
Appendix 2 – Checklist Responses

Appendix 2 contains the checklists as submitted by the following organisations:

TII – Transport Infrastructure Ireland

NTA – The National Transport Authority

IE – Irish Rail

RSA – Road Safety Authority

MBRS – Medical Bureau of Road Safety

Sport Ireland

Fáilte

Tourism Ireland Limited

The checklists that are required to be completed are:

Checklist 2: Capital Expenditure Being Considered - 2015

Checklist 3: Current Expenditure Being Considered - 2015

Checklist 4: Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - 2015

Checklist 5: Current Expenditure Being Incurred - 2015

Checklist 6: Capital Expenditure Completed - 2015

Checklist 7: Current Expenditure Completed - 2015

Not all checklists are applicable for all organisations for expenditure in 2015.

There is a section at the top of each checklist which states the organisations to whom the checklist does not apply.

The **self-assessment rating** by each organisation is based on an appropriate sample of projects/programmes and schemes. Therefore, especially in the case of larger organisations, the responses are based on a representative sample as required by the Public Spending Code which is generally 5-10% of projects/programmes/schemes for the year in question.

The ratings are as follows:

1 – Scope for Significant Improvements

2 - Compliant but with Some Improvement Necessary

3 - Broadly Compliant

Checklist 2 - Capital Expenditure Being Considered

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

The following agencies did not have any expenditure that falls under the heading "Current - Being Considered"

Fáilte and Tourism Ireland Limited.

TII

Capital Expenditure Being Considered - Appraisal and Approval	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a Preliminary Appraisal undertaken for all projects > €5m	3	A project appraisal report has been prepared, or is being prepared, depending on the stage of the scheme and value, for all schemes.
Was an appropriate appraisal method used in respect of each capital project or capital programme/grant scheme?	3	In the case of schemes that went through earlier stage appraisal in earlier years, the appraisal method used was the one applicable at the time. Current appraisal in line with Project Appraisal Guidelines.
Was a CBA/CEA completed for all projects exceeding €20m?	3	CBA is completed in line with the Project Appraisal Guidelines for all schemes.
Was the appraisal process commenced at an early stage to facilitate decision making? (i.e. prior to the decision)	2	Appraisal was carried out in accordance with the methodology applicable at the time. Appraisal Guidelines are currently being updated to reflect changed requirements.
Was an Approval in Principle granted by the Sanctioning Authority for all projects before they entered the Planning and Design Phase (e.g. procurement)?	3	
If a CBA/CEA was required was it submitted to DPER (CEEU) for their views?	N/A	One was submitted in 2015. A further 2 will be submitted in 2016.

Were the NDFA Consulted for projects costing more than €20m?	3	Regular review with DTTAS & DPER of potential PPP possibilities; NDFA part of consultation.
Were all projects that went forward for tender in line with the Approval in Principle and if not was the detailed appraisal revisited and a fresh Approval in Principle granted?	3	
Was approval granted to proceed to tender?	3	
Were Procurement Rules complied with?	3	
Were State Aid rules checked for all supports?	3	
Were the tenders received in line with the Approval in Principle in terms of cost and what is expected to be delivered?	3	
Were Performance Indicators specified for each project/programme which will allow for the evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness?	3	Performance indicators are being used in relation to PPP schemes.
Have steps been put in place to gather Performance Indicator data?	3	

NTA		
Capital Expenditure Being Considered - Appraisal and Approval	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a Preliminary Appraisal undertaken for all projects > €5m	3	Yes
Was an appropriate appraisal method used in respect of each capital project or capital programme/grant scheme?	3	Yes
Was a CBA/CEA completed for all projects exceeding €20m?	3	Yes
Was the appraisal process commenced at an early stage to facilitate decision making? (i.e. prior to the decision)	3	Yes
Was an Approval in Principle granted by the Sanctioning Authority for all projects before they entered the Planning and Design Phase (e.g. procurement)?	3	Yes
If a CBA/CEA was required was it submitted to DPER (CEEU) for their views?	3	Yes
Were the NDFA Consulted for projects costing more than €20m?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Were all projects that went forward for tender in line with the Approval in Principle and if not was the detailed appraisal revisited and a fresh Approval in Principle granted?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Was approval granted to proceed to tender?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage

Were Procurement Rules complied with?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Were State Aid rules checked for all supports?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Were the tenders received in line with the Approval in Principle in terms of cost and what is expected to be delivered?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Were Performance Indicators specified for each project/programme which will allow for the evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Have steps been put in place to gather Performance Indicator data?	N/A	Projects have not progressed as far as tender stage
Irish Rail		
Capital Expenditure Being Considered - Appraisal and Approval	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a Preliminary Appraisal undertaken for all projects > €5m	3	All projects are subject to internal guidelines. IÉ adheres to the Public Spending Code in management of projects & programmes
Was an appropriate appraisal method used in respect of each capital project or capital programme/grant scheme?	3	See above
Was a CBA/CEA completed for all projects exceeding €20m?	3	See above

Was the appraisal process commenced at an early stage to facilitate decision making? (i.e. prior to the decision)	3	See above
Was an Approval in Principle granted by the Sanctioning Authority for all projects before they entered the Planning and Design Phase (e.g. procurement)?	3	The NTA have accepted project execution plans.
If a CBA/CEA was required was it submitted to DPER (CEEU) for their views?	N/A	This is a duty of the Sanctioning Body.
Were the NDFA Consulted for projects costing more than €20m?	3	The NDFA were consulted on the DART Underground only. Private financing was not considered appropriate for other projects. This was agreed with the Sanctioning Authority
Were all projects that went forward for tender in line with the Approval in Principle and if not was the detailed appraisal revisited and a fresh Approval in Principle granted?	3	
Was approval granted to proceed to tender?	3	For NTA funded projects with a Project Execution Plan.
Were Procurement Rules complied with?	3	
Were State Aid rules checked for all supports?	3	
Were the tenders received in line with the Approval in Principle in terms of cost and what is expected to be delivered?	3	

Were Performance Indicators specified for each project/programme which will allow for the evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness?	3	Under the Infrastructure Manager Multi-Annual Contract (IMMAC), performance Indicators were not specified on a project basis. Global performance indicators have been applied to the monitoring of the contract. These include delay minutes, service cancellations by route category and temporary speed restrictions. In addition, infrastructure failures that contribute in excess of 200 delay minutes are also highlighted
Have steps been put in place to gather Performance Indicator data?	3	Yes. There is an established process between the Infrastructure Manager and the RU to attribute delay minutes and service cancellations by cause. In addition the Chief engineers monitor the frequency, cause, delay and cancellation impacts of all significant infrastructure failures. These systems are regularly updated as considered appropriate.
RSA		
Capital Expenditure Being Considered - Appraisal and Approval	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a Preliminary Appraisal undertaken for all projects > €5m	3	Yes, All Capital Programmes that incur a gross expenditure greater than € 5M is outlined in the Authority's CMOD Return each year.
Was an appropriate appraisal method used in respect of each capital project or capital programme/grant scheme?	3	Yes, All Capital Programmes are assessed in respect of affordability, value for money and with other alternatives.
Was a CBA/CEA completed for all projects exceeding €20m?	N/A	N/A
Was the appraisal process commenced at an early stage to facilitate decision making? (i.e. prior to the decision)	N/A	N/A
Was an Approval in Principle granted by the Sanctioning Authority for all projects before they entered the Planning and Design Phase (e.g. procurement)?	3	Yes, The Department of Finance and the Department of Transport Tourism and Sport are made aware of all Capital Programmes and sanction is sought for all programmes.

If a CBA/CEA was required was it submitted to DPER (CEEU) for their views?	N/A	N/A
Were the NDFA Consulted for projects costing more than €20m?	N/A	N/A
Were all projects that went forward for tender in line with the Approval in Principle and if not was the detailed appraisal revisited and a fresh Approval in Principle granted?	N/A	N/A
Was approval granted to proceed to tender?	3	Yes
Were Procurement Rules complied with?	3	All Procurement law, and rules are complied with.
Were State Aid rules checked for all supports?	N/A	N/A
Were the tenders received in line with the Approval in Principle in terms of cost and what is expected to be delivered?	3	Yes, many programmes total contract cost came in under budget.
Were Performance Indicators specified for each project/programme which will allow for the evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness?	3	KPIs outlined for each programme
Have steps been put in place to gather Performance Indicator data?	3	Part of the Contract Management piece

Sport Ireland		
	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a Preliminary Appraisal undertaken for all projects > €5m	3	Feasibility study undertaken for National Velodrome & Badminton Centre project - CBA yet to be completed. NIA Phase 2 forms part of wider Campus Master Plan for which complete Development Control Plan and Master Plan were undertaken- CBA since undertaken in 2016.
Was an appropriate appraisal method used in respect of each capital project or capital programme/grant scheme?	2	CBA for Velodrome yet to be completed
Was a CBA/CEA completed for all projects exceeding €20m?	3	CBA for NIA Phase 2 completed in 2016
Was the appraisal process commenced at an early stage to facilitate decision making? (i.e. prior to the decision)	3	All appraisals and feasibility studies are undertaken before Board approval sought and submission made to Minister/Department for sanction.
Was an Approval in Principle granted by the Sanctioning Authority for all projects before they entered the Planning and Design Phase (e.g. procurement)?	3	Ministerial or Departmental sanction is sought before each stage of a capital projects.
If a CBA/CEA was required was it submitted to DPER (CEEU) for their views?	N/A	N/A in 2015
Were the NDFA Consulted for projects costing more than €20m?	N/A	N/A in 2015
Were all projects that went forward for tender in line with the Approval in Principle and if not was the detailed appraisal revisited and a fresh Approval in Principle granted?	3	NIA Phase 2 included in 2014 tender for entire NIA project (which provided for phasing). 2 Stage procurement of Velodrome commenced - to be completed upon receipt of sanction. Tender price for new Office accommodation project exceeded initial estimate and has been re-submitted for approval.

Was approval granted to proceed to tender?	3	Yes. Departmental/Ministerial sanction sought in advance of each project stage.
Were Procurement Rules complied with?	3	Yes
Were State Aid rules checked for all supports?	N/A	N/A
Were the tenders received in line with the Approval in Principle in terms of cost and what is expected to be delivered?	3	NIA tender in line with pre-tender estimates. Velodrome procurement not yet completed. NGB Office accommodation project no yet sanctioned.
Were Performance Indicators specified for each project/programme which will allow for the evaluation of its efficiency and effectiveness?	3	Performance outcome specs for sports facilities form part of procurement documentation
Have steps been put in place to gather Performance Indicator data?	N/A	N/A

Checklist 3 - Current Expenditure Being Considered

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

The following agencies did not have any expenditure that falls under the heading "Current - Being Considered"

TII, NTA, Irish Rail (Outside the GDA), MBRS, RSA Sport Ireland, Fáilte, Tourism Ireland Limited.

Checklist 4 - Capital Expenditure Being Incurred

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

The following agencies did not have any expenditure that falls under the heading "Capital - Being Incurred"

MBRS, Tourism Ireland Limited

TII

Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	Regular steering meeting held on all projects over 20M
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	N/A	No programme for which co-ordination required
Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	2	Project Management understaffed.
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	
Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	2	A number of projects were late completing.

Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	
Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	N/A	
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	N/A	
If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	3	
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?	N/A	No projects terminated
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	3	In the case of TII, the reports go to the Board rather than the Minister. Project-specific reports to the Minister would be by exception, only if a project were in difficulty.

NTA		
Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	Yes
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	Yes
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	3	This depends on scale of project, smaller projects have same person competing same role
Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	3	Yes
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	Done on all large projects
Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	3	Yes
Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	All adjustments were authorised
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	Yes

Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	3	No circumstances have warranted this to-date
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	3	No circumstances have warranted this to-date
If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	3	Yes
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?	3	No projects terminated
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	3	Yes
Irish Rail		
Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	Contracts under NTA funded projects are made by way of Letter of Offer.
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	3	Program Managers were appointed

Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	3	
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	<p>Under the Infrastructure Manager Multi-Annual Contract (IMMAC), monitoring reports are submitted to the Regulator on a 4 week period basis. These report progress (plan against budget) across the major asset categories. In addition the Regulator samples the implementation of a number of individual projects each period.</p> <p>Project specific monthly reports for the following projects were submitted to the National Transport Authority (NTA); City Centre Resignalling Project (CCRP), Development of Kent Station, & The National Train Control Centre (NTCC). These reports are reviewed at monthly steering meetings or at alternate arrangements as required by the NTA.</p> <p>In addition to the detailed progress reports issued to the NTA, the project produces Period Reports to the Iarnród Éireann board via the IM reporting process. These reports cover progress, financial status and risk items.</p>
Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	3	
Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	
Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	N/A	N/A
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	N/A	N/A

If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	3	There were budget (cash flow) adjustments agreed with the sanctioning authority
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?	3	
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	3	Submitted to Advisory Group, IE Board and Sanctioning Authority
Road Safety Authority		
Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	Yes, all capital expenditure is underpinned with signed contracts in place.
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	Yes, on all major capital programmes
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	3	Project Management in place on all material projects
Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	3	Yes
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	Yes, using Prince 2 project management reporting tool

Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	3	Yes, tight management and reporting on project spend
Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	Yes, sometimes to take account of project changes in scope
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	Yes, through management team meetings
Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	No	
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	N/A	
If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	N/A	All capital projects in Authority funded from own resources
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?	No	
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	N/A	

Sport Ireland

Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	Yes
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	Progress reported to all Board meetings. NIA steering group met as required
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	3	All Campus projects are directed by Development Manager
Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	3	Development Manager has overall responsibility for delivering projects. Project managers and multi-disciplinary Technical Advisers are appointed to oversee all capital projects.
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	Technical advisers are required to prepare regular reports and briefings throughout the project duration and all progress is reported to each Board meeting. A special steering group was established to oversee the NIA project
Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	2	Scheduled completion dates were exceeded in 2 completed projects
Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	Minor adjustments made during construction but savings through value engineering also secured.
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	All changes are made in such a timeframe as to not delay project.

Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	N/A	No
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	N/A	N/A
If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	N/A	N/A
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?		No
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	3	Regular reports are provided to the Department on progress with all Campus projects.
Fáilte		
Capital Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Was a contract signed and was it in line with the approval in principle?	3	
Did management boards/steering committees meet regularly as agreed?	3	
Were Programme Co-ordinators appointed to co-ordinate implementation?	3	

Were Project Managers, responsible for delivery, appointed and were the Project Managers at a suitable senior level for the scale of the project?	3	
Were monitoring reports prepared regularly, showing implementation against plan, budget, timescales and quality?	3	Grantees are required to submit a monthly progress report to Fáilte. As a part of the Grant payment process, costs and the project are reviewed to ensure it's delivered in line with our Letter of Offer criteria.
Did the project keep within its financial budget and its time schedule?	3	All projects grant have an upper limit so budget exposure is capped. Projects can go beyond the timeframe envisaged. These delays are usually due to planning and legal issues.
Did budgets have to be adjusted?	3	
Were decisions on changes to budgets / time schedules made promptly?	3	
Did circumstances ever warrant questioning the viability of the project and the business case incl. CBA/CEA? (exceeding budget, lack of progress, changes in the environment, new evidence)	3	Projects that haven't commenced in the timeline expected are reviewed. On occasion the timeline is extended and on occasion the grant is decommitted depending on the individual project and the reasons for the delay.
If circumstances did warrant questioning the viability of a project was the project subjected to adequate examination?	3	
If costs increased was approval received from the Sanctioning Authority?	3	
Were any projects terminated because of deviations from the plan, the budget or because circumstances in the environment changed the need for the investment?	3	
For significant projects were quarterly reports on progress submitted to the MAC and to the Minister?	N/A	Not Applicable

Checklist 5 - Current Expenditure Being Incurred

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

All agencies had expenditure under the heading "Current- Being Incurred"

TII

Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Are outputs well defined?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Are outcomes well defined?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure

Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
How many formal Value for Money or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	2	The score for directly managed maintenance expenditure would be close to 3, but less so for LA managed expenditure
NTA		
Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	Yes
Are outputs well defined?	3	Yes

Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	Yes
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Yes
Are outcomes well defined?	3	Yes
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	Yes
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	3	Yes
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	Yes
Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	3	Done on all large projects
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	3	Done on all large projects
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	3	Done on all large projects

Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	3	Yes
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	3	Yes
Irish Rail		
Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	Objectives are set out in the PSO and MAC
Are outputs well defined?	3	Yes. Schedule of services defined for PSO and schedule of works defined for MAC
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	Yes. Quarterly reporting to NTA on PSO and 4 weekly reporting to the DTTaS on MAC
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Yes. KPI's in place for PSO and MAC

Are outcomes well defined?	3	Yes. Clear KPI definitions in place
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	Yes. Quarterly for PSO and 4 weekly for MAC
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	3	Yes, service and infrastructure cost comparison.
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	Yes. Performance and reliability targets in place
Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	3	The business case and objectives are reviewed prior to the commencement of each project phase. The objectives and business case are presented to the Board in a Board Paper
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	None	
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	N/A	None scheduled to be published
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	3	Such matters are identified in Board papers and actioned accordingly
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	N/A	

Road Safety Authority

Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	Yes, In accordance with RSA Strategy and Business Plan
Are outputs well defined?	3	Yes, through annual business planning process
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	Measured monthly through suite of KPIs
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Yes, all services are measurable with set of KPIs
Are outcomes well defined?	3	Yes
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	Monthly
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	Yes	
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	Financial and non-Financial Measurements

Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	No	
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	Yes	There is a VFM policy review started in 2015 in our Driver Testing service
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	Yes	
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	Yes	The Authority will follow any recommendations of a VFM review
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	Yes	The Authority is currently conducting an internal human resource allocation review.
Medical Bureau Road Safety		
Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	
Are outputs well defined?	3	
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	

Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Yes all programmes are assessed in respect of affordability, VFM and with other alternatives
Are outcomes well defined?	3	
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	3	
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	
Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	3	Yes in line with the Annual Budget and Business Plan
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	3	
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	N/A	
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	3	
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	3	

Sport Ireland		
Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	There are objectives set out in our strategy and business plans for each programme.
Are outputs well defined?	3	The outputs are set out in our strategy and business plans
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	Progress is monitored against the strategy and the Board is updated
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Directors and Managers responsible for the programmes have to give an update to the CEO on an on-going basis, timeline are specified in the business plans
Are outcomes well defined?	3	Outcomes are specified in the business plans
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	Reviews and research is carried out on a regular basis to ensure that the programmes are delivering the required outcomes
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	N/A	Not relevant
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	Speak reports are used to monitor the progress of Local Sports Partnerships. Midyear reviews and annual meetings are held with National Governing Bodies. Athletes progress is monitored. Research is used to monitor progress.

Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	3	Speak reports are used to monitor the progress of Local Sports Partnerships. Midyear reviews and annual meetings are held with National Governing Bodies. Athletes progress is monitored. Research is used to monitor progress.
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	N/A	Not relevant
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	N/A	Not relevant
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	N/A	Not relevant
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	N/A	Not relevant
Fáilte		
Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	Fáilte Ireland operates a project management (PM) framework for all areas of significant expenditure. Within this framework objectives and targets are set annually.
Are outputs well defined?	3	Outputs are defined with the PM framework
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	

Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	Within the PM framework resources are defined, outputs and targets are measured which enables efficiency to be monitored. Also the Project management office and Finance work together across the organisation to ensure learning from completed projects are used to inform planning for subsequent projects which builds in efficiency.
Are outcomes well defined?	3	Outcomes are defined within the PM framework.
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	N/A	not applicable
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	The PM framework includes status reporting on plans on a quarterly basis.
Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?	3	
How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?	3	An internal review process through the Project Management office is in place and is reviewed at least quarterly
Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?	N/A	not applicable
Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?	3	This has been incorporated into the PM framework. It is also used in multi annual grant funding for such areas as festivals and events.
How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?	3	Particularly in Festivals and Events, results of research have been used to inform the level of funding in subsequent years.

Tourism Ireland

Current Expenditure Being Incurred - Implementation/roll out phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
Are there clear objectives for all areas of current expenditure?	3	
Are outputs well defined?	3	
Are outputs quantified on a regular basis?	3	
Is there a method for monitoring efficiency on an on-going basis?	3	
Are outcomes well defined?	3	
Are outcomes quantified on a regular basis?	3	
Are unit costings compiled for performance monitoring?	3	
Is there a method for monitoring effectiveness on an on-going basis?	3	

<p>Is there an annual process in place to plan for new VFMs, FPAs and evaluations?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>TI's expenditure is all on marketing projects and the effectiveness etc. of this marketing is assessed via market research and related studies. Accordingly, the expenditure does not fall into a category for which questions 9 through 13 are especially relevant or applicable.</p>
<p>How many formal VFMs/FPAs or other evaluations been completed in the year under review?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Have all VFMs/FPAs been published in a timely manner?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Is there a process to follow up on the recommendations of previous VFMs/FPAs and other evaluations?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>How have the recommendations of VFMs, FPAs and other evaluations informed resource allocation decisions?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Checklist 6 - Capital Expenditure Recently Ended

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

The following agencies did not have any expenditure that falls under the heading "Capital - Recently Ended"

RSA, MBRS, Fáilte and Tourism Ireland Limited

TII

Capital Expenditure Recently Ended - Post Project Review/Evaluation Phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
How many post project reviews were completed in the year under review?	3	Reviews are normally not carried out in year of completion - they are carried out once traffic patterns settle a few years post-construction. Post-project reviews are carried out on all schemes, as required.
Was a post project review completed for all projects/programmes exceeding €20m?	3	Reviews are normally not carried out in year of completion - they are carried out once traffic patterns settle a few years post-construction. Post-project reviews are carried out on all schemes, as required.
If sufficient time has not elapsed to allow a proper assessment of benefits, has a post project review been scheduled for a future date?	3	
Were lessons learned from post-project reviews disseminated within the Sponsoring Agency and to the Sanctioning Authority?	3	Lessons learned data base was compiled from complete PPR's and is used for new projects.

Were changes made to the Sponsoring Agencies practices in light of lessons learned from post-project reviews?	3	
Were project reviews carried out by staffing resources independent of project implementation?	3	
NTA		
Capital Expenditure Recently Ended - Post Project Review/Evaluation Phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
How many post project reviews were completed in the year under review?	3	Conducted for larger projects and appropriate sample sizes done for smaller projects, for 2015 projects, currently 5 Post Project Reviews are being completed for projects that ended in 2015
Was a post project review completed for all projects/programmes exceeding €20m?	3	Yes
If sufficient time has not elapsed to allow a proper assessment of benefits, has a post project review been scheduled for a future date?	3	Yes
Were lessons learned from post-project reviews disseminated within the Sponsoring Agency and to the Sanctioning Authority?	3	Yes

Were changes made to the Sponsoring Agencies practices in light of lessons learned from post-project reviews?	3	Yes
Were project reviews carried out by staffing resources independent of project implementation?	3	Yes
Irish Rail		
Capital Expenditure Recently Ended - Post Project Review/Evaluation Phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
How many post project reviews were completed in the year under review?	3	Economic evaluation/detailed post project reviews are carried out 3 to 5 years after project completion, where appropriate
Was a post project review completed for all projects/programmes exceeding €20m?	N/A	
If sufficient time has not elapsed to allow a proper assessment of benefits, has a post project review been scheduled for a future date?	3	Reviews are timed to allow for full project close out and a period of user adoption
Were lessons learned from post-project reviews disseminated within the Sponsoring Agency and to the Sanctioning Authority?	3	Post project reviews to be carried out prior to close out where appropriate. 1. Lessons learnt/exercises carried out. 2. Economic evaluation/detailed post project reviews are carried out 3 to 4 years after project completion, where appropriate

Were changes made to the Sponsoring Agencies practices in light of lessons learned from post-project reviews?	N/A	N/A.
Were project reviews carried out by staffing resources independent of project implementation?	3	The IMMAC review carried out independently from the implementation team
Sport Ireland		
Capital Expenditure Recently Ended - Post Project Review/Evaluation Phase	Self-Assessed Compliance Rating: 1 - 3	Comment/Action Required
How many post project reviews were completed in the year under review?	3	All facilities are reviewed post-construction (with end-users or operators and technical advisers) to ensure that construction brief has been met. End-users and operators are involved in monitoring during development stages also.
Was a post project review completed for all projects/programmes exceeding €20m?	N/A	N/A
If sufficient time has not elapsed to allow a proper assessment of benefits, has a post project review been scheduled for a future date?	N/A	N/A
Were lessons learned from post-project reviews disseminated within the Sponsoring Agency and to the Sanctioning Authority?	N/A	N/A

Were changes made to the Sponsoring Agencies practices in light of lessons learned from post-project reviews?	N/A	N/A
Were project reviews carried out by staffing resources independent of project implementation?	1	No. Construction sign-off carried out by Development Manager and appointed technical advisers (due to resourcing restraints). However, end-users or operators are also involved in reviewing outcomes

Checklist 7 - Current Expenditure Recently Ended

Scope for significant improvements = a score of 1, Compliant but with some improvement necessary = a score of 2, Broadly compliant = a score of 3.

The following agencies did not have any expenditure that falls under the heading "Current - Recently Ended"

TII, NTA, Irish Rail (Outside the GDA), RSA, MBRS, Sport Ireland, Fáilte, Tourism Ireland Limited.