are the procedures properly documented, published and known about?
- Have users received adequate training and coaching to take advantage of the new facilities?
- Are staff displaying appropriate attitudes to get the best out of the system (confidence in its capabilities, belief in its purpose, willingness to make it work, etc.)?
- How busy, usable, useful and adequate are support services such as the systems support function and help desk?
- Are third parties such as customers and suppliers satisfied with the service?
- Is the level and nature of identified faults acceptable?
- Are faults handled at an acceptable speed and with satisfactory results?
- Is data integrity being maintained within the system and in relation to other integrated or interfaced systems?
- Are systems controls being applied correctly?
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- Are business, procedural and financial controls being applied correctly?
- Does the system and its usage meet current legal and regulatory requirements?
- Is the system able to process transactions at an adequate speed?
- Does the system have the capacity to deal with the actual peak loadings as encountered and foreseen?
- Are staff following operational procedures including backup, recovery, security and disaster recovery?
- Benefits?
- What were the final costs of the project?
- What is the actual operating cost of the new solution?
- What is the actual benefit being delivered by the new solution?
- How does that compare to the original project definition?
- Future improvements?
- Could further training or coaching improve the degree of benefit being generated?
- Are there further functional improvements or changes that would deliver greater benefit?
- Are specific improvements required in procedures, documentation, support, etc.?

The PIR should be treated as any project and a formal project plan developed.

4.3 Undertake the Review

The review must compare the achieved results to those benefits that were specified in the Business Plan.

The questions raised in 4.2. above will need to be investigated through a combination of investigative techniques including interviews, examination of documentation, performance statistics, hands-on tests and checks, etc. Implications and potential remedial options would then be assessed and evaluated.

The review will include:
- Get input from the project team, the customers, and other major stakeholders.
- Conduct the PIR after the project’s deliverables have been in service for an adequate period of time to evaluate the product or service’s successful integration into the business.
- Review the Project Business Case to evaluate how closely the project results match the original goals, objectives, and deliverables. This review should also include a gap analysis between the planned requirements, schedule, and budget and what was actually delivered, when and for how much.
- Conduct a lessons learned exercise to capture the most salient points for inclusion in the PIR report.
- Conduct a customer survey.
- Consider utilizing an objective third party to conduct the PIR.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the project management practices and other processes as well as the success of the project deliverables.
- Document practices and procedures that led to project successes and make recommendations for applying them to similar future projects.
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- Provide only the level of detail necessary to show meaningful analysis of events and conclusions.
- Attach appropriate documentation which may be useful information to the PIR such as a final Quality Assurance Report, customer survey results, etc.

Typically the post implementation review focuses on ‘did we do what we said we would do and did that work’. In some form of structured deliverables that have been through formal review and approval (e.g. an approved change management strategy and change management plan), the PIR may have the objective of establishing ‘did we execute in accordance with the plan and were the change management objectives achieved’. When developing surveys the survey language will need to reflect the appropriate objective.

An example PIR Survey is contained in Appendix A, which reflects the ‘did we do what we said we would do and did that work’ scenario.

4.4 Prepare the PIR Report

The findings and recommended actions will need to be prepared in the form of a report and/or presentation.

Indication of the report content is contained in Appendix B.

4.5 Management Review and Approval

The findings and recommendations will be presented to:
- the projects business owners,
- the leading participants in the project, and
- other parties who may be concerned with the results e.g. SHEF.

Specific actions should be proposed to address any further work that is recommended. This might be handled in several different ways, for example:
- as routine support and maintenance,
- as remedial work to be performed by the original project team,
- for line management to address through user education and procedures etc.,
- as further phases of development involving new projects.

5. IMPLEMENTATION

It is the responsibility of all WA Health ICT personnel to observe and comply with this Policy and other associated guidelines, standards and procedures.

The Post Implementation Review (PIR) is designed to collect and utilise knowledge learned from project concept through to design, development and implementation. The review focuses on how well the project outcomes match the required performance. All WA Health ICT projects need to conduct PIRs and it should be considered part of the project management methodology.
A good time to start thinking about the Post Implementation Review is when members of the project team remember the most – shortly after the project has been delivered, and when most of the problems have been ironed-out. Start to list ideas and observations while they are still fresh in people's minds.

However, to adequately assess the quality of the implementation and complete the PIR, enough time should have elapsed for the changes caused by the project to truly take effect.

There will probably be a period of adjustment before finally reviewing the solution as it was intended to operate, typically allow a few weeks, or a few months, before doing the full PIR. Where possible, allow for at least one, full, successful cycle of business before reviewing lessons learned.

The implementation of an effective and successful PIR will require the dedication of those involved in the review process, access to all relevant information and personnel, and finally a commitment to apply the knowledge learnt from the study.

During the course of a PIR stress that criticism of specific individuals is undesirable and counterproductive. A PIR should not be used to find fault or apportion blame. A professionally performed PIR should provide a balanced assessment focusing on positive and negative feedback. This focus on an overall constructive feedback process should be emphasised throughout the review process.

Project decision makers should be used as an information resource able to answer questions about the history of the project. The PIR need not be limited to new or recently completed projects. A project may be significant if it seems to be performing exceptionally, effectively or poorly, or it is a key service delivery resource.

To successfully conduct a PIR a number of key points should be considered by the project team:

- what decisions are key to improved project value?
- who makes these decisions?
- when and where are these decisions made?
- what issues impact on them?
- what other reference material is used?

Defining the purpose establishes the scope – what is to be included and what is not. The objectives of the investment will also drive the scope, and will vary according to the investment’s size and complexity. It may also be affected by any significant stakeholder concerns raised over the project to date.

The scale of the review will depend on whether the investment is providing a service, economic infrastructure or includes a long-term service contract, such as Public Private Partnerships.
6. BACKGROUND

The Post Implementation Review (PIR) process collects and utilises knowledge learned throughout a project to optimise the delivery and outputs of future projects. PIR is a process, a tool and a means of collecting and communicating information. A PIR can be used to evaluate all stages in the asset life cycle.

There are three purposes for a Post-Implementation Review:

1. To ascertain the degree of success from the project, in particular, the extent to which it met its objectives, delivered planned levels of benefit, and addressed the specific requirements as originally defined.
2. To examine the efficacy of all elements of the working business solution to see if further improvements can be made to optimise the benefit delivered.
3. To learn lessons from this project, lessons which can be used by the team members and by the organisation to improve future project work and solutions.

In some cases, the first of these objectives can be a contractual issue. Where that is the case, it may be safer to run separate reviews - one focused on contractual compliance and the other seeking to derive further benefit from a no-blame review.

A Post-Implementation Review should be scheduled some time after the solution has been deployed. Typical periods range from 6 weeks to 12 months, depending on the type of solution and its environment.

It should not be performed while the initial issues are still being dealt with or while users are still being trained, coached and generally getting used to its operation. The PIR should be timed to allow the final improvements to be made in order to generate optimum benefit from the solution.

7. RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES

8. ASSOCIATED DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH POLICIES, STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

WA Health ICT policies are available on the HIN Intranet Site.
- Acceptable Use Policy – Computing and Communication Facilities.

9. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS / SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS 4915-2002 (Reference Use Only)</th>
<th>Project Management - General conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sets out an agreement to be used where a particular project requires a project manager to undertake the carrying out of the work through to completion of the services, and includes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS / SPECIFICATIONS

| **AS ISO 10006-** | Quality Management Systems - Guidelines for Quality Management in Projects  
Provides guidance on quality system elements, concepts and practices for which the implementation is important to, and has impact on, the achievements of quality in project management and supplements the guidance given in AS/NZS ISO 9004. It is identical with and has been reproduced from ISO 10006:2003. |

10. REFERENCES

HIN PMO Templates

11. DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>The Project Management Institute defines project management as the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to a broad range of activities in order to meet or exceed stakeholder needs and expectations from a project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 12. VERSION CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Version</th>
<th>Effective Date: 02 Feb 2014</th>
<th>Operational Directive No: OD: 0509/14</th>
<th>SHEF ICT Approved Date: 16 December 2013</th>
<th>Next Review Date: January 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Group:</td>
<td>Enquiries Contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Network (HIN) - Strategy</td>
<td>Manager, HIN Information Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Version Notes**

- **November 2006** Original Development.
- **February 2013** Major rewrite and reformatting.

*No Longer Applicable Withdrawn Nov 2016*
APPENDIX A – Post Implementation Survey Example

{Name of Project}

Post Implementation Review Survey

Example

Background

Project Name
Enter the name of the project prior to sending out or conducting survey.

Project Summary
Provide an executive level summary of the project for the benefit of survey responders.

Name of Responder
Enter the name of the person completing the survey.

Project Role
Enter the type of role the survey responder played in the project. Common roles include Project Manager, Business Analyst, Technical Analyst, Sponsor, Stakeholder, Project Team Member, Developer, Tester and End User.

Schedule
From your perspective:
• Did the project remain on schedule?
• What helped the project remain on schedule?
• What prevented the project from remaining on schedule?
• What strategies were used to help the project stay on schedule?

Costs
From your perspective:
• Did the project remain within predicted budget?
• If the project came in under budget, how were savings made?
• If the project ran over budget, why did this happen?

Goals & Objectives
From your perspective:
• What were the major goals & objectives of this project?
• Did the project deliverables align with these goals and objectives?
• Did project outcomes help meet the goals and objectives?
• If not, why did the project vary from the objectives?

Requirements & Functionality
From your perspective:
• Was the functionality promised as part of this project delivered at the end of the project?
• What was not delivered and what might have caused this?
• Were service requirements met upon project completion?
• If requirements were not met, what caused this?
• Does the system work as intended?

Benefits
From your perspective:
• Do the projected benefits match the actual benefits?
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- Are there intangible benefits because of this project?

**Lessons Learned**

From your perspective:
- Overall, was the project a success?
- What was done really well?
- What could have been done better?
- What recommendations would you make for future project application?
- What would you do differently if you could do it over again?
- What have you learned that can be applied to future projects?

**Recommendations**

Based on your experiences with this project:
- Do you have any advice for future projects?
- Did this project uncover or prove any Best Practices?

No Longer Applicable
Withdrawn Nov 2016
APPENDIX B – Post Implementation Report Example

<Name of Project>

Post Implementation Review Report

Example

Executive Summary
Provide a brief summary of the project and results.

Overview
Summary of Project Being Reviewed
Describe the project being reviewed.

Project History
Briefly describe the project history; why the project was undertaken, expected benefits, etc.

Project Objectives
What, specifically, was the project supposed to accomplish (e.g., reduce maintenance costs by 15%, improve operator interface, improve system response time by 20% etc.).

Project Status
As of the PIR, what is the status of the project? Is it complete?, Are there any outstanding issues? etc.

Review Results (for example)

Schedule

Projected
Note the anticipated beginning and ending dates of the project as proposed in the project charter.

Actual
Note the actual beginning and ending dates of the project.

Reasons for variance
If there was a variance between the projected project schedule and the actual project schedule, describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Costs

Projected
Note the anticipated project costs as proposed in the project charter.

Actual
Note the actual project costs.
Reasons for variance
If there was a variance between the projected project costs and the actual project costs, describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Software Evaluation

Projected
Software can be reviewed on fit (does it meet the requirements-process and technical), form (is it user friendly?) and function (does it do what needs to be done correctly, efficiently and effectively?).

Actual
Note the actual performance of the software including integration.

Reasons for variance
If there was a variance describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Hardware and Network Evaluation

Projected
This may include desktop computers, laptops, network connections, dial up connections, servers, scanners etc.

Actual
Note any major hardware issues arising during the project or still outstanding

Reasons for variance
If there was a variance describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Goals & Objectives

Projected
Note the project goals and objectives as outlined in the project charter.

Actual
Describe the achieved objectives and progress towards goals resulting from project. When objective measures or evaluation cannot occur as part of the PIR exercise, include a description of how these measures will be obtained or evaluation completed.

Variance
If there was a variance between the projected goals and objectives and the actual results, describe the key reason(s) for the variance. Include a discussion of the impacts of delayed measurement or evaluation highlighted above.

Requirements & Functionality

Projected
Note the functionality as proposed in the project Business Case and any additional documentation.

Actual
Note how the delivered functionality met requirements.

Reasons for variance
If there was a variance between the projected functionality and the actual functionality, describe the key reason(s) for the variance. If there was a variance between the documented requirements and the delivered functionality, describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Benefits

Projected
Note the project benefits anticipated at the beginning of the project

Actual
Note the benefits realized or projected as a result of the project.

Reasons for variance
If there was a variance between the anticipated benefits and the actual benefits, describe the key reason(s) for the variance.

Lessons Learned
Provide practical lessons obtained during the review. Some common categories that may be helpful are listed below.

- Vendor Solicitation and Selection;
- Contract Negotiation & Management;
- Technology;
- Project Management;
- Communications Plan;
- Technical Design Specifications;
- Data Conversion;
- Testing;
- Training;
- Implementation;
- etc.

This list will be modified based on the lessons learned information reported for the project.

Production and Operations/Next Steps
Identify a plan for any outstanding issues that must be addressed for the project. Are there next steps for the system, such as upgrades or further implementations?

Recommendations
Based on the project’s lessons learned, describe recommendations for future or similar projects.

No Longer Applicable
Withdrawn Nov 2016