DRAFT

City of Adelaide

Project Management Framework Review

September 2026

IDEAS | PEOPLE | TRUST

Contents

Executive Summary

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Background

The City of Adelaide (CoA) delivers a significant portfolio of capital, renewal and strategic projects to support the delivery of infrastructure, community services, economic development initiatives and strategic priorities. Effective project management practices are critical to ensuring projects are delivered within approved scope, budget and timeframes, while achieving intended outcomes and benefits.

To support project delivery, CoA has established a Project Management Office (PMO) framework comprising governance forums, project lifecycle controls, change management processes, reporting requirements, templates, practice guides, record-keeping standards and supporting systems. The PMO framework is designed to provide a consistent approach to project delivery across the Initiate, Commit, Design, Deliver and Close phases of the project lifecycle and includes supporting guidance for project planning, scheduling, change management, reporting, handover and project closure activities.

Given the scale and complexity of Council's project portfolio, it is important that project governance, project management practices and PMO controls operate effectively and are consistently applied across the organisation. Weaknesses in project governance, planning, oversight, risk management or project delivery controls may impact Council's ability to deliver projects efficiently, realise intended project outcomes and provide effective stewardship of public funds.

Objective

The objective of this internal audit was to assess the design adequacy and operating effectiveness of Council's PMO framework and key controls across the project lifecycle, and its alignment to leading practice. This review was guided by a maturity assessment framework (refer Appendix 1), which was used to assess CoA's current state across key project management dimensions and identify opportunities for continuous improvement.

Scope and Approach

The scope of this review examined the effectiveness and maturity of Council's project management framework, including the governance, controls, processes, reporting arrangements and supporting systems used to manage capital, renewal and strategic projects. The review considered project management practices across the project lifecycle, including project initiation, planning, governance, risk management, change control, reporting, benefits realisation and project close-out, to identify opportunities to improve consistency, governance oversight and project delivery outcomes. This review was conducted in consultation with representatives from the PMO and Governance & Strategy teams. The engagement included testing of project management documentation, governance artefacts and a sample of projects comprising:

- 2 New and Upgrade projects
- 3 Renewal projects (including 1 ICT Renewal)
- 1 Strategic project

A summary of test results for the selected samples is outlined in Appendix 2. While project documentation and governance artefacts were reviewed for each sample, the engagement did not include direct consultation with Project Managers, Asset Managers or other project delivery personnel. As such, the review focused on the design and operation of the PMO framework, governance arrangements and supporting controls, rather than assessing the capability or performance of individual project stakeholders. Appendix 3 details the approach undertaken to perform this review.

DRAFT

Executive Summary (cont.)

Methodology and Maturity-Based Assessment Approach

As part of this review, BDO assessed the maturity of CoA’s project management framework using a Project Management Maturity Assessment Model tailored to reflect Council’s project delivery environment, governance arrangements and PMO framework. The maturity model comprised twelve dimensions covering the project lifecycle and supporting PMO capabilities:

- Strategic Alignment & Project Initiation
- Governance Structure & Oversight
- Roles, Responsibilities & Capability
- Delegations & Approvals
- Stage Gates & Project Lifecycle Controls
- Planning & Baseline Management
- Risk, Issues & Escalation
- Reporting & Performance Monitoring
- Change Control
- Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation
- Close-Out & Lessons Learned
- Framework Enablement – Templates, Guidance & System

The maturity assessment model applied, including detailed criteria for each dimension and definitions of maturity levels, is provided in *Appendix 1*.

Executive Summary (cont.)

How to read this report

This internal audit has been conducted as a maturity-based assessment, consistent with guidance issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA). The IIA encourages the use of maturity models in assurance engagements to provide insight into capability, sustainability and pathways for improvement, rather than focusing solely on control failures or historical non-compliance.

For the purposes of this report:

- CoA’s current state maturity has been assessed against the defined criteria for each dimension
- Observations have been documented where gaps exist between the current state and a higher, more mature operating state
- Recommendations are forward-looking and focus on practical actions to support progression in maturity, rather than remediation of isolated deficiencies.

To ensure recommendations are practical and proportionate to CoA’s operating context, the target state for this engagement has been assumed to **be Level 4.0 (Advanced)** across all dimensions.

This reflects a level of maturity where project management practices are consistently applied across the project lifecycle, governance and oversight arrangements are embedded, project performance and risks are actively monitored, and project delivery is supported by well-established controls, processes and enabling systems. The target state also recognises the scale and complexity of CoA’s capital, renewal and strategic project portfolio, while remaining achievable within a local government context.

The overall engagement rating presented in this report is aligned to the average weighted maturity assessment across all dimensions. This approach is consistent with IIA guidance and reflects the fact that project management effectiveness is best assessed holistically rather than on the basis of individual issues in isolation.

Accordingly, the report should be read as:

- An assessment of current capability and maturity
- A clear articulation of where maturity can be strengthened
- A practical roadmap to support continuous improvement over time.

DRAFT

Overall assessment

The rating, provided in the table, reflects our overall assessment of CoA's Project Management Framework maturity that was assessed by this review. Appendix 1 outlines the differing rating levels and their respective definitions.

Overall maturity and effectiveness

The overall effectiveness of CoA's Project Management Framework is supported by established governance structures, clearly defined project lifecycle controls, formal change management processes, comprehensive guidance materials and well-developed reporting arrangements. CoA has established a mature PMO framework comprising detailed practice guides, governance documentation, standardised workflows and supporting systems that provide a strong foundation for consistent project delivery across the capital portfolio. The review identified that key project management activities, including project governance, approvals, planning, baseline management, reporting, change control, commissioning and handover, are supported by documented processes, governance oversight and retained project records.

Based on the maturity assessment, CoA achieved an average maturity rating of 3.0 – Established across the twelve project management dimensions. This indicates that the fundamental elements of an effective project management framework are in place and are generally operating as intended across the capital, renewal and strategic project portfolio. The strongest dimensions assessed were Governance Structure & Oversight, Delegations & Approvals, Stage Gates & Project Lifecycle Controls, Change Control, and Framework Enablement – Templates, Guidance & Systems, where mature governance, approval and control practices were consistently evidenced. In addition, the review identified strong strategic alignment and project initiation practices, with project briefs consistently demonstrating alignment to Council priorities and project approvals supported through established governance and budget processes appropriate to the type and scale of project being delivered.

The greatest opportunities to improve overall maturity relate to strengthening the consistency with which project management requirements are applied and evidenced across the portfolio. In particular, the review identified opportunities to improve project risk management, project performance reporting, benefits realisation and lessons learned practices. Risk Management was the least mature dimension assessed, with limited evidence that project risks are being systematically documented, maintained and monitored in accordance with the PMO framework. Project risk registers were largely absent across the sampled projects, and risk information within project initiation documentation was frequently incomplete or not maintained within the PMO system. Similarly, while projects are generally commissioned, handed over and closed effectively, benefits are not consistently measured after project completion and lessons learned activities were not evidenced across the sampled projects.

The review also identified opportunities to strengthen consistency of project management practices across project types and improve the reliability of portfolio reporting information. While reporting arrangements appear to provide meaningful visibility of project performance across the capital portfolio, consultation with the PMO team identified that project status information is not always updated in a timely manner by Project Managers. In addition, detailed project-level performance reporting was not consistently evidenced for the strategic project sample reviewed. Collectively, these observations indicate that while reporting processes are well established, the accuracy and completeness of project information remains dependent on consistent maintenance of project records and reporting artefacts by project delivery teams. Council advised that it is currently investigating options for a new Planning, Project Management and Reporting (PPR) system, which may provide opportunities to improve system integration, enhance reporting capability and reduce reliance on manual administration activities over time.

Overall, CoA has established the key structural elements of an effective project management framework and is operating at an Established (Level 3) level of maturity. The recommendations in this report are intended to support CoA in embedding more consistent application of project management practices across the portfolio, improving visibility of project risks, strengthening the quality and reliability of project reporting, and enhancing benefits realisation and organisational learning processes. Collectively, these improvements will support progression towards Level 4 – Advanced, where project management practices are proactively monitored, consistently applied, data-informed and continuously improved across the organisation.

Maturity Rating (out of 5)	
Dimension	Rating
1. Strategic Alignment & Project Initiation	3.0
2. Governance Structure & Oversight	3.5
3. Roles, Responsibilities & Capability	3.0
4. Delegations & Approvals	3.5
5. Stage Gates & Lifecycle Controls	3.5
6. Planning & Baseline Management	3.0
7. Risk, Issues & Escalation	1.5
8. Reporting & Performance Monitoring	2.5
9. Change Control	3.5
10. Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation	3.0
11. Close-Out & Lessons Learned	2.5
12. Framework Enablement – Templates, Guidance & Systems	3.5
Overall	3.2

Disclaimer

BDO limited the procedures performed during this internal audit project to inquiries of relevant personnel, inspection of evidence and observation of, and enquiry about, the operation of the control procedures for a small number of transactions or events. Our procedures are not designed to provide assurance as defined by the Australian Auditing Standards (AUASB Standards) and an audit opinion was not expressed in this report. An internal audit project does not provide all of the evidence that would be required in an audit.

The matters raised in this report are only those that come to our attention during the course of performing our procedures and may not necessarily be a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that may exist or improvements that might be made.

We cannot, in practice, examine every activity and procedure, nor can we be a substitute for management's responsibility to maintain adequate controls over all levels of operations and their responsibility to prevent and detect irregularities, comply with laws and regulations and avoid fraud. Accordingly, management should not rely on our report to identify all weaknesses that may exist in the systems and procedures reviewed, or potential instances of fraud that may exist.

Our report was prepared solely for the internal use of CoA. No responsibility to any third party shall be accepted, as our report has not been prepared, and is not intended, for any other purpose. The responsibility for determining the adequacy or otherwise of the procedures performed by BDO is that of CoA management and the procedures performed are solely to assist you in assessing the processes reviewed by BDO.

CoA should assess management actions for their full commercial impact before they are implemented.

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations

The table below provides a high-level overview of each maturity assessment by dimension, and recommendations, the responsible officer and their position, and the date by which the recommendation will be implemented. A detailed summary of each recommendation and its respective findings is provided in this report under section Current State Assessment and Recommendations. The risk ratings are based on BDO Priority Ratings outlined in Appendix 4. The Maturity rating is based on the Maturity level criteria outlined in Appendix 1.

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
1. Strategic Alignment & Project Initiation	**3.0 - Established**	CoA has established a repeatable project initiation process supported by project briefs that are consistently used across project categories. The project briefs reviewed demonstrated strong alignment to Council strategies and organisational objectives, and project need was generally well articulated. Project approvals are supported through established governance and budget processes that are appropriate to the type and scale of project being delivered, including program-level approval of renewal works through the BP&B and capital planning processes. Opportunities for improvement primarily relate to the completeness and consistency of project initiation documentation, with risk, benefits, dependency and delivery planning information not always completed to a consistent standard. As a result, project initiation practices are well established and provide a strong foundation for project selection, approval and delivery.	**1.1 (Short-term Recommendation)** - Require completion of key sections within project briefs, including benefits, risks, dependencies and delivery considerations. Consider introducing a quality review process to support more consistent completion of project initiation documentation across the portfolio.	Implement formal quality review processes for project briefs	PMO MGR	Apr 2027
2. Governance Structure & Oversight	**3.5 - Established / Advanced**	CoA has established a well-defined project governance structure supported by governance forums including CTG, ARG, PCG and Executive governance. Governance decisions were consistently supported by documented approvals, change requests, governance reports and approval records, providing a clear audit trail of project decisions. The review identified strong evidence of governance oversight throughout project delivery, particularly in relation to project re-timings, funding reallocations, change requests and matters requiring escalation. Collectively, the governance framework provides clear accountability, effective decision-making pathways and strong oversight of project delivery across the capital portfolio.	**2.1 (Long-term OFI) Progressing to an Advanced maturity level -** Establish a periodic governance assurance program to monitor the effectiveness and consistent application of key governance controls across the project portfolio. This could include periodic reviews of governance forum effectiveness, approval timeliness, action closure rates, compliance with delegated authority requirements, and adherence to stage gate and lifecycle control requirements. Results should be consolidated and reported to governance forums to provide assurance over the effectiveness of governance arrangements, identify exceptions or recurring issues, and support continuous improvement across project governance, approvals and lifecycle management practices.	**N/A - OFIs do not require a Management Action plan**		

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
3. Roles, Responsibilities & Capability	**3 - Established**	CoA has established a comprehensive PMO framework that clearly defines project management roles, responsibilities and accountabilities across the project lifecycle. Detailed guidance, governance documentation and supporting procedures provide clarity regarding stakeholder responsibilities, while PMO personnel consulted as part of the review demonstrated a strong understanding of project management and governance obligations. The PMO also provides significant support through governance coordination, templates, workflows, reporting tools and guidance materials, promoting consistency across the project portfolio. However, testing identified some inconsistencies in the application and evidencing of key project management responsibilities within project records, indicating an opportunity to further improve consistency across the portfolio.	**3.1 (Medium-term Recommendation):** Reinforce existing PMO requirements by requiring Project Managers to confirm completion of key project management activities, including maintenance of project risks, project reporting and core project documentation, at agreed lifecycle stages and governance review points.	Review the current checkpoints in place to ensure robustness of process	PMO ANALYST	Mar 2027
4. Delegations & Approvals	**3.5 - Established / Advanced**	CoA has established a mature delegations and approvals framework that clearly defines approval authority, escalation pathways and governance responsibilities across the project lifecycle. Approval pathways are supported by detailed governance documentation, standardised workflows and documented delegation requirements. Testing identified strong evidence that project approvals, funding reallocations and change requests are consistently supported by documented endorsement and approval records, providing a clear and traceable audit trail for project decision-making.	**Refer to 2.1 (Long-term OFI)**	**N/A - OFIs do not require a Management Action plan**		

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
5. Stage Gates & Lifecycle Controls	**3.5 - Established / Advanced**	CoA has established a structured project lifecycle framework supported by defined lifecycle stages, governance checkpoints and record-keeping requirements. Testing identified evidence that projects progress through documented lifecycle phases, including initiation, planning, design, delivery and close-out, with lifecycle activities supported by governance oversight and retained project records. Governance review points are embedded throughout the project lifecycle, and project decisions are supported by clear documentation and approval pathways. Collectively, these controls provide a strong foundation for project governance, accountability and transparency across the project portfolio.	**Refer to 2.1 (Long-term OFI)**	**N/A - OFIs do not require a Management Action plan**		
6. Planning & Baseline Management	**3 - Established**	CoA has established planning and baseline management practices that support the development, approval and maintenance of project scope, design and financial baselines. Across the sampled projects, planning activities were supported by documented design and project documentation, Baseline CapWorks records and formal governance processes. Financial baselines are actively maintained throughout delivery, with project re-timings, budget reallocations and funding adjustments supported by approved change management processes. Executive EOM and IPW reporting also demonstrate active oversight of project expenditure, delivery status and forecast funding positions across the capital portfolio.	**6.1 (Medium-term Recommendation) -** Review and rationalise change request reason categories to ensure they are clear, relevant and consistently applied across the project portfolio, and require a change reason to be recorded for all change requests. As reliable data becomes available, undertake portfolio-level analysis of recurring change drivers, variance trends and forecasting assumptions, with results reported to governance forums and used to strengthen future planning, budgeting, forecasting accuracy and project delivery performance.	Review the current CR process to improve options Conduct a system clean up to improve data quality within systems Introduce baseline monitoring across the system	PMO MGR	Oct 2027

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
7. Risk, Issues & Escalation	**1.5 - Foundational / Developing**	Risk management was the least mature dimension assessed. While the PMO framework assigns responsibility for identifying, managing and escalating project risks to Project Managers, limited evidence was identified that these requirements are being consistently implemented in practice. Only one of the six sampled projects maintained a project risk register, risk assessment sections within project briefs were frequently incomplete or absent, and there was limited evidence that project risks were being actively monitored or escalated through governance processes. Collectively, the testing indicates that project risk management remains largely dependent on individual project manager practices rather than a consistent and embedded project management discipline across the portfolio.	**7.1 (Short-term Recommendation) -** Require all projects meeting defined value, complexity or risk thresholds to establish and maintain a project risk register within the PMO system. Project risk registers should not be maintained in separate standalone documents or spreadsheets. This will establish the PMO system as the single source of truth for project risk management, improve visibility of project risk exposure across the portfolio and support more effective governance oversight.	Develop and implement processes to centralise risk registers with associated escalation processes incorporated	PMO MGR	Apr 2027
			7.2 (Short-term Recommendation) - Strengthen project initiation requirements to ensure project-specific risks are identified and documented during development of the project brief. Project briefs should include meaningful assessment of delivery risks, mitigation actions and accountable owners prior to project approval.	Update the Project Brief review process to ensure that project specific risks are identified. Build an assessment of project deliverability into the project briefing stage	PMO MGR	Apr 2027

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
8. Reporting & Performance Monitoring	**2.5 - Developing / Established**	CoA has established multiple reporting mechanisms that provide visibility of project delivery, expenditure, program performance and governance decisions across the capital portfolio. Reporting occurs through project status reporting, governance forums, Infrastructure and Public Works (IPW) reporting and Executive PMO reporting, providing multiple levels of oversight across the organisation. The reporting reviewed contained meaningful information relating to project performance, expenditure, delivery status, project re-timings and emerging delivery issues. However, consultation with the PMO team identified that project status information is not always updated in a timely manner by Project Managers, creating a risk that portfolio reporting may not always reflect the current status of projects. In addition, detailed project-level performance reporting was not consistently evidenced for the strategic project sample, indicating that reporting and performance monitoring practices are less mature for certain project types.	**8.1 (Short-term Recommendation) -** Define minimum reporting requirements for complex strategic projects, including reporting on scope, schedule, budget, key milestones, risks, issues, dependencies and forecast delivery outcomes. Reporting should be retained within the PMO system and regularly reported through governance forums.	Refine linkages between the strategic goals, project delivery and program reporting across the council. Expand PMO performance reporting to include key PMO control areas	PMO MGR	Apr 2027
			8.2 (Medium-term Recommendation) - Establish clear expectations regarding the frequency and timeliness of project status updates within the PMO system and periodically review compliance with these requirements. Consider introducing automated reminders, exception reporting or dashboard monitoring to identify projects with overdue status updates.	Strengthen project delivery reporting processes across the council	PMO MGR	Jul 2027

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
9. Change Control	**3.5 - Established / Advanced**	CoA has established a mature and consistently applied change control framework. Significant project changes are supported by formal change requests, documented impact assessments and governance approvals prior to implementation. Testing identified strong evidence that budget reallocations, project re-timings, funding transfers and baseline adjustments are assessed, approved and recorded through established governance processes. Approved changes are subsequently reflected in project baselines, governance reporting and financial records, providing strong traceability and accountability across the samples reviewed.	**9.1 - Refer to recommendation 6.1** (Medium-term recommendation)	Review the current CR process to improve options Conduct a system clean up to improve data quality within systems Introduce baseline monitoring across the system	PMO MGR	Oct 2027
10. Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation	**3 - Established**	CoA has established structured commissioning and handover processes that are consistently evidenced through handover workflows, documented responsibilities and operational acceptance activities. Testing identified strong evidence that completed assets and project deliverables are formally transferred into operational ownership through a structured and repeatable process. Expected project benefits are also captured within project documentation and the PMO system, demonstrating that intended project outcomes are considered during project planning and delivery. However, benefits are not consistently defined in measurable terms, assigned to accountable owners or monitored following project completion, limiting Council's ability to demonstrate that projects have delivered the outcomes used to justify investment.	**10.1 (Medium-term Recommendation) -** Require significant projects to define measurable benefits, success measures, benefit owners and review timeframes during project initiation. As part of the project close-out process, Council should determine whether ongoing benefits monitoring is required and formally document how benefits will be measured, reported and reviewed following delivery. Benefits should be incorporated into existing PMO reporting processes to provide visibility over realised outcomes and support more informed future investment and prioritisation decisions.	Include project and strategic outcomes with agreed success measures within the project initiation process	PMO MGR	Jun 2027

DRAFT

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
11. Close-Out & Lessons Learned	**2.5 - Developing / Established**	CoA has established effective project closure practices across its capital and renewal project portfolio. Testing identified evidence that practical completion, cost finalisation, asset registration and project record management activities are being consistently completed and retained. However, no evidence of lessons learned reviews, post-project reviews or lessons learned documentation was identified across the sampled projects. In addition, close-out practices were less consistently evidenced for the strategic project sample, where limited formal close-out documentation was available. As a result, while projects are generally being closed effectively, opportunities to capture organisational learning and continuously improve project delivery practices are not being consistently realised.	**11.1 (Short-Term Recommendation) -** Finalise and implement the proposed lessons learned process and require lessons learned reviews to be completed for significant projects (e.g. projects exceeding a nominated value)	Finalise and implement the formal lessons learned process	PMO MGR	Nov 2026
			11.2 (Medium-term Recommendation) - Develop minimum close-out requirements for strategic projects. This should include defined closure documentation, evidence of completion, close-out approval requirements and record retention expectations. The close-out process should also include consideration of any ongoing benefits realisation activities, including confirmation of benefit owners, monitoring arrangements and review timeframes where post-delivery benefit measurement is required (refer Recommendation 10.1).	Introduce minimum required project close out actions for all projects	PMO MGR	Mar 2027
			11.3 (Medium-Term Recommendation) - Following implementation of the lessons learned process, PMO to periodically review completed lessons learned outputs to identify recurring delivery issues, systemic challenges and opportunities to improve project management practices, templates and governance processes.	Provide evaluations and insights on lessons learned and associated risks and issues across the project lifecycle	PMO ANALYST	Jun 2027

Summary of Issues and Recommendations (Cont.)

Assessment Dimension	Current State Maturity	Maturity Rating Rationale	BDO Recommendations and Opportunities for Improvement	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
12. Framework Enablement - Templates, Guidance & Systems	**3.5 - Established / Advanced**	CoA has established a comprehensive PMO framework supported by an extensive suite of templates, practice guides, workflows, governance tools and supporting systems. Documentation reviewed demonstrated that the PMO provides guidance across the full project lifecycle, including project initiation, planning, reporting, change management, handover and close-out activities. The standardised tools and workflows are actively used across the project portfolio and provide a strong foundation for consistent project delivery practices. The review also identified evidence that the PMO is continuing to enhance and evolve the framework as improvement opportunities are identified, demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement.	**12.1 (Long-Term OFI) Progressing to an Advanced maturity level:** Develop a longer-term roadmap for enhancing PMO systems and tools to improve usability, reporting capability, data consistency and integration across the project lifecycle. This should focus on reducing reliance on standalone spreadsheets and manually maintained registers while preserving the strengths of the existing framework. Council is currently investigating options for a new Planning, Project Management and Reporting (PPR) system, which may provide opportunities to improve system integration, enhance reporting capability and reduce manual administration. The roadmap should be aligned to the outcomes of this initiative to ensure future system investments support Council's broader PMO maturity objectives and reporting requirements.	**N/A - OFIs do not require a Management Action plan**		

Current State Assessment and Recommendations

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.0 – Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 1: Strategic Alignment and Project Initiation

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Strategic Alignment and Project Initiation dimension considers the extent to which projects are supported by robust start-up documentation, clearly articulated business need and strategic alignment, and whether project initiation requirements are consistently applied across the project portfolio.

Based on our testing, we have assessed this dimension at 2.5 (Developing/Established). Project briefs are consistently used across project categories and demonstrate strong alignment to Council strategies and organisational objectives. Business need is generally well articulated, and project approvals are supported by established governance and budget processes. Opportunities for improvement primarily relate to the consistency and completeness of project initiation documentation.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Project briefs demonstrate strong alignment to Council strategies

Project briefs tested consistently demonstrated clear alignment to Council's Strategic Plan and broader organisational objectives. Across the sampled projects, project briefs typically referenced the relevant strategic pillars, outcomes and initiatives that the project was intended to support. For example, the project briefs for the new and upgrade samples explicitly linked the projects to community accessibility, safety and environmental outcomes associated with the Park Lands. Similar alignment was observed across the renewal and strategic project samples.

2. Business need is generally well articulated

The reason for undertaking projects was generally well documented and supported across the sampled projects. Projects were typically initiated in response to identifiable drivers such as asset condition, safety concerns, service delivery requirements, renewal needs or broader strategic objectives. For example, the 'Shared Use Path Improvements – Park 27' new and upgrade project was initiated in response to identified safety-related issues, while renewal projects were supported by asset lifecycle and renewal requirements. Strategic project '88 O'Connell Project Delivery' was linked to broader economic development and city activation objectives.

3. Project approvals are supported by established governance and budget processes

Project approval pathways varied across project categories as required by established governance and budget processes. Strategic and new and upgrade projects could be traced to Business Plan and Budget (BP&B) documentation, Council reports, governance approvals or funding approval artefacts. For renewal projects, Council advised that approval occurs at a program level through the annual BP&B and capital planning processes, rather than through separate approval of individual renewal projects. Testing confirmed that the sampled renewal projects were included within approved renewal programs and funded capital works budgets, providing evidence that the projects had been subject to Council's established planning and approval processes.

4. Project Advocates consistently utilise project briefs, however completion standards vary

Project Advocates (e.g. Asset Planners) are responsible for the preparation and completion of project briefs as part of the project initiation process. Across all six sampled projects, project briefs were utilised and clearly embedded as Council's primary project initiation artefact. The template captures core information including project rationale, objectives, scope, strategic alignment and funding requirements.

While project briefs were consistently used, the completeness of supporting information varied between projects. Sections relating to risks, benefits, dependencies and delivery considerations were not always completed to the required standard across the sample set. In several instances, benefits were described at a high level and risk information was incomplete or omitted. No evidence was identified of a formal quality review process to assess completeness prior to approval.

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.0 – Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 1: Strategy and Approval (cont.)

Implication

Council has established a repeatable project initiation process supported by project briefs that clearly align projects to Council priorities and articulate the business need for investment. Project approvals are supported through established governance and budget processes that are appropriate to the type and scale of project being delivered.

However, inconsistencies in the completion of key project brief sections reduce the quality and consistency of information available to support project approval and decision-making. Improving the completeness of initiation documentation would strengthen project planning and provide greater assurance that project risks, benefits, dependencies and delivery considerations are being appropriately considered at project commencement.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
1.1 **Strengthen project brief completion requirements:** Require completion of key sections within project briefs, including benefits, risks, dependencies and delivery considerations. Consider introducing a quality review process to support more consistent completion of project initiation documentation across the portfolio.	Short-term	**1.1** Implement formal quality review processes for project briefs	PMO MGR	Apr 2027

DRAFT

Dimension 2: Governance Structure and Oversight

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Governance Structure and Oversight dimension considers the extent to which project governance arrangements are formally established, clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the project lifecycle, including governance forums, decision-making processes, escalation pathways and the documentation of governance decisions.

Based on our review of the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3.5 (Established/Advanced). Governance arrangements are supported by a structured governance framework, including established governance forums such as the Change Triage Group (CTG), which oversees capital project delivery and coordination activities; the Asset Review Group (ARG), which reviews asset-related investment and renewal matters; the Project Control Group (PCG), which oversees significant project decisions, funding adjustments and project changes; and Executive governance, which provides strategic oversight and decision-making for matters requiring executive endorsement. Governance decisions were consistently supported by documented approvals and clear evidence of escalation through the relevant forums. However, there is limited evidence that governance effectiveness is actively measured or monitored, which would be required to achieve a Level 4 maturity rating.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Governance approvals are well documented and traceable

A strength observed throughout the testing was the quality and traceability of governance approval documentation. Across the sampled projects, governance decisions could generally be traced through funding approvals, governance reports and approval records. Change requests consistently demonstrated evidence of governance review, endorsement and approval, including clearly documented approval actions, dates and decision-makers. For example, the sampled change request for ICT Renewals – Telecommunications (25/26) (Asset Renewals (ICT)) evidenced Asset Manager endorsement, ARG review, and approval through the established governance process. Similarly, 88 O'Connell Project Delivery (Strategic Project) evidenced governance approvals relating to funding reallocations and strategic project decisions.

2. Governance oversight is strongest during project delivery and change management activity

Governance involvement was most evident during project delivery, particularly where projects required changes to budget, scope, timing or funding allocations. Across the samples reviewed, change requests were consistently supported by governance review and approval, demonstrating that governance forums play an active role in overseeing project delivery and managing project changes. Funding re-timings, budget reallocations, project completion activities and financial adjustments were generally accompanied by documented governance decisions and approvals.

3. Limited evidence of governance effectiveness monitoring

While governance activities and decision-making were clearly documented in the projects tested, limited evidence was identified to support that Council actively measures or evaluates how effectively governance arrangements are operating. The testing did not identify governance performance measures, monitoring of governance compliance, reporting on approval timeliness, tracking of action completion rates, or periodic reviews of governance effectiveness. While governance forums appear to be functioning appropriately, there is limited evidence that Council collects information to assess whether governance decisions are being made in a timely manner, governance processes are operating consistently, or governance activities are contributing to improved project outcomes.

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 2: Governance Structure and Oversight (cont.)

Implication

Council has established governance structures that provide appropriate oversight and control throughout project delivery, with governance decisions generally supported by clear and traceable approval documentation. This provides a strong foundation for project oversight and accountability.

However, without formal measurement of governance effectiveness, Council has limited visibility over whether governance forums are operating efficiently, consistently or delivering the intended level of oversight. The absence of governance performance information also limits Council's ability to identify process inefficiencies, demonstrate continuous improvement, or assess whether governance arrangements remain appropriate as the project portfolio evolves.

Opportunity for Improvement	Priority
2.1 **Progressing to an Advanced maturity level:** Develop and implement governance performance measures to assess the effectiveness of key governance forums and decision-making processes. Measures could include approval turnaround times, governance action closure rates, escalation responsiveness and compliance with governance requirements. Periodic reporting of these measures would provide greater visibility over governance effectiveness and support continuous improvement activities.	Long-term

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 - Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 3: Roles, Responsibilities and Capability

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Roles, Responsibilities and Capability dimension considers whether project management roles, responsibilities and capability expectations are clearly defined, documented and consistently applied, and the extent to which Council develops, supports and monitors the capability and capacity required to deliver projects effectively.

Based on the documentation reviewed and testing performed, we assessed this dimension at 3.0 – Established. It should be noted that this review was primarily conducted in consultation with the Project Management Office (PMO) and Governance & Strategy teams. As such, the review focused on the roles and responsibilities as documented in the PMO framework, and did not include direct consultation with Project Managers or Asset Managers regarding the operational application of their roles and responsibilities.

Council has established a comprehensive PMO Framework that clearly defines the responsibilities of key project stakeholders, supported by detailed practice guides, governance documentation and standardised project management processes. PMO stakeholders consulted as part of the review demonstrated a strong understanding of their responsibilities and how those responsibilities interact throughout the project lifecycle. Opportunities for improvement primarily relate to the formal measurement and ongoing development of project management capability.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined within the PMO framework

The PMO has developed a comprehensive project management framework including detailed practice guides covering all key phases of the project lifecycle, including project initiation, governance, change management, close-out activities, lessons learnt and post-implementation reviews. These guides clearly articulate the responsibilities of key stakeholders, including Project Managers, Advocates, Asset Managers, Asset Planners, Design Managers, PMO personnel and governance bodies. Responsibilities are documented at both a governance level and a process level, providing clarity regarding who is responsible for key decisions, approvals and activities throughout project delivery. The framework also includes defined governance structures, delegation pathways and responsibility matrices to support consistent application across projects.

2. PMO staff demonstrated a strong understanding of their responsibilities

The PMO personnel consulted as part of this review demonstrated a strong understanding of their responsibilities and governance obligations. This was evident through the way PMO representatives articulated governance pathways, project management processes and lifecycle requirements during walkthroughs, as well as the quality and consistency of the supporting documentation provided throughout the review. PMO personnel were able to clearly explain project requirements, approval pathways, governance responsibilities and the interaction between key project stakeholders, consistent with the documentation provided.

3. Strong PMO support promotes consistency across the project lifecycle

The PMO plays a significant role in supporting capability and consistency across Council's project portfolio. Beyond maintaining governance forums and reporting processes, the PMO has developed an extensive suite of supporting tools, templates, training materials, system workflows and guidance documentation to assist project teams. The PMO maintains project management systems, governance workflows, project reporting tools, templates and change management processes, all of which support consistent project delivery across different project types. The breadth of guidance available significantly reduces reliance on informal practices and provides project teams with clear direction throughout the project lifecycle.

4. Responsibilities are clearly defined, however implementation is not always consistent

Council’s PMO framework clearly defines responsibilities for key project activities and governance processes. For example, the Governance Framework assigns responsibility to Project Managers for managing project risks and issues, maintaining project documentation, producing project reporting, and escalating matters through governance channels where required. However, testing identified instances where documented responsibilities were not consistently reflected in project records. For example, while Project Managers are responsible for identifying and managing project risks, risk information within sampled project documentation was not always complete or consistently maintained. Similarly, the completeness and quality of project documentation varied across the sample despite the existence of documented guidance and clearly defined responsibilities.

DRAFT

Dimension 3: Roles, Responsibilities and Capability (cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 - Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established a mature project management framework with clearly defined roles, responsibilities and supporting guidance. Project stakeholders generally understand their responsibilities and the framework provides a strong foundation for consistent project delivery.

However, where key project management responsibilities are not consistently executed or evidenced in project documentation, Council has limited visibility over whether project management practices are being applied consistently across the portfolio. This reduces assurance that key controls, such as risk management, project documentation and reporting requirements, are being performed to a consistent standard and may lead to variability in project management outcomes.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
3.1 **Embed accountability for completion of key project management artefacts:** Reinforce existing PMO requirements by requiring Project Managers to confirm completion of key project management activities, including maintenance of project risks, project reporting and core project documentation, at agreed lifecycle stages and governance review points. This will strengthen accountability and promote more consistent application of the PMO framework across projects.	Medium-term	**3.1** Review the current checkpoints in place to ensure robustness of process	PMO ANALYST	Mar 2027

DRAFT

Dimension 4: Delegations of Authority and Approvals

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 – Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Delegations of Authority and Approvals dimension considers the extent to which approval authorities are clearly defined, documented and consistently applied throughout the project lifecycle, including the escalation of decisions to the appropriate governance forum or approving authority.

Based on our review of project documentation, governance records and PMO guidance, we assessed this dimension at 3.5 – Established/Advanced. Council has established a well-defined delegations framework that clearly identifies approval authorities across project types and decision categories. Approval pathways are supported by detailed governance documentation, and sampled approvals were consistent with documented delegation requirements. Opportunities for improvement primarily relate to strengthening assurance that approvals are operating consistently across all project stages and project types.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Approval authorities are clearly defined within the PMO governance framework

Council has established a comprehensive PMO governance framework that clearly defines approval responsibilities across project delivery, governance and executive functions. The framework includes detailed delegations relating to scope changes, schedule changes, budget reallocations, additional funding requests, carry forwards, project closures and approval of new projects. Approval thresholds are clearly documented and aligned to governance bodies including ARG, CTG, PCG, Executive and Council. The framework also defines escalation requirements where decisions fall outside delegated authority, supporting consistency in decision-making across the project portfolio.

2. Approval decisions are generally well documented and traceable

For the sampled projects, testing identified that approval decisions throughout the project lifecycle were documented and retained. Sampled change requests included documented endorsements, governance review outcomes and formal approval decisions, providing a clear audit trail from request through to approval. Governance records generally identified the approving authority, date of approval and rationale for the decision. For example, sampled change requests demonstrated evidence of Asset Manager endorsement and governance approval through ARG, CTG, PCG or Executive consistent with the documented delegation framework. This provides transparency over project decision-making and supports accountability for project outcomes.

3. Approval pathways are supported by detailed workflows and guidance

The PMO framework is supported by extensive guidance documentation that clearly explains approval and review processes. Project request, governance and change management documentation provides step-by-step guidance on endorsement requirements, approval workflows, governance escalation pathways and records management obligations. The approval process within the Project Request System also includes multiple review and endorsement levels prior to approval, providing opportunities for challenge and review before funding or project decisions are finalised.

DRAFT

Dimension 4: Delegations of Authority and Approvals (cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has implemented a structured PMO delegations and approvals framework that clearly defines approval authority, escalation pathways and governance responsibilities. Approval decisions associated with project delivery and change management are well documented and provide a strong audit trail supporting accountability and transparency.

While approval pathways are well established, Council currently has limited visibility over whether delegation requirements are being applied consistently across all projects and lifecycle stages. Progressing to an Advanced maturity level would provide greater assurance through periodic monitoring and review of approval compliance, enabling Council to identify approval exceptions, strengthen governance oversight and demonstrate ongoing compliance with delegated authority requirements across the portfolio.

Opportunity for Improvement	Priority
4.1 Refer to 2.1 (Long-term OFI)	Long-term

DRAFT

Dimension 5: Stage Gates and Project Lifecycle Controls

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 – Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Stage Gates and Project Lifecycle Controls dimension considers whether projects progress through defined lifecycle stages supported by documented approval points, governance oversight and evidence that key requirements have been completed before advancing to the next phase.

Based on the testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3.5 – Established/Advanced. Council has established a structured project lifecycle supported by defined governance forums, lifecycle deliverables and record-keeping requirements. Evidence reviewed demonstrates that samples projects are progressing through key lifecycle phases using documented processes and governance controls.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Projects are supported by defined lifecycle stages and key stage deliverables

Council has established a documented project lifecycle consisting of Initiate, Commit, Design, Deliver and Close phases, supported by defined requirements for each stage. Across the sampled projects, Council was able to provide evidence to demonstrate that these lifecycle phases were being followed, including project briefs, design documentation, procurement documentation, project reporting, governance approvals, financial records and project closure artefacts.

2. Governance review points are embedded throughout the project lifecycle

Governance controls are integrated throughout key project lifecycle stages rather than being applied only at project commencement. Testing identified evidence of governance oversight through ARG, CTG and PCG at various points throughout delivery. Governance forums reviewed project performance, funding movements, project re-timings and decisions requiring escalation, providing formal review points before significant project decisions were implemented. Meeting minutes and approval records demonstrated that governance bodies play an active role in overseeing project progression and delivery outcomes throughout the lifecycle.

3. Defined record-keeping requirements support stage gate compliance throughout the project lifecycle

Council has established documented record-keeping requirements that specify the minimum artefacts required throughout the project lifecycle. Across all sampled projects, Council was able to provide evidence from multiple lifecycle stages, including initiation documents, design documentation, governance approvals, procurement records, financial records, project reporting and project close-out documentation. This allowed project activities and key decisions to be traced throughout delivery and provided evidence that lifecycle controls were being supported by appropriate project records. While individual documentation gaps have been identified in other dimension assessments, record retention across the sample was generally strong and supported transparency and accountability across the project lifecycle.

DRAFT

Dimension 5: Stage Gates and Project Lifecycle Controls (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established a mature project lifecycle framework supported by defined lifecycle stages, governance checkpoints and record-keeping requirements. The testing identified evidence that projects progress through documented lifecycle phases and that key project decisions are supported by governance oversight and retained documentation. These controls provide a strong foundation for project governance and support transparency over how projects progress from initiation through to completion.

However, Council currently has limited visibility over the extent to which lifecycle requirements are being applied consistently across the broader project portfolio. Progressing to an Advanced maturity level would enable Council to actively monitor compliance with stage gate requirements, identify recurring gaps or bottlenecks in project delivery, and provide governance forums with greater assurance that projects are consistently meeting lifecycle expectations before progressing to subsequent phases.

Opportunity for Improvement	Priority
5.1 Refer to 2.1 (Long-term OFI)	Long-term

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 – Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 6: Planning & Baseline Management

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Planning and Baseline Management dimension considers the extent to which project scope, cost and delivery baselines are established, documented and managed throughout the project lifecycle.

Based on the testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3 – Established. Council has established planning processes that supports the development of project scope, design and budget baselines before delivery commences. Baseline information is maintained throughout the project lifecycle and changes to approved funding allocations are controlled through governance and change management processes. The primary opportunity for improvement relates to demonstrating more consistent monitoring and reporting of baseline performance across the portfolio.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Projects are supported by documented scope and design baselines prior to delivery

The projects tested demonstrated evidence that planning activities are undertaken before works commence. Across the sampled projects, Council was able to provide planning and design documentation that defined project scope, technical requirements and delivery expectations prior to procurement and construction activities commencing. For example, the Shared Use Path Improvements – Park 27 – Adjacent Port Road Underpass project (New & Upgrade) included a detailed Issued for Tender (IFT) design package containing layouts, technical specifications, construction details and engineering drawings. The quality and completeness of the design documentation reviewed provided a clear baseline against which project performance can be managed.

2. Financial baselines are established, maintained and updated throughout the project lifecycle

Strong evidence was identified demonstrating active management of project budgets and financial baselines across all sampled projects. Council provided Baseline CapWorks records for each project reviewed, which documented original funding allocations, approved baseline budgets, carry forwards, contingency allocations and revised baseline positions across multiple financial years. Baseline records maintained original and revised positions, enabling movement in project funding to be traced over time. The sampled budget re-timing change requests further demonstrated that changes to project funding and expenditure profiles are assessed, approved and formally recorded before baseline adjustments are made.

3. Planning and baseline information is actively managed through governance and reporting processes

Testing identified evidence that planning and baseline information is not only maintained at a project level but is also reviewed through governance and reporting processes. Executive EOM reports and Infrastructure and Public Works (IPW) reporting provide visibility of capital program performance, project delivery status, expenditure and forecast funding positions. In addition, the sampled re-timing change requests demonstrated active review of planned expenditure profiles and financial baselines where projects required budget movements between financial years.

DRAFT

Dimension 6: Planning & Baseline Management (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 – Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established effective planning and baseline management practices that support the development, approval and maintenance of project scope, design and financial baselines. Projects are supported by documented planning artefacts prior to delivery, Baseline CapWorks records are maintained across the portfolio, and budget changes are actively managed through governance and change management processes. The Executive EOM and IPW reporting processes also demonstrate that project expenditure, delivery status and forecast funding positions are regularly reviewed through established governance forums.

However, Council currently has limited visibility over portfolio-wide trends in baseline performance and the underlying causes of project re-timings, budget reallocations and forecast variances. Progressing to an Advanced maturity level would enable Council to systematically analyse planning and baseline performance information across the portfolio, identify recurring drivers of variance, improve forecasting accuracy and use historical delivery insights to strengthen future project planning, budgeting and decision-making.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
6.1 Strengthen change and variance analysis to improve forecasting and planning performance: Review and rationalise change request reason categories to ensure they are clear, relevant and consistently applied across the project portfolio, and require a change reason to be recorded for all change requests. As reliable data becomes available, undertake portfolio-level analysis of recurring change drivers, variance trends and forecasting assumptions, with results reported to governance forums and used to strengthen future planning, budgeting, forecasting accuracy and project delivery performance.	Medium-term	**6.1** Review the current CR process to improve options Conduct a system clean up to improve data quality within systems Introduce baseline monitoring across the system	PMO MGR	Oct 2027

DRAFT

Dimension 7: Risk, Issues & Escalation

Maturity Assessment
Current: 1.5 - Foundational / Developing
Target: 4 - Advanced

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Risk, Issues and Escalation dimension assesses whether project risks are systematically identified, documented, monitored and escalated throughout the project lifecycle.

Based on the testing performed across the six sampled projects, this was assessed as the least mature area reviewed at 1.5 (Foundational/Developing). While Council's PMO framework assigns responsibility for managing project risks and issues to Project Managers, there was limited evidence that these requirements were being consistently applied in practice.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Project risk registers were largely absent across the sampled projects

The absence of risk registers across most of the sampled projects represents a disconnect between Council's documented risk management requirements and project delivery practices. The PMO framework assigns responsibility for identifying, maintaining and escalating project risks to Project Managers; however, risk registers could only be evidenced for one of the six sampled projects, Shared Use Path Improvements – Park 27 – Adjacent Port Road Underpass (New & Upgrade).

2. Risk information captured during project initiation was incomplete and inconsistent

The project briefs reviewed provided limited evidence that project delivery risks are being systematically identified and assessed during project initiation. For example, the risk assessment sections within the renewal project briefs for Heavy Patching – Franklin Street – West Terrace to Morphett Street (Asset Renewals) and ICT Renewals – Telecommunications (25/26) (Asset Renewals (ICT)) were incomplete. Whilst the project brief template contained dedicated sections for both the "Risks of Doing the Project" and "Risks of Not Doing the Project", these sections contained no meaningful risk assessments, mitigation actions or ownership information.

Similarly, the Greening – Market Street (Gouger St to Wright St) (New & Upgrade) project identified several delivery challenges within the project brief, including that estimated delivery costs exceeded current funding allocations. Despite this, no corresponding project risks, mitigation strategies or risk owners were documented within the risk assessment section.

3. Limited evidence of ongoing risk monitoring and escalation

The testing identified very limited evidence that project risks were being actively reviewed or escalated throughout project delivery. Governance approval records, change requests, re-timing requests, budget reviews and project status reporting rarely provided visibility of project risks, treatment actions, changing risk exposure or escalation activities.

In practice, many of the issues being discussed through governance processes (e.g. delayed procurement, funding pressures, delivery delays, contractor availability and stakeholder impacts) could reasonably be expected to originate from active project risk management processes. Instead, risks often appeared to become visible only once they had already impacted the project and required governance intervention.

The Project Risk Register (extract from the PMO system) also identified opportunities to improve the maturity and consistency of risk management practices. Several entries relate to issues that had already materialised, including project delays, funding constraints and delivery challenges. In several instances, risks appear to have been recorded after project impacts were already evident rather than being identified and managed proactively. The register also demonstrates variation in the quality of risk descriptions, treatment actions and risk assessments between projects, suggesting that risk management approaches are not being applied consistently and remain heavily dependent on individual Project Manager judgement.

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 1.5 – Foundational / Developing
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 7: Risk, Issues & Escalation (Cont.)

Implication

Council has established project risk management requirements within its PMO framework; however, the testing identified that these requirements are not being consistently implemented. Project risks are not being systematically documented, maintained or monitored, resulting in limited visibility of project risk exposure at both a project and portfolio level.

As a result, there is reduced assurance that project delivery risks are being proactively identified and managed before impacting project outcomes. The absence of project risk registers, incomplete risk assessments within project briefs and limited evidence of ongoing risk monitoring indicate that risk management is largely reliant on individual Project Manager judgement rather than a consistent and embedded project risk management practice. This increases the likelihood that risks are not identified at all, or identified only after issues have emerged, reducing Council's ability to proactively manage impacts to project scope, schedule, budget and delivery outcomes.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
7.1 **Require project risk registers to be maintained within the PMO system:** Require all projects meeting defined value, complexity or risk thresholds to establish and maintain a project risk register within the PMO system. Project risk registers should not be maintained in separate standalone documents or spreadsheets. This will establish the PMO system as the single source of truth for project risk management, improve visibility of project risk exposure across the portfolio and support more effective governance oversight.	Short-term	**7.1** Develop and implement processes to centralise risk registers with associated escalation processes incorporated	PMO MGR	Apr 2027
7.2 **Strengthen risk identification during project initiation:** Strengthen project initiation requirements to ensure project-specific risks are identified and documented during development of the project brief. Project briefs should include meaningful assessment of delivery risks, mitigation actions and accountable owners prior to project approval. This will improve the quality of project planning, promote earlier identification of project risks and support the ongoing maintenance of project risk registers throughout the project lifecycle.	Short-term	**7.2** Update the Project Brief review process to ensure that project specific risks are identified. Build an assessment of project deliverability into the project briefing stage	PMO MGR	Apr 2027

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 2.5 – Developing / Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 8: Reporting & Performance Monitoring

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Reporting and Performance Monitoring dimension considers the extent to which project and portfolio performance information is collected, monitored and reported to support effective governance oversight and delivery decision-making.

Based on the documentation reviewed and testing performed, we assessed this dimension at 2.5 – Developing/Established. Council has implemented multiple reporting mechanisms that provide visibility of project delivery, expenditure, program performance and governance decisions. Reporting occurs through project status reporting, governance forums, Infrastructure and Public Works (IPW) reporting and Executive PMO reporting, providing multiple levels of oversight across the capital portfolio. However, the absence of consistent project-level reporting for strategic projects and identified issues relating to the timeliness of project status updates indicate that reporting practices are not yet being applied consistently across all project types.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Council has established structured reporting mechanisms across the capital portfolio

Performance monitoring is embedded within Council's governance processes through recurring project, program and portfolio reporting. The quarterly project status reporting provides visibility of project status, budget position, delivery progress, forecast completion and key project commentary across the capital program. In addition, governance meeting minutes from ARG, CTG and PCG demonstrate that project performance, funding reallocations, project re-timings and delivery issues are routinely reviewed and discussed.

2. Executive and IPW reporting provides meaningful oversight of portfolio performance

The Executive PMO reports and IPW reporting reviewed for the tested capital projects were comprehensive, providing visibility of capital expenditure performance, forecast delivery outcomes, project re-timings, emerging delivery issues, program performance and portfolio-level trends. Reporting also included commentary explaining the drivers of project delays, budget movements and delivery challenges, enabling management to understand not only what is occurring but also the factors affecting project performance.

3. Reporting and performance monitoring is less mature for strategic projects

While Council was able to provide substantial reporting evidence for the broader capital portfolio, limited evidence was available demonstrating detailed project-level performance monitoring for the strategic project sample, 88 O'Connell Street Redevelopment. Council was able to provide governance approvals, change requests and project documentation associated with the project; however, equivalent project-level reporting showing ongoing monitoring of scope, budget, schedule, milestones, risks and delivery performance was not available.

This was notable given the scale, strategic significance and complexity of the project relative to the other projects tested. Projects of this nature would typically be expected to be supported by regular performance reporting that tracks delivery against approved scope, cost, schedule, risks, dependencies and key milestones.

4. Project status information is not always maintained in a timely and accurate manner

Consultation with the PMO team identified that project status information within the PMO system is not always maintained or updated in a timely manner. While the sample testing performed did not identify reporting deficiencies for the capital projects reviewed, PMO representatives advised that project status records are occasionally not updated promptly by Project Managers. For example, instances have been identified where projects had reached practical completion several months earlier, but the project status had not been updated within the PMO system to reflect the change.

DRAFT

Dimension 8: Reporting & Performance Monitoring (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 2.5 – Developing / Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established mature reporting and performance monitoring processes that provide governance forums with visibility of project delivery, expenditure, project status and emerging issues across the portfolio. However, the effectiveness of these reporting arrangements is dependent on the timely and accurate maintenance of project information within the PMO system.

Where project status information is not updated promptly or consistently, there is a risk that portfolio reporting does not accurately reflect the current status of projects. In addition, the absence of consistent project-level performance reporting for strategic projects may reduce visibility of project delivery performance, risks, key milestones and emerging issues for some of Council's more complex and strategically significant initiatives. Collectively, these factors may reduce the reliability of information used by management and governance forums to monitor project performance and make informed project delivery decisions.

Recommendations		Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
8.1	**Establish minimum project performance reporting requirements for strategic projects:** Define minimum reporting requirements for complex strategic projects, including reporting on scope, schedule, budget, key milestones, risks, issues, dependencies and forecast delivery outcomes. Reporting should be retained within the PMO system and regularly reported through governance forums.	Short-term	**8.1** Refine linkages between the strategic goals, project delivery and program reporting across the council. Expand PMO performance reporting to include key PMO control areas	PMO MGR	Apr 2027
8.2	**Strengthen accountability for maintaining project status information:** Establish clear expectations regarding the frequency and timeliness of project status updates within the PMO system and periodically review compliance with these requirements. Consider introducing automated reminders to identify projects with overdue status updates. This will improve the accuracy and reliability of portfolio reporting and provide greater confidence that governance forums are making decisions based on current project information.	Medium-term	**8.2** Strengthen project delivery reporting processes across the council	PMO MGR	Jul 2027

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 9: Change Control

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Change Control dimension considers the extent to which changes to project scope, budget, schedule and funding are identified, assessed, approved and reflected within project records before implementation.

Based on the testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3.5 – Established/Advanced. Council has implemented a formal change request process supported by clear governance approval pathways, documented impact assessments and strong record retention practices. The testing identified consistent evidence that significant project changes are assessed and approved before implementation, with governance forums actively overseeing funding reallocations, project re-timings and baseline adjustments.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Significant project changes are supported by formal change requests and governance approvals

The projects tested demonstrated the consistent use of formal change requests to manage significant project changes. Across the sampled projects, budget reallocations, project re-timings, funding transfers, project recasting and changes to approved expenditure profiles were supported by documented and approved change requests before implementation.

For example, CR3987 and CR4145 documented portfolio-wide re-timing of New & Upgrade projects, including the rationale for the changes, funding impacts and governance approvals required before adjustments were made to project budgets and expenditure profiles. These requests were reviewed through the established governance framework before implementation, demonstrating that changes are not made informally or outside approved governance processes.

2. Approved changes are reflected in project baselines and governance reporting

Testing identified evidence that approved project changes are subsequently reflected within project records and portfolio reporting. Budget reallocations and project re-timings approved through the change control process were reflected within Baseline CapWorks records, Executive reporting and governance reporting. This ensures traceability between the approved decision, the resulting baseline adjustment and subsequent performance monitoring activities.

3. Governance forums maintain active oversight of portfolio changes

The governance minutes reviewed demonstrated that project changes were actively discussed and challenged by governance forums. ARG, CTG and PCG minutes contained evidence of discussion relating to project re-timings, funding reallocations, project delivery constraints and requests requiring governance approval. Governance involvement appeared to extend beyond approval of individual changes and included broader oversight of portfolio impacts arising from project changes.

4. Change management reporting could provide greater insight into the root causes of project changes

The PMO has developed a dashboard that captures the reasons for change requests across the project portfolio, providing a mechanism to analyse drivers of project re-timings, budget movements and scope changes. However, completion of the change reason field is not currently mandatory and the available categories are broad, reducing the consistency and usefulness of the information captured. As a result, while Council has established the foundations for portfolio-level change analysis, opportunities exist to improve data quality and strengthen reporting on the underlying causes of project changes.

DRAFT

Dimension 9: Change Control (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established a mature and well-controlled change management process. Significant changes to project scope, budget and schedule are supported by documented change requests, governance review and formal approval before implementation. Change decisions are traceable, impacts are assessed, and approved changes are reflected in project baselines and reporting processes.

However, while Council has established a dashboard to capture and analyse the reasons for project changes across the portfolio, the usefulness of this information is currently limited by inconsistent completion of change reason fields and broad categorisation of change drivers. Progressing to an Advanced maturity level would enable Council to generate more reliable insights into the underlying causes of project re-timings, budget movements and scope changes, supporting improved planning, forecasting, decision-making and continuous improvement across the project portfolio.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
9.1 Refer to recommendation 6.1	Medium-term	**9.1 Refer to Management Action Plan 6.1**	PMO MGR	Oct 2027

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 - Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 10: Commissioning, Handover and Benefits Realisation

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Commissioning, Handover and Benefits Realisation dimension considers whether completed projects are formally transferred into operational ownership and whether the intended benefits of projects are subsequently monitored and evaluated.

Based on the testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3.0 – Established. Council has implemented structured handover and commissioning processes that are consistently evidenced through project records and workflow approvals. However, while project benefits are captured within project documentation and the PMO system, there is limited evidence that these benefits are subsequently measured, reviewed or validated following project completion.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Operational handover activities are formally completed and evidenced

The handover workflows reviewed provided strong evidence that operational handover activities were completed and recorded as part of project delivery. Across the sampled projects, handover workflows included assigned actions, responsible stakeholders, completion dates and evidence that required handover activities had been completed before project closure. The evidence reviewed demonstrates that commissioning and handover activities have been embedded within the project lifecycle and are supported by documented workflow controls. This provides assurance that completed assets and project deliverables are transitioned into operational ownership in a structured manner.

2. Benefits are documented but are not consistently measured after project completion

The Project Status List History (from the PMO system) reviewed demonstrated that expected project benefits and outcomes were being captured within Council's PMO system. However, the benefits documented were often expressed as broad project outcomes rather than measurable benefits with defined targets, owners or review timeframes. While the system captures what the project intends to achieve, limited evidence was available demonstrating how those benefits will be measured or how success will be assessed following delivery.

For example, a number of project records reference improved service outcomes, asset performance improvements or broader community benefits; however, the documentation did not consistently identify how these outcomes will be measured, who is accountable for achieving them, or at what point Council will determine whether the benefits have been realised. As a result, benefits management appears to be primarily focused on capturing intended outcomes during delivery rather than managing and validating benefits after implementation.

DRAFT

Dimension 10: Commissioning, Handover and Benefits Realisation (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3 - Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established an effective commissioning and handover process that supports the structured transfer of projects into operational ownership and provides clear evidence that handover activities have been completed.

However, while intended project benefits are documented, they are not consistently defined in measurable terms, assigned to accountable owners or linked to a process for validating whether benefits have been achieved. This limits Council's ability to demonstrate that completed projects are delivering the outcomes used to justify investment and reduces visibility of the value realised from completed projects.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
10.1 **Strengthen benefits realisation practices:** Require significant projects to define measurable benefits, success measures, benefit owners and review timeframes during project initiation. As part of the project close-out process, Council should determine whether ongoing benefits monitoring is required and formally document how benefits will be measured, reported and reviewed following delivery. Benefits should be incorporated into existing PMO reporting processes to provide visibility over realised outcomes and support more informed future investment and prioritisation decisions.	Medium-term	**10.1** Include project and strategic outcomes with agreed success measures within the project initiation process	PMO MGR	Jun 2027

DRAFT

Maturity Assessment
Current: 2.5 – Developing / Established
Target: 4 - Advanced

Dimension 11: Close Out and Lessons Learned

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Close-Out and Lessons Learned dimension considers whether projects are formally closed, financial and administrative close-out activities are completed, and project learnings are captured and used to improve future project delivery.

Based on the testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 2.5 – Developing/Established. Council has implemented comprehensive project closure practices for its capital program. However, lessons learned activities were not evidenced for any sampled project, and the close-out process was not applied consistently across project types.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. Administrative and financial close-out activities are consistently completed for capital and renewal projects

Project closure activities were well evidenced across all capital and renewal project samples. Council was able to provide evidence that practical completion had been achieved through signed practical completion certificates, project costs had been finalised and recorded, and project asset registers had been completed and updated. Project files were complete and contained the documentation expected to support project closure.

2. Close-out practices are less consistent for strategic projects

The strategic project sample, – 88 O'Connell Street Redevelopment, did not follow the established project closure process. The documentation provided included project status history records showing progression to practical completion, settlement activities, receipt of Council's balance payment and confirmation that the project was complete. The status history ultimately recorded that the project had reached practical completion and delivered a range of anticipated economic and community outcomes.

However, unlike the capital project samples, limited evidence was provided demonstrating how project close-out had been formally completed. The review did not identify dedicated project closure documentation, close-out checklists, closure approvals or other artefacts equivalent to those observed for the capital and renewal projects. In addition, there was limited evidence that the close-out process had been used to formally document how identified project benefits would be monitored following completion, including the success measures, accountable benefit owners and review timeframes required to support ongoing benefits realisation activities. This creates a dependency on the improvements outlined in Dimension 10 (Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation) to ensure responsibility for post-delivery benefit measurement is clearly established at project closure.

3. Lessons learned activities were not evidenced across any sampled project

No evidence of completed lessons learned reviews, post-project reviews or lessons learned documentation was available for any of the six sampled projects.

Council acknowledged this gap during the review and advised that a lessons learned process has recently been developed and is currently under review. A lessons learned survey has also been created to support capture of project learnings following completion. While these initiatives indicate that the issue has been recognised, the testing identified no evidence that lessons learned activities have yet been embedded within project delivery practices.

DRAFT

Dimension 11: Close Out and Lessons Learned (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 2.5 – Developing / Established
Target: 4 – Advanced

Implication

Council has established effective administrative and financial project closure processes and was able to demonstrate that practical completion, cost finalisation and project record management activities are occurring across its capital program.

However, close-out practices are not applied consistently across all project types and there is no evidence that project learnings are being captured following completion. The absence of lessons learned reviews means that delivery challenges, successful practices and improvement opportunities are not being systematically retained or shared across future projects. This limits organisational learning and increases the likelihood that recurring project delivery issues will continue to emerge across the portfolio.

Recommendations	Priority	Management Action Plan	Action Owner	Target Date
11.1 Implement the lessons learned process for significant projects: Finalise and implement the proposed lessons learned process and require lessons learned reviews to be completed for significant projects (e.g. projects exceeding a nominated value)	Short-term	**11.1** Finalise and implement the formal lessons learned process	PMO MGR	Nov 2026
11.2 Standardise close-out requirements across project types: Develop minimum close-out requirements for strategic projects. This should include defined closure documentation, evidence of completion, close-out approval requirements and record retention expectations. The close-out process should also include consideration of any ongoing benefits realisation activities, including confirmation of benefit owners, monitoring arrangements and review timeframes where post-delivery benefit measurement is required **(refer Recommendation 10.1).**	Medium-term	**11.2** Introduce minimum required project close out actions for all projects	PMO MGR	Mar 2027
11.3 Periodically review lessons learned themes: Following implementation of the lessons learned process, PMO to periodically review completed lessons learned outputs to identify recurring delivery issues, systemic challenges and opportunities to improve project management practices, templates and governance processes.	Medium-term	**11.3** Provide evaluations and insights on lessons learned and associated risks and issues across the project lifecycle	PMO ANALYST	Jun 2027

DRAFT

Dimension 12: Framework Enablement – Templates, Guidance and Systems

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 - Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Current State Assessment and Observations

The Framework Enablement dimension considers whether project delivery is supported by documented templates, guidance materials, systems, workflows and governance tools that enable consistent application of project management practices across the organisation.

Based on the documentation reviewed and testing performed across the sampled projects, we assessed this dimension at 3.5 – Established/Advanced. Council has developed a comprehensive PMO framework supported by a large suite of templates, practice guides, workflows and systems. The PMO has invested significant effort in developing a structured project management environment that supports project delivery across the full project lifecycle. The primary opportunity for improvement relates to strengthening system enablement and reducing reliance on manual administration activities.

Specifically, we have noted the following observations:

1. The PMO framework provides comprehensive guidance across the project lifecycle

Council has developed a substantial suite of project management guidance covering project initiation, change management, scheduling, contingency management, close-out activities, record keeping, project requests, handover activities and lessons learned. The documentation reviewed demonstrates that the PMO framework provides clear guidance for project stakeholders throughout the Initiate, Commit, Design, Deliver and Close phases of the project lifecycle. Council has documented its expectations in considerable detail and has established guidance to support consistent delivery practices across a broad range of project types.

2. Templates, workflows and governance tools support consistent project delivery practices

The PMO framework is supported by a range of standardised templates, registers, workflows and governance tools. Examples reviewed during testing included project briefs, change requests, project status reporting tools, handover workflows, project asset registers and project record-keeping requirements. These tools provide Project Managers with structured mechanisms for documenting and managing project activities and support consistency across the project portfolio. The testing identified evidence that these tools are actively being used across the portfolio, particularly in relation to project reporting, change management and project administration activities.

3. Framework development is occurring proactively to address identified maturity gaps

Discussions with PMO staff and review of documentation suggested that Council is continuing to evolve the PMO framework as areas for improvement are identified. For example, the PMO team has recently developed a lessons learned and post-implementation review process and supporting survey, despite these practices not yet being consistently implemented across projects. Similarly, the PMO has developed detailed guidance covering close-out, change management, scheduling and project controls that extends beyond the minimum requirements typically observed within comparable local government project environments.

4. The PMO system environment appears comprehensive but remains heavily reliant on manual administration

The review identified that the PMO system contains substantial project information and supports functions such as project requests, change control, project status reporting and workflow management. While the existing environment is functional and supports project delivery, it appears increasingly complex and administratively intensive. As the size and complexity of the project portfolio grows, greater automation and integration between PMO processes, reporting and workflow activities may be required to improve efficiency and reduce manual effort. Council advised that it is currently investigating options for a new Planning, Project Management and Reporting (PPR) system, which may provide opportunities to improve system integration, enhance reporting capability and reduce reliance on manual administration activities over time.

DRAFT

Dimension 12: Framework Enablement – Templates, Guidance and Systems (Cont.)

Maturity Assessment
Current: 3.5 – Established / Advanced
Target: 4 - Advanced

Implication

Council has established a mature PMO framework supported by comprehensive guidance materials, standardised templates, governance tools and lifecycle workflows. These resources provide strong foundations for consistent project delivery and have enabled Council to implement structured project management practices across its capital portfolio.

However, the current framework relies heavily on manual administration across multiple systems, registers and reporting tools. As the capital portfolio continues to mature, this may increase administrative effort, reduce efficiency and create challenges in maintaining data quality and consistency across PMO processes. Greater system integration and automation would improve scalability and strengthen the sustainability of the PMO operating model.

Opportunity for Improvement	Priority
12.1 **Progressing to an Advanced maturity level:** Develop a longer-term roadmap for enhancing PMO systems and tools to improve usability, reporting capability, data consistency and integration across the project lifecycle. This should focus on reducing reliance on standalone spreadsheets and manually maintained registers while preserving the strengths of the existing framework. Council is currently investigating options for a new Planning, Project Management and Reporting (PPR) system, which may provide opportunities to improve system integration, enhance reporting capability and reduce manual administration. The roadmap should be aligned to the outcomes of this initiative to ensure future system investments support Council's broader PMO maturity objectives and reporting requirements.	Long-term

Appendices

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Maturity Assessment Matrix

Dimension	Level 1 - Foundational	Level 2 - Developing	Level 3 - Established	Level 4 - Advanced	Level 5 - Optimised
Strategic Alignment & Project Initiation	No documented strategic plan; reactive decisions; minimal compliance evidence	Project briefs are usually prepared and include business need and strategic alignment, however quality and approval evidence is inconsistent.	Standardised project initiation processes are applied. Project briefs include business need, strategic alignment, benefits, risks and approval evidence.	Initiation documentation is reviewed for quality and completeness. Compliance with initiation requirements is monitored.	Project selection and prioritisation is data-driven and informed by strategic value, benefits, risk and delivery capacity.
Governance Structure & Oversight	Governance responsibilities and decision-making pathways are unclear or undocumented.	Governance forums exist, however responsibilities, escalation pathways and governance records are inconsistently applied.	Governance forums operate within a documented framework with defined roles, responsibilities and escalation pathways.	Governance effectiveness is monitored through performance measures and periodic review.	Governance arrangements are risk-based, scalable and continuously improved.
Roles, Responsibilities & Capability	Responsibilities are unclear and delivery relies on individual knowledge.	Key roles are understood, however responsibilities and capability expectations are not consistently documented.	Roles, responsibilities and capability expectations are clearly documented and understood.	Capability, capacity and succession risks are actively monitored and managed.	Workforce capability is systematically developed and aligned to future project demand.
Delegations of Authority & Approvals	Approval pathways are unclear and approvals are poorly documented.	Delegations exist but approval requirements and evidence are inconsistently applied.	Delegations are documented, linked to project thresholds and approvals are consistently evidenced.	Compliance with delegation requirements is monitored and exceptions are reviewed.	Approval workflows are automated, auditable and regularly refined.
Stage Gates & Project Lifecycle Controls	Projects progress without defined lifecycle stages or approval checkpoints.	Lifecycle stages exist but stage gate requirements and evidence of completion are inconsistent.	Projects progress through defined lifecycle phases supported by documented deliverables and approvals.	Compliance with stage gate requirements is actively monitored and reported.	Lifecycle performance is measured and used to continuously improve delivery practices.
Planning & Baseline Management	Scope, schedule and budget baselines are not formally established.	Scope, schedule and budget information is documented but baselines are inconsistently maintained.	Scope, schedule and budget baselines are approved, maintained and controlled throughout delivery.	Baseline performance, variances and forecasting trends are actively monitored and reported.	Historical delivery data is used to improve planning, estimating and forecasting accuracy.
Risk, Issues & Escalation	Risks are managed reactively and risk registers are not maintained.	Risks are identified for some projects but monitoring, ownership and escalation are inconsistent.	Risks and issues are documented, assigned, reviewed and escalated through defined governance pathways.	Risk trends, treatment effectiveness and escalation performance are monitored and reported.	Portfolio risk information drives governance, prioritisation and project decision-making.

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Maturity Assessment Matrix (Cont.)

Dimension	Level 1 - Foundational	Level 2 - Developing	Level 3 - Established	Level 4 - Advanced	Level 5 - Optimised
Reporting & Performance Monitoring	Reporting is inconsistent and provides limited oversight of project performance.	Reporting occurs regularly but content and quality varies across projects.	Standardised reporting provides visibility of scope, schedule, budget, risks and project status.	Performance trends, forecasts and variances are analysed and reported.	Reporting provides integrated, predictive insights across the portfolio.
Change Control	Project changes are implemented without formal assessment or approval.	Change requests exist but are not consistently applied or documented.	Formal change control processes assess and approve scope, budget and schedule changes before implementation.	Change trends and recurring drivers are monitored and reported across the portfolio.	Change information is analysed to improve planning, forecasting and delivery performance.
Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation	Handover is informal and responsibility for benefits is unclear.	Handover occurs but requirements and evidence vary between projects.	Formal handover processes are completed and operational ownership is evidenced. Benefits are documented.	Benefits are assigned to owners and monitored following project completion.	Benefits realisation informs future investment and project prioritisation decisions.
Close-Out & Lessons Learned	Projects are not formally closed and lessons learned are not captured.	Close-out activities occur inconsistently and lessons learned are rarely completed.	Formal close-out processes and lessons learned activities are completed and documented.	Lessons learned are reviewed centrally and used to improve project management practices.	Continuous improvement is embedded and lessons learned are systematically applied across the portfolio.
Framework Enablement - Templates, Guidance & Systems	Templates, guidance and systems are fragmented or inconsistently used.	Standard templates and guidance exist but compliance and system integration are limited.	Approved templates, guidance, workflows and systems are consistently used across the project lifecycle.	Compliance with framework requirements is monitored and supported by system controls and workflows.	Systems, workflows and reporting are integrated, automated and continuously improved.

DRAFT

Appendix 2 – High Level Summary of Test Results (Sampled Projects)

Project #	Project Type	Project Description	Summary of Test Results
Z3791	New & Upgrade	Shared Use Path Improvements - Park 27 - Adjacent Port Road Underpass	• Strong evidence of project planning, governance, reporting and change control processes. • Detailed design, schedule and budget baselines were maintained and monitored. • Only sampled project with a documented and maintained project risk register. • ARG/CTG approvals and change management records were retained. • Practical completion, handover and project close-out records were evidenced. • No evidence of lessons learned or post-implementation review activities.
Z0523	New & Upgrade	Greening - Market Street (Gouger St to Wright St)	• Project initiation, planning, reporting and change control requirements were evidenced. • Detailed design documentation and project reporting records were available. • No project-specific risk register or evidence of ongoing risk monitoring was provided. • Practical completion, handover and financial close-out activities were evidenced. • No evidence of lessons learned or post-implementation review activities.
Z8127	Asset Renewals	LED Renewal - River Torrens - south path leading up to rail overpass	• Project brief, planning documentation, reporting and governance approvals were evidenced. • Design, procurement and delivery activities were supported by documented project records. • No project risk register or formal risk monitoring artefacts were provided. • ARG/CTG approvals and change management records were retained. • Change requests demonstrated ARG review and approval. • Practical completion and handover activities were evidenced; lessons learned were not evidenced.
Z8265	Asset Renewals	Heavy Patching - Franklin Street - West Tce to Morphett St	• Project planning, reporting, governance and change management requirements were evidenced • Budget, schedule and delivery progress were regularly tracked. • No project-specific risks were documented and no risk register was provided. • ARG/CTG approvals and change management records were retained. • ARG approvals and change management records were retained. • Project completion and handover were evidenced; lessons learned were not evidenced.
Z0683	Asset Renewals (ICT)	ICT Renewals - Telecommunications (25/26)	• Project initiation, delivery monitoring and change management records were evidenced. • Governance approvals and financial tracking records were maintained. • No project risk register or evidence of structured risk management was provided. • Formal change request process was used to manage project close-out and return of unspent funds. • Lessons learned and post-project review activities were not evidenced.
4403	Strategic Project	88 O'Connell Project Delivery	• Strategic alignment, governance oversight and change control activities were evidenced throughout delivery. • Project outcomes, benefits and ongoing status reporting were documented. • No project risk register or evidence of formal risk monitoring was provided. • Governance approvals for funding and project changes were retained. • Formal project closure, file compliance and lessons learned activities were not evidenced

Appendix 3 – Detailed Approach

The scope of this review considered CoA’s project management framework, with a focus on the following areas:

Project Governance and Oversight:

- Alignment of roles and responsibilities
- Alignment with strategic planning and implementation

End-to-end Project Management Process and Gateways, including:

- Identification
- Approval stages
- Planning
- Delivery
- Risk management and escalation
- Project reporting and performance monitoring
- Commissioning and handover
- Close-out / post-delivery review
- Delegations of authority / approvals
- Governance charters

As part of this review, BDO assessed the adequacy and maturity of CoA’s project management practices using BDO’s Project Management Maturity Assessment Model, which reflects leading project management practices (e.g. PMBOK / PMI Standard, PRINCE2, P3M3 and ISO 21502) and was tailored to reflect CoA’s operational environment.

The maturity assessment considered the following dimensions:

1. Strategic Alignment & Project Initiation
2. Governance Structure & Oversight
3. Roles, Responsibilities & Capability
4. Delegations of Authority & Approvals
5. Stage Gates & Project Lifecycle Controls
6. Planning & Baseline Management
7. Risk, Issues & Escalation
8. Reporting & Performance Monitoring
9. Change Control
10. Commissioning, Handover & Benefits Realisation
11. Close-Out & Lessons Learned
12. Framework Enablement (Templates, Guidance & Systems)

The full Project Management Maturity Assessment Model applied, including detailed criteria for each dimension and maturity level definitions, is provided in Appendix 1.

This review was undertaken in consultation with the Project Management Office (PMO) and Governance & Strategy teams.

Appendix 3 – Detailed Approach (Cont.)

Our approach comprised the following phases:

Phase 0: Project Kick-Off and Planning

Project Kick-Off and Planning focused on establishing the foundation for an effective engagement, including stakeholder consultation, confirmation of timelines and deliverables, identification of scope exclusions, development of information requests and obtaining access to relevant documentation.

An initial kick-off meeting was held to confirm roles and responsibilities, introduce CoA representatives and the BDO engagement team, and confirm key points of contact.

Phase 1: Process Discovery

The Process Discovery phase included the following stages:

1a - Document Collation and Process Interviews

- Obtained CoA's suite of project management documentation, including the project management framework, governance charters, delegations, end-to-end project management processes and gateways (identification, approvals, planning, delivery, change management, commissioning and handover, and close-out processes) and other relevant supporting documentation.
- Obtained project register information and supporting project records.
- Conducted interviews with nominated CoA representatives to gain an understanding of the key processes and systems used to support the project management framework.
- Identified key project management risks and control areas relevant to the project lifecycle and maturity assessment dimensions.

1b - Process and Documentation Review

- Reviewed CoA's project management documentation and supporting artefacts obtained during Phase 1a.
- Documented, at a high level, the key project management processes, governance arrangements and controls operating across each of the 12 maturity assessment dimensions.

Phase 2: Assessment of Process Adequacy

The Process Adequacy phase included the following stages:

2a - Adequacy Assessment and Risk / Control Gap Analysis

- Assessed the alignment of CoA's project management framework documentation against the Project Management Maturity Assessment Model.
- Evaluated the design of project management processes and controls across each maturity assessment dimension against the assessment criteria.
- Identified opportunities for improvement in the design of project management processes, controls and governance arrangements.
- Determined areas that required further validation through walkthroughs and testing.

2b - Walkthroughs and Testing

- Selected a representative sample of capital, renewal and strategic projects for detailed review.
- Conducted walkthroughs and testing of project management activities to assess: — Compliance with CoA's project management framework, policies and procedures.
- Operating effectiveness of project management processes and controls across each maturity assessment dimension.
- Identified improvement opportunities based on the results of walkthroughs, testing and supporting documentation review.

Note: The review did not provide assurance over individual project outcomes. However, selected projects were reviewed to assess compliance with the project management framework and the operating effectiveness of key controls.

Appendix 3 – Detailed Approach (Cont.)

Phase 3: Process Improvement

- Held discussions with CoA representatives to validate factual accuracy of observations and maturity assessments.
- Developed practical improvement opportunities and recommendations to address identified gaps and strengthen project management maturity.

Phase 4: Report Results

- Prepared a summary of observations and recommendations aimed at enhancing CoA's project management framework and project delivery capability.
- Held closing discussions with CoA representatives regarding the review outcomes.
- Prepared a draft report and obtained management comments.
- Finalised the report.

Appendix 4 – Recommendation Priority Guidance

Recommendations have been prioritised based on the level of effort required, dependencies, and the extent to which they support progression toward higher maturity.

Priority	Timeframe	Criteria
Short-term	< 6 months	Improvements focused on strengthening compliance with existing PMO framework requirements and addressing identified control and documentation gaps. Typically includes enhancing project records, reporting practices, risk management activities, governance processes and other project management controls using existing tools, processes and resources.
Medium-term	6-12 months	Improvements that embed greater consistency, accountability and oversight across the project portfolio. Typically includes refinement of PMO processes, enhancement of governance and reporting practices, implementation of monitoring activities, and increased utilisation of existing PMO systems and tools to support more consistent project delivery outcomes.
Long-term	12-24+ months	Improvements aimed at progressing PMO maturity beyond established practices through enhanced assurance, trend analysis, continuous improvement and system enablement. Typically includes portfolio-level performance monitoring, data-driven decision-making, governance assurance activities, system enhancements and greater integration of project management processes, reporting and controls across the project lifecycle.

Appendix 5 - Documents Accessed and Stakeholders Consulted

Due to the volume of project documentation reviewed, the list below represents an extract of the documents assessed during the review.

Where available, all requested documentation for the selected project samples listed below was provided by Council and reviewed as part of the assessment:

- Shared Use Path Improvements (Z3791) – New & Upgrade
- Integrated Climate Strategy – City Public Realm Greening Program (Z0523) – New & Upgrade
- LED Renewal Program (Z8127) – Renewal
- Heavy Patching Program (Z8265) – Renewal
- ICT Renewals – Telecommunications (Z0683) – Renewal88 O'Connell Street Redevelopment (4403) – Strategic

Documents Accessed (extract):

- Z1111 CLC Air Handling Unit Project.mpp
- Asset Renewal Governance Minutes 2026-04-22
- Asset Renewal Governance Minutes 2026-05-06
- Change Triage Group Minutes 2026-03-25
- Program Control Group Minutes 2026-03-27
- PMO Governance TOR Review
- Attachment A - PM041 PM Practice Guide Operations Governance Framework
- Attachment B - PM041 PM Practice Guide Operations Governance Framework (PCG Review)
- Detailed Capital Project List 2024-25
- Detailed Capital Project List 2025-26
- ICT Projects 2025-26
- Strategic Projects 2025-26 Listing
- Information Sheet - How to Run a Work Breakdown Structure
- Information Sheet - Milestones and Schedule Guidelines
- Information Sheet - Schedule Baseline Management Guidelines
- PM158 Project Asset Register - Cost Breakdown Structure
- Practice Guide - Project Contingency
- Practice Guide - Schedule Management
- Project Management Office - Capital Project Status Reporting Tool
- Project Management Office - Strategic Project Status Reporting Tool
- Q2 Status Report 2025-26
- 2a. Updated 2025-26 - EOM March 2026 Finance Procurement and PMO
- 5. Exec 2025-26 - EOM April 2026
- IPW Report Apr25 - Council Report
- IPW Report Apr25
- IPW Report Mar25 - Council Report
- IPW Report Mar25
- CR Details CR5053 - Melbourne Street Wombat Crossings
- CR Details CR5100 - Public Art - Park 14 - Rymill Park - The Bridgland Fountain
- CR Details CR5116 - Barnard Street Streetscape Improvements (Wellington Square to Hill Street) (R2R)
- Information Sheet - When is a Change Request Required
- Practice Guide - Project Change Management
- Project Management Office - Capital Change Request Log
- Project Management Office - Strategic Change Request Log
- Practice Guide - Processing Retention Invoices
- Practice Guide - Project Asset Register - Handover Workflow
- Lessons Learnt Survey
- PM070 PM Practice Guide LL & PIR v2.0
- Practice Guide - Close Phase
- 4014110586 Practice Guide - CITB Levy
- Project Management Office - Project Request System
- Project Record Keeping Requirements

Stakeholders Consulted:

- Coordinator, Project Management Office
- Acting Manager PMO and PMO Analyst (dual role)
- Risk and Audit Advisor