

End of Project Report

projectcentre

Project/Programme Name	Northern Ireland Renewable Heat Incentive (Development Phase 1)		
SRO	Mary Smith		
Project/Programme Manager	Keith Avis		
Start Date	January 2012	Completion Date	30 January 2013

Note: Additional document completion guidance is included as hidden text. The text can be revealed (or hidden) by selecting the **Tools** menu, **Options** and select the **View** tab. Under **Formatting marks**, check the **Hidden Text** box.

Part 1: Project Closure

Purpose of the project

Briefly describe the change introduced through the project, why it needed to be done and the long-term benefits it has enabled.

At the end of the project we have developed and installed the necessary processes and procedures to ensure that the Northern Ireland Renewable Heat Incentive scheme was operation by 1 November and that the IT solutions for payments and periodic data went live on 30 January 2013.

Objectives achieved/not achieved Refer back to the original objectives in the PID and explain the degree to which they have been achieved, with reasons given for non-achievement. If there have been any major changes to the objectives since the PID was signed off these should be explained. Any benefits achieved during the life of the project should be described, and quantified where possible.

Feasibility Study

Achieved: Timely drafting and approval of Feasibility Study through senior managers - approved by DETI in a timely fashion

Not achieved: Detailed approval of all costs from all Ofgem teams. Some team costs were ultimately found to be insufficient for the work to be complete.

Developed guidance

Achieved: Agreement from AD to complete NIRHI standalone guidance; agreement for guidance to be published under DETI brand; drafting and clearance of guidance in time for start of DETI consultation; successful participation in DETI consultation event; agreed and made updates to text following consultation and secured approval for consultation.

End of Project Report

projectcentre

Developed IT functionality

Achieved: Fully scoping of IT solution on time; all IT functionality (minus payment and periodic data) cleared and in place for 1 November scheme go-live; UAT and BA testing successfully complete; full internal approval and sign-off of IT solution.

Not achieved: Delivery of full IT solution within budget agreed with DETI;

Developed Admin Arrangements:

Achieved: Ofgem and DETI approval of Admin Arrangements; similar approval for baseline scope document.

Not achieved: Delivery of Admin Arrangements in time for 1 November go-live; Ofgem legal approval of Admin Arrangements;

Operational process

Achieved: The development of all System Operator Process documents and Process Information Guides were undertaken, cleared and delivered in time for scheme and full IT solution go-live; requirements for payments, audit and data sharing were put in place on time, ready to be used when needed.

Not achieved: NIRHI process assurance report in time for approval of go live, on the basis that this will be undertaken as part of the wider GB/NI RHI audit in February 2013.

Finance

Achieved: Funding agreed and approved between Ofgem MD and DETI in the Feasibility Study and updated and approved through the Baseline Scope Document.

Not achieved: Ofgem legal sign-off of original funding requirements; delivery of full IT solution within agreed costs.

Communications

Achieved: Comms approval of guidance process; approval and timely update of website with all relevant details; ongoing engagement with Comms on any NIRHI issued raised by stakeholders; face to face interaction with stakeholders through participation at NIRHI guidance consultation event.

Acceptances and sign-offs. Describe the formal sign-offs that were necessary and have been confirmed at completion of the project. These may include (depending on the type of project) user acceptance, security acceptance, data protection, operations, legal, purchase contract closure, maintenance contract commencement.

Admin Arrangements, guidance, internal procedures, IT solutions audit, payments and

End of Project Report

projectcentre

comms strategies all produced in consultation with teams from Ofgem legal, IT, Comms, finance/risk management, GB RHI team and IT security as appropriate. Final approval on all documentation achieved through the Project Manger and SRO and ultimately by News Schemes Development Associate Director and/or Commercial Managing Director.

Changes incorporated Summarise, using information drawn from the Issues Log, the changes that were approved after the PID had been approved. For each change the benefit, cost, effort and time implications should be given.

Changes include team structure; interim standalone solution for payments and periodic data pending full IT go-live on 30 January; agreeing to have separate NI guidance, rather than build into GB RHI guidance.

Outstanding Risks and Issues Any risks that have relevance post project should be passed over to the relevant team for inclusion in operational risk register. Any outstanding issues, particularly any worthwhile requests for change that the project was unable to implement and any known faults in the deliverables, should be passed over to the relevant authorities for consideration as part of operational management.

Apart from finalising payment process (on track for delivery before end April when required) all other risks and issues have been resolved.

Post project review The terms of reference, suggested timing and ownership for a post project review of benefits should be given. Refer to the Benefits Realisation Plan to help determine scope and timing of a review.

No need for a terms of reference, but the project should be reviewed at the time NIRHI phase 2 development starts at the end of February/early March.

Part 2: Review of the effectiveness of project management

End of Project Report

projectcentre

Governance How well was the organised and controlled. eg Were roles and responsibilities clear? Were people at the correct level to meet their project responsibilities? Was the Business Case used by the SRO/Project Board for decision making throughout the life of the project? Were stakeholders engaged and managed effectively?

The project was successfully managed through weekly project management checkpoint meetings that clearly identified, allocated and tracked progress of individual tasks. Issues and clearance of documents and procedures were covered at the NSD Associate Director's weekly surgeries as needed. The Project/Programme Manager provided weekly updates to the RHI Direct Reports meeting and issues such as options for guidance and approval of the IT standalone solution were put to the monthly RHI Implementation Board for a steer. The Board also received monthly updates on scheme progress.

Planning and control How good were the plans and estimates for work, resources effort, timescale and cost? Were the progress tracking and reporting mechanisms sufficiently rigorous, timely and effective? Was control at the right level, too little, too much?

The project was supported by the usual project management tools (project plan, risk log, issues log etc.) that worked well in supporting delivery. The delivery projections at the initial scoping stage of the project were not followed in respect of timelines as DETI took 5 months from receiving the Feasibility Study to give the go-ahead for scheme development. The result was that the intended tie up with the GBRHI IT releases was not possible and therefore required a revised plan with a manual solution. The projections for discussing and agreeing the Administrative Arrangements and baseline scope document were also overly optimistic as it was not anticipated that DETI would have so many issues (particularly around the availability of data) to resolve.

Stakeholder management Were stakeholder identification, management and communication procedures appropriate and effective? Did stakeholders engage and perform as expected?

All internal stakeholders were engaged through weekly Checkpoint meetings, emails on issues as needed and (at a senior level) through board meetings. Weekly teleconference meetings were held with DETI to agree on and discuss progress on issues. External stakeholders were engaged through consultation on supplier guidance, with Ofgem taking an active role in presenting and fielding questions at consultation events.

End of Project Report

projectcentre

Supplier management Were identification, selection and management procedures appropriate and effective? Did suppliers perform as expected?

The Project team worked closely to Ofgem and NSD governance procedures and ensured that all throughout the process were engaged at the appropriate time and views and guidance were sought on particular issues as was needed.

Quality management Were the deliverables fit for purpose? Did the team possess the skills needed to deliver a quality outcome? Were errors/problems detected early enough to fix at lowest cost?

The project teams engaged with all other teams across Ofgem to seek input and guidance on specific deliverables. The expertise and quality of the input fully met requirements to deliver the project. The project team was recruited in haste and was filled externally with those on a short term contract. The teams was fortunate to have found those with the expertise and commitment to deliver the project on time. For phase 2 of NIRHI an ideal solution would be to form the team from members of the GB RHI team.

Risk and Issue management Is there evidence that risk management prevented or limited the effects of otherwise damaging events? Did issues arise that could have been predicted and managed as risks? Was the time, effort, money spend on risk mitigation proportionate to the actual risks

The risk register performed effectively in identifying risks and mitigating actions and deciding whether to escalate risks to senior management. As this was the first time that Ofgem had developed operational processes for DETI, it was inevitable that there would be some working practices and issues that would come to light that could not be anticipated. We stand in a better place to identify potential risks for phase 2 of the scheme.

Part 3: Sharing lessons learned

Recommended Good Practices From the Part 2 analysis above select examples to share with other projects.

Key recommendation for future projects is that additional importance needs to be given to the scoping phase of the project. In taking sufficient time to plan resource, costs and timing both Ofgem and our delivery partners will have the best foundation for the delivery

End of Project Report

projectcentre

of the development phase and expectations can be appropriately managed. Condensing the delivery of the project does compromise the effectiveness of the delivery team and risks representation damage to Ofgem, should we not be able to meet revised goals.

Lessons Learned From the Part 2 analysis above select examples of things that could have been done better and explain how for the benefit of other projects.

Attached is the Lessons Learned report for the Project.