

Australian Taxation Office Easier, Cheaper and More Personalised Change Program

Independent Assurer Report
FINAL Version 1.03 28 February 2007
Period covering 1st February 2007 – 28th February 2007



- **Executive Summary**
- **Recommendations**
- **Assurance Findings**
 - **Release 3 Design**
 - **Release 3 Build**
 - **Release 3 Test**
 - **Release 3 Deployment**

Introduction:

In accordance with the program schedule, February continues to contain substantial milestones for the Change Program with considerable activity in both Release 2 and Release 3, including:

- The formal acknowledgement of Plan J,
- The completion of CR Drop 3 and the commencement of CR Drop 4 for Release 3,
- Completion of the Release 3 Design Stage Gate and the accompanying replanning for Option J
- Further preparation and shakedown of the Release 3 drops that have been delivered to Assembly and Product Test environments,
- The introduction of a number of production improvements with the delivery of CPSF release 07.02, and
- The technical deployment of some elements of the R2 outbound components.

Focus:

In February the Independent Assurer team focused its core activities on the following areas:

- (i) Assessing the critical issues associated with the R3 build / fix and testing activities, the impacts on the respective plans and any core issues impacting the Build activities,
- (ii) Preparing for, facilitating, and participating in, the R3 Design Stage Gate and Stage Gate workshop,
- (iii) Conducting a review of the Release 3 interfaces (excluding the Plan J interfaces), and
- (iv) Continuing our overall watch on the program health with particular emphasis on program reporting, resourcing and scheduling.

Key Findings:

With the completion of the Release 3 Design Stage Gate (and the accompanying Stage Gate / Release 3 Re-Planning workshop), the IA acknowledges that February has seen substantial progress in Release 3. In particular, we recognise this progress has been achieved through:

- The program having a common understanding of the state of the current Program activities and an acknowledgement of the major items constraining progress,
- Increased commitment and ownership of the Change Program activities and outcomes by the ATO business areas, including the set up of business owned activities for assessing the impact the Release 3 solutions will have on the ATO business areas, their workforce and practices
- The push to deliver immediate breakthroughs to critical design issues and establishing new practices for the ongoing identification and agreement to resolutions of design issues
- A commitment to Plan J by the business areas and the Change Program and the clear commitment that:
 - There is no further schedule space to consider assessing issues, decisions just have to be made, and
 - R3.2 is the critical path activity for the Change Program and early consideration of the contingencies that are required to ensure the R3.2 commitment is maintained
- The ability to demonstrate to business areas, some core elements of the Release 3 ICP solution

Again, the IA acknowledges the successes achieved in February and encourages the Change Program to capitalise on these successes and maintain the CP's momentum. Based on our February assessment, the IA recommends that the CP:

- Communicate the Plan J and its underlying characteristics across the Change Program and ATO business areas.

- Look critically at the issues that continue to delay the start of both Release 3 Assembly Testing and Release 3 Product Testing. Commencing this testing is crucial to achieving the critical path and while actions have been instituted to address them, these improvements are not having an early enough impact.
- Continue to keep the pressure on identifying and obtaining resources and associated accommodation as while the risk has lessened, it is still present.

The summary ratings for each of the work streams are indicated below:

Overall Workstream Ratings Summary	
Workstream	Overall Rating
PMO and Governance	Not covered this period
Release 3 Design	Amber
Release 3 Build	Red
Release 3 Test	Red
Release 3 Deployment	Green

 = On Track

 = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

 = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

- **Executive Summary**
- **Recommendations**
- **Assurance Findings**
 - **Release 3 Design**
 - **Release 3 Build**
 - **Release 3 Test**
 - **Release 3 Deployment**

Release 3

R3 Design

•**R3.1:** To assist a complete assessment of the outstanding issues and the functionality that will be delivered for Release 3.1, the IA recommends that ongoing information on the design issues and the magnitude of effort be made available to help understand the functional status of Release 3.1. **Influencer for action: CP**

R3 Build

•**R3.2** Clearly define an implementation plan for the replacement of Historian and execute this plan. The plan should include key milestones and information such as endorsement of the approach by ATO stakeholders and the approach to final cutover to the new tool and the supporting processes. **Influencer for action: CP**

R3 Testing

R3.3: Finalise the HRPT and the Performance Test Approaches. **Influencer for action: CP**

R3.4: Define the Performance Target for key solution aspect areas (ICP, Siebel etc.). **Influencer for action: CP**

R3.5: Socialise the key performance risks and use these to define and revise the Performance Test implementation plan. **Influencer for action: CP**

R3.7: Improve communication between the build, deployment and the EM teams. **Influencer for action: CP**

R3.8: Add one or more new resources to enhance and complete the Deployment Verification Process more effectively. **Influencer for action: CP**

Key:

Influencer for Action (i.e. the group that could make it happen) can be one of, or a combination of:

- BAU
- CP
- ATO (P&P, ICT)

- **Executive Summary**
- **Recommendations**
- **Assurance Findings**
 - **Release 3 Design**
 - **Release 3 Build**
 - **Release 3 Test**
 - **Release 3 Deployment**

Overall Workstream Rating: Amber

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Design – Design Validation	Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent changes to the R3 Design team structure and responsibilities are starting to deliver improvements in the throughput and timeliness of critical design activities. The IA understands that under the current approach, it is possible that R3.1 design gaps may not be identified until the R3.1 solution is exposed to business users in the Pilot (currently anticipated to occur in October and November 2007). While the IA recognises that there are a number of methods in place to mitigate this risk (including Co-Design, UAT and BPA, design walk-throughs, other measures to identify design holes and ongoing solution assurance work), if any significant gaps are found during the Pilot, then it is unlikely there will be sufficient time in the schedule to make the changes prior to R3.1 deployment. Compounding this risk will be any schedule compression arising from the current delays in commencing Assembly and Product testing. The IA understands that one of the Stage Gate outcomes is for a business impact assessment that will allow a business driven approach to identifying the impacts Release 3 will have on the business processes and practices and workforce capabilities. The IA welcomes this initiative and considers it will provide a substantial offset to risks arising from a compressed delivery schedule and reduce the risk of any significant design gaps being identified late in the development cycle.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Amber		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Design – Design Validation	Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to these initiatives, the IA makes the following suggestions to help further mitigate this risk : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-Design continues into 2007 and potentially up until the Pilot, and the scenarios are used to cover a wider breadth of the solution. The overall focus, scenarios and results are coordinated to ensure they run across the other design assurance activities. - Early focus is given to UAT objectives, scope and coverage to help cover any possible gaps in the business impact assessment, and this activity is coordinated with other design assurance activities.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Amber		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Design – Design Closure	Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IA understands that only 8 weeks remain until the R3.1 design is frozen to allow the December/January 2008 R3.1 deployment milestone to be met. The IA acknowledges the substantial progress in the Design issues achieved from closing out the top design issues identified during the Stage Gate workshop along with the commitment to conduct ongoing “Issues Destruction” activities. With the current approach to managing the design activities, it is unclear what the design will be when it is frozen, particularly in terms of the functionality that will be deployed, and what the process will be for including critical change requests. <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R3.1: To assist a complete assessment of the outstanding issues and the functionality that will be delivered for Release 3.1, the IA recommends that ongoing information on the design issues and the magnitude of effort be made available to help understand the functional status of Release 3.1.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Source Code Management	Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current source code management tools and processes need to be changed in order to ensure acceptable levels of build and test productivity. The mainframe development process and tools, in particular, are causing delays in the code migration and deployment. Without better tools and processes to support source code management, there will continue to be an impact on the testing schedule and quality of the deployed code. • Historian is used for Mainframe source code management. It allows the management of multiple versions of programs and supports the promotion of changes into the testing and production environments. However, Historian lacks the sophistication to support code merging and branching, is highly manual and is prone to error. These issues have caused delays in the deployment of code and shakedown of Assembly Test environment. Furthermore, Plan J requires multiple code branches which cannot be supported by the current toolset. • Team Foundation Server (TFS) is used for mid-range source code management. Accenture submits that Historian should and can be replaced by TFS. The IA understands that this approach to source code management addresses the needs of the Change Program and may not be the solution adopted by the ATO once Accenture's support responsibilities end. • The IA agrees that improving the source code deployment process is critical to successfully repeating code deployments and we endorse this immediate term perspective. However, while the need to replace Historian seems to be understood by all parties, the IA considers that this activity should be considered urgent. • Currently one resource has been allocated to investigate this issue.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Source Code Management	Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that the replacement is done in a controlled manner, and as such, the strategy needs to include ensuring there is a clear plan for replacing Historian and that all stakeholders are clear : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The planthe creation of an Options Paper that describes the pros and cons of using TFS and ClearCase – including any risks, impact on current ATO development schedule and processes, resource requirements, and the conversion strategy; - the process and schedule to obtain ATO’s approval and signoff for the decision; <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R3.2 Clearly define an implementation plan for the replacement of Historian and execute this plan. The plan should include key milestones and information such as endorsement of the approach by ATO stakeholders and the approach to final cutover to the new tool and the supporting processes.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
Testing	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Product Test has not yet started and the IA is concerned that the delays will not be recoverable in the current schedule and testing approach. The CP is planning to start Product Test execution as soon as the Product Test shakedown issues are resolved. The Product Test team will then start executing the Drop 2 & 3 scripts on the Product Test environment that contains the CR Drop 2 version of ICP code. While Accenture and the ATO are working through the final elements of the Test Strategy it is still not signed off and agreed. The HRPT and Performance Test Approaches are yet to be agreed. This has meant that Performance Test preparation (creation of environments, finalising the test scripts and so on) has had to start prior to the approaches being agreed. The late sign-off of these approaches, coupled with the fact that preparation has had to occur in advance of an agreed approach contravenes accepted good practice and can result in additional work, time or costs in the test execution phase. The HRPT and Performance Test Approaches need to be finalised as a matter of priority. In addition, the performance test preparation and test execution are 2-3 weeks behind schedule. This is due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The delivery of Siebel environment is delayed for at least 2 weeks due to the CPSF SQL server upgrade; - The delay in completing the converted data to be used in performance test execution; and - The delay in completing the performance test metrics, i.e. response time, batch window, throughput and utilisation.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
Testing	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IA has concerns that if this delay continues, then crucial performance issues may not be found until late in the testing cycle, and this may impact on the deployment and the Go-Live time schedule. Furthermore, these delays can result in delays to areas such as technical infrastructure and environment sizing and infrastructure contingency planning. The IA understands that the key performance risks have been identified by the Performance Testing team. However, there is little understanding of these risks across the program and socialisation will assist in the prioritisation of testing scripts, and the revision of the HRPT and Performance Test implementation plans. In addition, there is currently no plan in place to mitigate the risks created by the delayed test schedule. <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R3.3: Finalise the HRPT and the Performance Test Approach. R3.4: Define the Performance Target for key solution aspect areas (ICP, Siebel etc.). R3.5: Socialise the key performance risks and use these to define and revise the Performance Test implementation plan.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Red		
Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
Migration Process	Red	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current migration process is not effective as the Deployment Verification Process is not formalised and well communicated to the build and deployment teams. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Deployment Verification Process provides the build and deployment teams with the listing of standard activities in packaging the source codes that are to be migrated to the test environment. • Without a standard Deployment Verification Process, migration would continue to slip, which could have impact on the schedule of other activities, i.e. Assembly Test, Product Test, Performance Test and possibly the formal deployment into the production environment. • The IA understands that CP has plans to improve the Deployment Verification Process, but there is no agreed timetable in place. The CP lacks resources to focus on this task. • The IA recommends adding one or more new resources to vastly enhance and complete the Deployment Verification Process more effectively. In addition, improve communication between the build, deployment and the EM teams. <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R3.7: Improve communication between the build, deployment and the EM teams. • R3.8: Add one or more new resources to vastly enhance and complete the Deployment Verification Process more effectively.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Green

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Deployment	Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous improvement is being demonstrated by the R3 Business Deployment streams, as their methodologies and strategies are influenced by the R1 and R2 learnings. For example, the Communications team are using existing communication channels from each Business Service Line (BSL) to deliver only relevant and important messages to the business, and are introducing tools to measure the businesses view of the effectiveness of the messages. • In addition, the Training and Performance Support stream of Business Deployment is working towards gaining resources with the right skill sets and ensuring that the current key stakeholders maintain authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It will be important to ensure that the responsibility is balanced appropriately between Accenture and the ATO, and that the ATO has sufficient business input into the training tools, channels and support model. - Although the proposed model for the R3 Practice Environment provides a more practical size environment for the users, there is a concern around the volumes, integrity and security of the data required for the practice environment. - The IA has found that there has been no resources identified for the Practice Environment team, this needs to be addressed in the next two weeks. The T&PS team and Practice environment team need to work closely and use the same scenarios in both situations to make the Practice Environment as useful as possible. The users have high expectations of this environment, which needs to be managed accordingly.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets

Overall Workstream Rating: Green

Criteria	Rating	Key Findings
R3 Deployment	Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction of Implementation Process Guides (IPGs), is an effective initiative in response to problems experienced in R2, in relation to project teams and business groups not understanding what process to take to reach the outcome of the deliverables. The IA recognises the ATO has addressed a key risk for the deployment program – providing a person to fill the business deployment BAE role. However, this role needs to be clearly defined and understood across the Business deployment stream and within business in order for it to be most effective.

Green = On Track

Amber = Concerns raised.
Mitigating actions in plan

Red = Major issues identified. Impacts to
timeline and/or budgets