



High Priority Organisms - Business Case & Project Management Plan

Author	Matthew Stone
Date	28 May 2008
Version	1.1
Status	FINAL
Permission	FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION (as required)

Executive Summary

The High Priority Organisms (HPO) project was first identified in 2003 and initiated in 2005, but was subsequently deferred until the completion of the Biosecurity Decisions Framework. In 2007 IDC was given lead accountability for the project, which is time-tabled in the MAFBNZ Strategic Plan for Q3&Q4 07/08 and Q1&Q2 08/09 i.e. calendar year 2008. This project plan revises that timetable, such that completion by December 2009 is now considered a realistic target, notwithstanding any further delays.

A draft Business Case and Project Management Plan (vers 0.3) was presented to MAFBNZ ELT in February 2008. ELT determined that further work on the problems to be addressed, the purpose, and the approach be undertaken. A series of three facilitated workshops were held in April, and this revised Business Case and Project Management Plan reflects that work.

The **problems** to be addressed by the HPO project are identified as:

1. Poor prioritisation of MAFBNZ effort in a number of areas leading to inefficiencies;
2. The probability that MAFBNZ is carrying out the wrong interventions leading to ineffectiveness;
3. The current set of overlapping lists of organisms have significant defects yet are used in part to inform and judge MAFBNZ performance
4. Stakeholders aren't clear about what MAFBNZ can and will do and have expectations that are not achievable; and
5. MAFBNZ is susceptible to lobbying for interventions against lower risk organisms by interest groups.

The **purpose** of the Organism Prioritisation Frameworks and associated lists to be created by the HPO project are identified as:

1. Assist in prioritising the allocation of resources across the biosecurity system;
2. Assist decision-making in reaction to new events or new information;

3. Improve interactions with stakeholders;
4. Inform the Unwanted Organisms register and Notifiable Organisms lists.

The **vision** for the Organism Prioritisation Framework to be created by the HPO project comprises the following components:

1. Organism Prioritisation Policy
 - Defines Categories of organisms
 - Identifies Criteria for categorisation
 - Defines biosecurity system performance expectations for organism categories
2. Dataset of standardised organism information
 - Relating to Categories and Criteria of Policy
 - Dataset organised as three tools
 - Impact Assessment Tool
 - Risk Assessment Tool
 - Intervention Prioritisation Tool
 - Supports a variety of “Lists”
3. Business system
 - System management responsibilities and processes
 - MAFBNZ business ownership of data variables
 - Expectations for how information is used by business

The **approach** to managing the work within the HPO project is summarized as (**N.B.** this is not a chronological sequence, as there are many interdependencies between activities associated with each heading):

1. Establish and communicate the vision for the organism prioritisation framework.
2. Develop the revised Organism Prioritisation Policy
3. Convert the policy criteria to a data standard and develop a prototype database in Microsoft Access.
4. Compile organism data against the criteria
5. Document the Business Systems for ongoing management, maintenance and utilisation of the Organism Prioritisation Framework and the associated lists.
6. Engage stakeholders through a stakeholder management plan.

Recommendations

I recommend the Project Sponsor and Business Owner:

1. **Note** the contents of this business case and project management plan.
2. **Accept** this combined business case and project management plan.
3. **Approve** the work required to deliver and close this project (as outlined in this combined business case and management plan), and the provision of resources estimated at 5000 hours of staff time and \$147,000 of direct costs to undertake this work

Table of Contents

Executive Summary1

Recommendations2

1 Document Purpose.....5

2 Context5

 2.1 Background & current situation.....5

 2.2 Project objective(s)7

3 Value7

 3.1 Business need and opportunity7

 3.2 Importance of project10

 3.2.1 Priority assessment..... 10

 3.2.2 Benefits Assessment 10

 3.2.3 Cost Assessment 11

 3.2.4 Investment Appraisal 11

 3.2.5 Funding 12

4 Scope12

 4.1 Included in scope12

 4.2 Excluded from scope14

 4.3 Scope management.....15

5 Deliverables.....15

 5.1 Deliverables15

 5.2 Acceptance process & responsibilities15

 5.3 Quality management.....16

6 Project Approach.....16

 6.1 Options and issues16

 6.2 Proposed approach.....16

 6.3 Performance measures19

 6.4 Project Integration Management.....19

 6.5 Project Procurement Management20

7 Costs.....20

 7.1 Costs20

 7.2 Project Cost Management21

8 Project Structure and Governance21

 8.1 Project structure, roles and authority21

 8.2 Staff Replacement22

 8.3 Project Human Resource Management22

 8.4 Governance Process23

9 Timetable23

 9.1 Timetable23

 9.2 Project Time Management.....25

10 Considerations.....25

10.1 Project Risks	25
10.1.1 Risks	25
10.1.2 Project Risk Management.....	27
10.2 Assumptions, dependencies, constraints & impacts	27
11 Communication.....	27
11.1 Communication	27
11.2 Project Communication Management.....	28
12 Project Profile	29
13 Authorisation	29
14 Document and project administration.....	31
Appendices	32
A-1: Deliverables	32
A-2: Gantt Chart outlining project plan	33

1 Document Purpose

This combined Business Case and Project Management Plan outlines the justification for undertaking this project, guides project delivery and provides the basis for project control.

The overarching purpose of the document is to ensure that the project is aligned for success, clearly defining the roles, responsibilities, processes, and activities which will result in the project producing the deliverables required, on-time, within budget, and to the agreed standard(s). It addresses the strategies, scope, roles, responsibilities, timetable, costs, and risks and issues appropriate to the project's management activities, and identifies the impact of the project on the business.

2 Context

2.1 Background & current situation

Existing organism-based frameworks for prioritisation

MAF Biosecurity New Zealand historically has had difficulty determining how much resource should be allocated to different activities across the biosecurity system. It is not clear which organisms pose the highest risks to New Zealand, and how to balance risks to different sectors and different values. We currently balance these implicitly anyway, so we need to be able to do this transparently and using a consistent decision-making process.

The Biosecurity Act and associated policies create the statutory organism categorisation framework of “unwanted organisms” and “notifiable organisms”. “Unwanted organism” means any organism that a chief technical officer believes is capable or potentially capable of causing unwanted harm to any natural and physical resources or human health (Biosecurity Act, 1993). The Biosecurity Act does not define the term notifiable organism however under section 45 of the Act the Governor-General may, by Order in Council, declare any organism to be a notifiable organism. MAFBNZ policy states that all notifiable organisms are unwanted organisms, and this category is limited to those organisms which cause serious harm to natural and physical resources or human health (Biosecurity Council - Policy Statement on Unwanted Organisms for the Purposes of the Biosecurity Act 1993, part 3.6). From this, it is clear that Notifiable Organisms is currently a subset of Unwanted Organisms, based on potential impact.

The Policy and Risk Directorate is currently the business owner of this system, a role that includes: developing policy for the business system; maintaining the unwanted organisms register; adding new organisms and removing organisms if necessary.

What is the problem with the current organism listing systems?

A survey of a sample of MAFBNZ Directors and Group Managers¹ identified the following issues associated with the categorisation framework and business system:

- Lists are incomplete and there is no obvious rationale for inclusion/exclusion.
- Environmental focus is lacking. The lists of pests of environmental concern inherited from the Department of Conservation reflect the post-border responsibilities of a pest management agency rather than a concerted cross-system focus on exotic pests that may cause harm to the environment.
- No useful biological, distribution or risk-based data associated with organisms. As a result, users of the register encounter searchability issues. (**N.B.** Other MAFBNZ databases such as BRAD do contain valuable biological, epidemiological, and commodity-risk related data but the Unwanted Organism Register is currently not integrated in any way with these other data sources.)
- The business system associated with the unwanted and notifiable lists is not working effectively or efficiently. The criteria are not well-defined, and so assessment of organisms for listing relies on technical input and (often inconsistent) judgement calls. The size of the unwanted organisms list means that maintaining or reviewing the list is a mammoth task, and is given low priority. Business as usual activities that capture information could be better used in listing processes.
- Proliferation of lists causes confusion, makes maintenance difficult, and potentially results in mis-alignment of information or contradictions. Two clear examples already exist: 1) Despite being a specific category of “Unwanted”, the “Notifiable Organisms” list is maintained separately to the Unwanted Organisms register. 2). The MAFBNZ website contains a "Pest and Disease Watchlist". This information is also completely separate to the Unwanted Organisms list. Once again, discrepancies are apparent and confusion results.

What are the problems that the HPO project needs to address?

During project initiation, a facilitator (John Hellstrom) worked with the Project Team under terms of reference that included achieving a clear articulation of problem, purpose and approach. Hellstrom's report² summarised the problem with existing systems as follows (in his report, each of these issues is expanded upon with a series of explanatory bullet points):

1. Poor prioritisation of MAFBNZ effort in a number of areas leading to inefficiencies;
2. The probability that MAFBNZ is carrying out the wrong interventions leading to ineffectiveness;

¹ High Priority Organisms: Project initiation interview with L4 Managers. HPO project initiation survey.xls <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/090101b3802aa00e>

FCS Folder Location: <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d890>

² Hellstrom_HPO Workshops Report_Final.doc

<http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/090101b38031d9d1>

FCS Folder Location: <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d88e>

3. The current set of overlapping lists of organisms have significant defects yet are used in part to inform and judge MAFBNZ performance
4. Stakeholders aren't clear about what MAFBNZ can and will do and have expectations that are not achievable; and
5. MAFBNZ is susceptible to lobbying for interventions against lower risk organisms by interest groups.

2.2 Project objective(s)

1. Develop a standardised framework for organism-specific biosecurity information

Goal 1. To provide effective leadership across the system

2. Support decisions on the appropriate allocation of biosecurity system resources

Goal 2. To make timely and informed decisions

3. Assist the communication of biosecurity risks and priorities to MAFBNZ and external audiences

Goal 5. To see that everyone takes responsibilities for biosecurity risks and interests

3 Value

3.1 Business need and opportunity

Hellstrom's report identified the business needs to be met by the HPO project as: To develop a transparent, easy to use, responsive set of tools (e.g. criteria, databases, business systems, etc) that are used consistently across MAFBNZ. This would:

1. Assist in prioritising the allocation of resources across the biosecurity system by;
 - Providing focus for annual work-planning and for adjusting biosecurity interventions;
 - Providing focus for external surveillance to assess changing likelihood;
 - Identifying areas of inadequate/excessive capacity and capability;
 - Providing a basis to measure system performance;
 - Enabling coordination of effort and interventions across directorates;
 - Enabling gaps to be identified and proactively addressed; and
 - Enabling MAFBNZ to balance values.

2. Assist decision-making in reaction to new events or new information by;
 - Providing focus for some interventions such as pathway targeting, surveillance and incursion response;
 - Providing a focus for evaluating other relevant data such as interception records, pest risk analyses;
 - Providing a tool that evaluates priority compared to other work, and whether to do more work or intervene;
 - Facilitating quicker decision-making; and
 - Enabling MAFBNZ to better identify gaps in information, to inform decisions about how much uncertainty to accept, whether to do more work, and in what areas.

3. Improve interactions with stakeholders by;
 - Working with them to develop the criteria and system for classifying organisms;
 - Making the outcome of applying this system and the implications of the outcome explicit and transparent;
 - Using these criteria in any consultations and in making decisions on new/emerging organisms;
 - Avoiding ad hoc decisions by the consistent use of criteria;
 - Making the application of criteria in making decisions fully transparent;
 - Recognising that the fact that hindsight trumps foresight needs to be managed as an issue affecting public perceptions;
 - Reducing unrealistic expectations of MAFBNZ interventions by publishing the set of organisms that are assessed as failing to achieve HRO status with reasons (criteria scores)*; and
 - Restraining lobbying by special interests groups for priority in biosecurity interventions by:
 - Making explicit those organisms that will and will not be targeted by MAFBNZ; and
 - Making explicit the criteria that will need to be addressed in any application for priority.

4. Inform the Unwanted Organisms register and Notifiable Organisms lists.

A survey of a sample of MAFBNZ Directors and Group Managers, discussions with project managers for intersecting cross-cutting projects³, and consideration of MAFBNZ's business as

³ Sarah Clinehens (Government Industry Agreements Project); Stephen Butcher (Border Systems Review Project); Richard Webster (Border Identification Review Project); Joan Breach (BRAD); Frank Ngan (MAFBNZ Information Management Plan).

usual has identified the following opportunities to apply a more structured and consistent consideration of factors that may contribute to priority when evaluating changes to Biosecurity interventions:

Pre-border interventions

1. Hazard identification during import risk analysis and import health standards setting.
2. Determining the level of analysis required when considering border system risks and setting border standards.
3. Defining the level of input into international standard-setting bodies' work programmes (e.g. OIE, IPPC).

Border interventions

4. Determining the degree of border clearance inspection for particular risk pathways.
5. Determining the level of identification required when suspect organisms are encountered during border clearance.
6. Determining the reactive level of additional risk management when suspect organisms are encountered during border clearance.
7. Defining diagnostic capability and capacity requirements for managing imports.

Post-border interventions

8. Defining incursion investigation priorities.
9. Defining response preparedness capability and capacity.
10. Defining surveillance system early detection priorities.
11. Deciding response objectives when organisms are detected.
12. Identifying candidate organisms for Government and Industry biosecurity surveillance and response cost-sharing agreements.
13. Defining diagnostic capability and capacity requirements for surveillance, investigation and response.

Whole of system

14. Data standardisation prior to the Organism Master Data project identified in the Information Management plan.
15. Performance measurement and evaluation of the biosecurity system.
16. Prioritisation of compliance and enforcement activities.
17. Prioritisation of science and research activities.
18. Targeting communications messages.

3.2 Importance of project

3.2.1 Priority assessment

The project was first identified in 2003 and initiated in 2005, but was subsequently deferred until the completion of the Biosecurity Decisions Framework. In 2007 IDC was given lead accountability for the project, which is time-tabled in the MAFBNZ Strategic Plan for Q3&Q4 07/08 and Q1&Q2 08/09 i.e. calendar year 2008. All Directors and Managers interviewed during the initiation survey considered this project to be of high priority and strategic importance.

3.2.2 Benefits Assessment

Shared understanding of priorities internal to MAFBNZ

The existence of criteria to prioritise organisms, and defined lists of priority organisms, will allow MAFBNZ to identify where to target resources to best manage risk. The criteria will provide a transparent, consistent and sustainable process for assessing an organism. The criteria will guide what information we 'need to know' to determine the priority of an organism, particularly where an organism is found and is 'unknown'. The list will also act as a key enabling tool for the wide-ranging system needs identified at 3.1 above.

Improved communication of priorities to external stakeholders

The project will provide a mechanism for MAFBNZ to clearly demonstrate leadership of the New Zealand biosecurity system. There is expected to be wide stakeholder interest and it will be critical to manage expectations and be clear about our priorities and limitations. The criteria and resulting High Priority Organism list will better inform stakeholders of MAFBNZ's priorities, enabling them to make better informed decisions and to manage their own biosecurity risks.

3.2.3 Cost Assessment

The largest project resource requirement will be MAFBNZ staff time. Direct external costs are confined to expert peer review and stakeholder management and consultation. For a project manager devoting 30% of time and a 12 person project team devoting, on average, 20% of their time for the 2008/09 financial year, the estimated resource requirement is 2.7 FTE. This excludes non-project team staff participating in internal focus groups.

Direct costs that may be incurred are estimated as \$147,000, as follows:

- Stakeholder engagement and consultation processes (\$37,000), comprising
 - Seminars to “Share the vision” with internal MAFBNZ staff (\$3,000)
 - Attendance at existing stakeholder fora, conferences or summits (NZ Biosecurity Institute, NETS, BMAC, CE Forum, BCG, sector consultation committees) to “Share the vision” (\$3,000)
 - Wide stakeholder consultation during candidate organism identification (\$5,000)
 - Facilitated internal focus groups during development of policy, categories and criteria for the unwanted organism policy (3 @ \$2k = \$6,000)
 - Facilitated external focus groups during development of policy, categories and criteria for the unwanted organism policy (3 @ \$5k = \$15,000)
 - Wide stakeholder consultation on the revised unwanted organism policy (\$5,000)
- Expert consultants assistance during design of data repository (\$10,000)
- Expert consultants for review of impact assessment tool (2 @ \$10k = \$20,000)
- Expert consultants for review of animal, plant, marine and environment sector organism data (8 @ \$10k = \$80,000)

3.2.4 Investment Appraisal

No investment appraisal has been undertaken. As noted above, the benefits associated with the project are system enabling, rather than directly measurable.

3.2.5 Funding

As a strategic cross-cutting project with system-wide interest and relevance, it is expected that the \$147,000 of direct costs will be funded from the DDG's strategic fund in 2008-2009.

4 Scope

4.1 Included in scope

1. Establishment and promotion of a vision for the outcomes of this project, to both internal and external stakeholders.
2. A new Organism Prioritisation Policy, replacing the current Unwanted Organism Policy, subjected to stakeholder consultation, comprising:
 - a. A revised categorisation framework for Unwanted Organisms;
 - b. Criteria used for designation of:
 - i. Unwanted Organisms, on the basis of impact. This should clearly state the most important criteria for designation of High Impact Organisms (on the basis of impact to Biosecurity values);
 - ii. Likelihood of encountering organisms at the border and post-border. This should clearly state the most important criteria for designation of High Risk Organisms (on the basis of impact and likelihood of encounter); and
 - iii. Priority for re-assessment of intervention strategies, at each point of intervention in the Biosecurity system (and for cross-system functions).
 - c. Statutory implications associated with designation of any status.
 - d. Business implications associated with designation of any status, in accordance with the following principles:
 - i. High Impact Organisms: generic capability maintained to intervene.
 - ii. High Risk Organisms: defined levels of specific capability and capacity maintained to intervene.
 - iii. Intervention Re-assessment Organisms: Timeframes for re-assessment.

- e. MAFBNZ roleholders who act as the business owners for particular criteria and categorisation variables.
3. A data standard and prototype database in Microsoft Access reflecting the information management needs associated with the Organism Prioritisation Policy, including:
 - a. impact, risk and priority criteria and categories;
 - b. business ownership;
 - c. mechanisms to capture history and track changes.
 4. Sector-based lists of candidate organisms as an outcome of a stakeholder consultation process (i.e. a “long-list” of anticipated 250-500 organisms).
 5. Population of data associated with the impact, risk and priority criteria for long-listed organisms, subjected to external expert peer review.
 6. The creation of the following lists:
 - High Impact Organisms
 - A National List, anticipated to be in the order of 100 organisms
 - Sector-based lists (e.g. Dairy Industry; Cut Flower Industry; Environment)⁴ anticipated to be in the order of 10 organisms
 - High Risk Organisms
 - At the Border
 - At Post-Border
 - Intervention Re-assessment Priorities, as updatable annual plans relating to points of intervention and cross-system Biosecurity functions.

⁴ A standardised framework for “sectors” will be developed as part of the data standard. In order to access external information sources, in particular the data available from Statistics NZ, sector classification schemes for statistical data collection that are in common usage should be adopted wherever possible.

7. A report outlining the recommended business process and role-holders to efficiently and effectively manage, maintain and utilise the information in Organism Prioritisation Framework, and the associated lists.

4.2 Excluded from scope

1. Compilation of a reference data-set of information relating to taxonomy, biology, ecology or epidemiology of organisms, except to the extent required by the policy criteria.
2. Revision of data contained in the Unwanted Organism Register associated with organisms which are not identified as “long-list” candidates.
3. Data collection for organisms already present in New Zealand.⁵
4. Detailed organism specific impact assessments or risk analyses.⁶
5. Stakeholder consultation on the final Notifiable and High Priority lists and sector weighting mechanism.
6. Definition of the capability/capacity standards for High Risk Organisms at points of intervention. A high level statement of expectations will form part of the policy. Detailed definition of standards and the processes in each area is more logically managed by the responsible business units themselves, who will have superior knowledge of relevant systems and supply, demand and cost issues.
7. Categorisation of the organisms list with respect to cost shares within any Government Industry Cost-Sharing Agreement. This is left to the specific project dealing with these matters.
8. Implementation of the recommended business process for ongoing management of the Unwanted Organism Register and Organism Prioritisation Framework.
9. Creation of the Organism Master Data solution, as anticipated by the MAFBNZ Information Management Plan. As the business case for the IM Plan notes, this will require integration of a number of currently disparate data sources, and retirement of others. While the

⁵ Organisms already present in New Zealand have previously been subjected to a prioritisation process within the Priority Pests for National Management project.

⁶ The project will rely upon existing data and reports available on industry value and organism impacts, transforming these to summary-level measures. Where necessary, summary-level sector-based impact measures will be estimated using expert opinion.

deliverables of this project will presumably contribute to the Organism Master Data solution, any integration is outside the scope of this project.

4.3 Scope management

The scope inclusions and exclusions described in the final project management plan signed off by the Project Sponsor will become the final project scope. This scope will be tightly managed by the MAF BNZ Project Manager.

Weekly meetings will be held with the project team where the detailed work plan is discussed, and modified if necessary.

Any changes to scope, budget or milestones will be referred to the sponsor prior to commitment.

5 Deliverables

5.1 Deliverables

A summary of the project's deliverables is provided in section 4.1 ('Included in scope') above. A detailed list of project's deliverables and their acceptance criteria is provided in the Appendices.

5.2 Acceptance process & responsibilities

The Project Sponsor is ultimately responsible for acceptance of all deliverables.

A Project Steering Committee with representatives from MAFBNZ Executive Leadership Team is expected to provide project governance support, thereby reflecting the cross-cutting strategic importance of the project.

The Sponsor is expected to consult the Project Steering Committee at the following milestone events:

- Acceptance of the Business Case and Project Management Plan.
- Acceptance of the categorisation framework and associated criteria of the Organism Prioritisation Policy and Organism Prioritisation Framework, following internal and external focus group review.
- Acceptance of the DRAFT Organism Prioritisation Policy, prior to stakeholder consultation, and the FINAL policy, following consultation.
- Acceptance of the stakeholder consultation plan on candidate organisms for the "long-list".
- Selection of the external experts for peer review of
 - Criteria and categories
 - Organism data
- Acceptance of the final lists (High Impact Organisms; High Risk Organisms; Intervention Re-assessment Organisms)

- Acceptance of the report outlining the recommended business process and role-holders for ongoing management.
- Acceptance of the Project Close-Out Report.

In addition to the above, the Project Sponsor will share any and all reports requested by the Steering Committee of relevance to the project, and appropriately consider all reasonable suggestions associated with project methods and deliverables.

5.3 Quality management

Quality Management within the project will be through the described Project Management and Project Governance mechanisms. No additional Quality Management processes are anticipated, aside from internal focus groups and external expert peer reviews as indicated.

6 Project Approach

6.1 Options and issues

An issues and options paper⁷ was presented to the Project Steering Committee outlining options associated with five important scope considerations, outlined below:

- Overall scope of the toolkit to be developed: Impact, Risk or Priority
- Objectivity vs Subjectivity: strategic positioning of the toolkit on this continuum
- Managing project organism data
- Stakeholder management
- Organism Scoping: Established organisms

6.2 Proposed approach

- A. Establish and communicate the vision for the organism prioritisation framework.

Activities would comprise:

- a. Steering Committee and ELT sign-off project vision
- b. Article for Biosecurity magazine
- c. Morning/afternoon-tea presentations for MAFBNZ staff at Pastoral House, Auckland Biosecurity Centre, Ballantyne House, Tamaki IDC, Wallaceville IDC, Lincoln IDC, SWPD.

⁷ HPO Steering Committee Issues and Options Paper.doc
<http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/090101b38031d9d4>
FCS Folder Location: <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d88e>

- d. Agenda item or conference presentations at the following stakeholder fora: NZ Biosecurity Institute, NETS, BMAC, CE Forum, BCG, sector consultation committees.

B. Develop the revised Organism Prioritisation Policy

Activities would comprise:

- a. Gather intelligence on organism prioritization frameworks.
- b. Analyse intelligence and identify options.
- c. Develop the revised categorisation framework for Unwanted Organisms;
- d. Identify and standardise criteria to be used for designation of:
 - i. Unwanted Organisms, on the basis of impact;
 - ii. Likelihood of encountering organisms at the border and post-border;
 - iii. Priority for re-assessment of intervention strategies, at each point of intervention in the Biosecurity system (and for cross-system functions).
- b. Test these criteria with internal and external focus groups.
- c. Define statutory implications associated with designation of any status.
- d. Define business implications associated with designation of any status, in accordance with the following principles:
 - i. High Impact Organisms: generic capability maintained to intervene.
 - ii. High Risk Organisms: defined levels of specific capability and capability maintained to intervene.
 - iii. Intervention Re-assessment Organisms: Timeframes for re-assessment.
- e. Identify MAFBNZ roleholders who act as the business owners for particular criteria and categorisation variables.
- f. Compile into a policy format.
- g. Consult the draft policy.

C. Convert the policy criteria to a data standard and develop a prototype database in Microsoft Access.

Activities would comprise:

- a. Define variable type and allowable values for each criteria;
- b. Define algorithms for combining variables to achieve categorisations;
- c. Define needs for capturing history and tracking changes;
- d. Document the above as a Data Standard;
- e. Develop prototype database, using expert assistance.

D. Compile organism data against the criteria

Activities would comprise:

- a. Gather intelligence to compile lists of candidate organisms, organised into an agreed sector-based framework;
- b. Consult stakeholders on the candidate organism lists affecting sectors they are interested in, inviting additions;

- c. Confirm sector-based lists of candidate organisms as an outcome of a stakeholder consultation process (i.e. a “long-list” of anticipated 250-500 organisms);
- d. Populate data associated with the impact, risk and priority criteria for long-listed organisms, consulting the MAFBNZ roleholders designated as business owners for variables wherever appropriate;
- e. Identify sector experts for peer review of the populated data;
- f. Create the following lists:
 - o High Impact Organisms
 - A National List, anticipated to be in the order of 100 organisms
 - Sector-based lists (e.g. Dairy Industry; Cut Flower Industry; Environment)⁸ anticipated to be in the order of 10 organisms
 - o High Risk Organisms
 - At the Border
 - At Post-Border
 - o Intervention Re-assessment Priorities, as updatable annual plans relating to points of intervention and cross-system Biosecurity functions.

- E. Document the Business Systems for ongoing management, maintenance and utilisation of the Organism Prioritisation Framework and the associated lists.

Activities would comprise:

- a. Define the MAFBNZ roleholders designated as business owners for variables
- b. Identify business as usual activities that will create information that should be captured in the Organism Prioritisation Framework
- c. Define in generic terms the capability and capacity expectations associated with High Risk Organisms;
- d. Define in generic terms the processes to identify, plan and implement Intervention Re-assessment Priorities.
- e. Define the interim mechanisms for data management, security and integrity until the Microsoft Access prototype is fully implemented via the “Organism Master Data Solution”.

- F. Engage stakeholders through a stakeholder management plan.

Activities would comprise:

- a. Develop a presence for the HPO project on the MAFBNZ website.
- b. Create stakeholder lists, and categorise using the agreed sector framework;
- c. Identify candidates for internal and external focus groups that are broadly representative of the stakeholder community.

⁸ A standardised framework for “sectors” will be developed as part of the data standard. In order to access external information sources, in particular the data available from Statistics NZ, sector classification schemes for statistical data collection that are in common usage should be adopted wherever possible.

- d. Interaction with Government Industry Agreement Project stakeholders through the GIA project mechanisms.

6.3 Performance measures

The success of this Project is to be measured using the following criteria:

Performance Criteria	How Measured
Project Objectives	Business units use Organism Prioritisation Frameworks and associated lists during annual operations planning for 2010-11. Business units use Organism Prioritisation Frameworks and associated lists to explain work planning mechanisms to stakeholders in 2010-11.
Deliverables	Steering Group acceptances as per 5.2 above.
Time	Project completion by 24 December 2009.
Cost	Project completed within financial budget.

6.4 Project Integration Management

This project must interact and integrate with a number of other strategic projects.

1. Organism Master Data solution. The objective of the Organism Master Data solution is to provide an integration mechanism for organism databases across MAFBNZ and, potentially, the biosecurity system. The HPO project must recognise the existing data held by systems such as the Unwanted Organisms Register, BRAD, BORIC, PAQIS, and PPIN. The HPO project should avoid re-creating or duplicating data held elsewhere. Ongoing discussions with the MAFBNZ Information Management Plan Project Manager Frank Ngan will be required as the HPO project progresses and the Organism Master Data project moves into initiation phase.
2. Government-Industry Agreements. The objective of this project is to form a binding agreement for joint decision-making and funding of biosecurity readiness and response activities in the post-border arena. The project must identify the organisms that will be covered, and describe a mechanism for allowing cost shares to be allocated. Discussions with the project manager (Sarah Clinehens) have identified that the outcome of the HPO project could provide the starting point for specific negotiation of a list of organisms to be covered by any government-industry agreement. At present it appears that the respective project time-lines are reasonably well aligned for this to eventuate. A stakeholder list developed during consultation of the Biosecurity Response Policy and Discussion Document on Government Industry Agreements for Biosecurity Response has created a useful resource for stakeholder consultation in the High Priority Organisms project.

3. Border Systems Analysis and Review Project. This project is relatively advanced towards re-defining the border systems that operate from “trigger to trade”. A high-level model has been described and agreed by EMT. The model has three pipes, and a filter that guides decisions as to which is the appropriate pipe for a particular issue. The interaction with the HPO project arises because the status of a risk organism associated with any border issue as a High Priority Organism forms a component of this filter. The development of the risk issues considered by the filter has touched on matters that determine risk organism priority or national significance. Project Manager Stephen Butcher advises that this is probably as far as the project will take this issue in the meantime, but consideration of these issues within the HPO project will be of significant interest. Again, a commitment to ongoing liaison between the project managers has been made.
4. Border Identification Review. This project is also relatively advanced. The project has identified priority organisms requiring full identification when suspected at the border (for purposes such as risk estimation, reporting and system performance measurement), albeit for a limited number of commodity pathways (primarily pathways associated with plant and environmental pests/diseases). In doing so, criteria for this decision were developed. In both respects, the project has provided important thinking to guide the HPO project in the plant and environment sectors.
5. Marine Biosecurity Decision Support Tool. The tools to be created in this project include a risk profiling tool, the output of which is a listing of top overseas donor ports and associated non-indigenous marine species of concern. Some potential for overlap is perceived by MBDST project manager (Sara Khaling Rai) and this will require coordination.

6.5 Project Procurement Management

The procurement of expert services for peer review and focus group facilitation are the significant procurement requirements of this project. Associated costs for individuals are not expected to exceed the \$20K threshold, and therefore the procurement approach will be to seek verbal quotes from a limited number of potential suppliers⁹ with recognised expertise and solid reputations for delivery.

7 Costs

7.1 Costs

Expected Costs for Project		
Cost (\$\$)	Direct	\$ 147,000
	Indirect	\$ 0

⁹ MAF Organisational Procedures for Procurement

Expected Costs for Project		
Staff Time (Hours)	Direct	4,860 hours *
	Indirect	240 hours**

* Estimated from estimated 2.7 FTE requirement for one year.

** Estimated from 10 staff attending a four hour focus group, on six occasions.

7.2 Project Cost Management

Cost management is anticipated to be straight forward. All costs involve operational, rather than capital, expenditure. The following processes will operate:

- Once budget is approved, this will be held in cost centre 303, the MAFBNZ Strategic Projects cost centre. This will provide full visibility of project expenditure to the ADG Biosecurity, Project Sponsor and Project Manager.
- A project code will be assigned and all project costs allocated to this code.
- All project expenditure must be approved by the Project Manager, using the project code and 303 cost centre.
- Each month the Project Manager will review expenditure against the project code.
- The scope of externally contracted work will be managed so that costs are within budget. If this cannot occur, a variation will be sought prior to allocation of work externally.
- The Project Manager will report cost and time resource expenditure to date in monthly project progress reports, circulated to the Project Sponsor and MAFBNZ Project Office

8 Project Structure and Governance

8.1 Project structure, roles and authority

Role	Name(s)/Skills	Agree	Authority
Governance Oversight <i>(select appropriate body and provide details)</i>	Business Unit: IDC Business Group: MAFBNZ Cross MAF: NA Strategic: MAFBNZ Executive Leadership Team		
Business Owner	Peter Thomson (Project Portfolio Sponsor)		
Sponsor	Hugh Davies		

Role	Name(s)/Skills	Agree	Authority
Steering Committee	Hugh Davies - Chair Peter Thomson Douglas Birnie Steve Stuart Tim Knox	Y	Barry O'Neil
Project Manager	Matthew Stone (0.3)	Y	Hugh Davies
Project team*	Laura-Kate Peterson, Policy & Risk (0.2) Fleur Petrovich, Policy & Risk (0.2) Chris Houston, Post-Border (0.2) Paul Stevens, Post-Border (0.2) Stephen Butcher, Border Standards (0.2) Doug Lush, Post-Border (0.2) Frances Velvin, Post-Border (0.2) Deirdre Haines, IDC (0.2) Doug Farr, Passenger (0.2) Sandy Toy, Policy & Risk (0.2) TBA, Communications (0.2) TBA, Cargo (0.2)		

8.2 Staff Replacement

Not Applicable

8.3 Project Human Resource Management

The processes that will be used to make the most effective use of the people involved within the project are as follows:

- Secure line management authority to free up for the required time and afford this project priority over BAU
- Undertake an initial project briefing with all project team
- Provide clear task descriptions for all allocated work
- Allocate Workstream Manager responsibilities to experienced staff, to share management responsibility

- Project Manager monitors and reviews tasks as they are being progressed
- Fortnightly project team meetings to ensure strategic coordination and to provide overview of progress.

8.4 Governance Process

A verbal update will be provided by the Project Manager to the Project Sponsor at a fortnightly face-to-face meeting.

The Portfolio Manager will be advised of these meetings and invited to attend.

A monthly written report in the format of the MAFBNZ project report template will be produced by the Project Manager and provided to the Project Sponsor, Portfolio Manager, and Project Office.

The report will cover:

- activities in each of the six workstreams (A-F) undertaken in the previous month
- activities in each of the six workstreams (A-F) planned for the next month
- adherence to project timetable
- adherence to project budget
- any variations required.

Steering Committee meetings will be scheduled for the lifetime of the project at the outset in accordance with the project time-line and the anticipated delivery of milestones requiring acceptance by the Project Sponsor where consultation with the Steering Committee has been indicated (5.2 above).

9 Timetable

9.1 Timetable

Activity	Date
Governance meetings	
1. Problem, Purpose and Approach (Hellstrom report); Vision; Options and Issues; Business Case and Project Plan; Risks	May 08
2. Categories and Criteria; Stakeholder consultation plan for candidate organisms.	August 08
3. Draft Organism Prioritisation Policy; Stakeholder consultation plan for OP policy; Experts for peer review of organism data.	February 09
4. Final OP Policy; Organism lists; Business system.	July 09
5. Project close out report	September 09

Project timetable	Date
CPORT approved	1 December 2007
Start “Plan” phase	26 October 2007
Combined Business Case & PMP approved by ELT	31 May 2008
Start “Deliver” phase	1 June 2008
Deadlines	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HPO Lists available for business unit operational planning 2010-11 	1 February 2010
Key stage/milestone date(s)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELT sign-off Project Plan 	31 May 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vision established and shared. 	1 August 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder plan for consultation on long-list developed and initiated 	1 August 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unwanted Organism Categorisation Framework and associated criteria accepted by Sponsor/Steering Group, following internal and external focus groups. 	1 November 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate organism long-lists confirmed following consultation 	1 November 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Standard finalised and prototype database developed 	1 February 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft OP Policy ready for stakeholder consultation 	1 February 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate organism data populated into prototype database, ready for expert peer review 	1 April 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert peer review of data completed. 	1 June 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalised lists produced. 	1 August 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business system documented. 	1 August 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final OP Policy signed off by Steering Committee 	1 August 2009
Start “Close” phase	1 August 2009
Close report approved	1 October 2009
Completion date	1 November 2009

9.2 Project Time Management

Time is constrained in this project only by the desire to have a Organism Prioritisation Framework and associated lists available for use by MAFBNZ business units to assist operational planning for the 2009-10 financial year.

The project has been on MAFBNZ's strategic plan for some years now. In the absence of an agreed High Priority List, business units adopt alternative approaches, such as the use of the Animals "Dirty 30", BRAD Risk Group 3, or the Notifiable Organisms list to assist prioritisation.

A project plan and timeline has been developed (Appended Gantt chart). Milestones have been timetabled, and this includes a timetable for acceptance of key deliverables by Project Governance. While some flexibility exists, every attempt will be made to follow this timetable.

Critical issues associated with the timetable are:

- Achieving ELT sign-off of the project plan and vision, allowing the project to move to delivery phase
- The availability of project team members.
- External factors that may influence consultation processes, such as achieving stakeholder engagement or the availability of preferred experts for reviews.

10 Considerations

10.1 Project Risks

10.1.1 Risks

This project involves cross-MAFBNZ collaboration. A risk assessment has been undertaken using an inventory of factors required for successful collaboration¹⁰. Risks identified in this assessment are as follows:

Risk 1. The HPO project is not effectively integrated with closely aligned ongoing projects and data-sources, including BRAD, MBDST and GIA, resulting in overlaps, gaps or strategic non-alignment.

Risk 2. We fail to achieve a shared vision for the outcomes of the HPO Project and communicate this to internal and external stakeholders, resulting in a lack of understanding of what this project is trying to achieve.

Risk3. We push the pace of development of the HPO Project too hard, resulting in ineffective collaboration amongst the project team.

Risk 4. The pace of development of the HPO Project prevents effective stakeholder engagement, resulting in a failure to build trust in the project outcomes amongst external stakeholders.

¹⁰ HPO risk assessmentt.doc <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/090101b38031d9d3>
FCS Folder Location: <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d88e>

Risk 5. The HPO Project Team is not sufficiently representative of MAFBNZ Directorates, which results in a failure to take appropriate account of particular business needs or complexity and failure to achieve cross-organisation buy-in.

Risk 6. The HPO Project Team is not sufficiently representative of the national Biosecurity stakeholder community, which results in a failure to achieve cross-system buy-in.

Risk 7. Directorates are not given the opportunity to effectively participate in the Project Team because team members do not effectively liaise back or represent the Directorate views.

Risk 8. The Project Team fails to secure from the Project Sponsor and Steering Group clarity with respect to vision, objectives, and approaches.

Risk 9. The Project Team fails to overcome the organizational tendency to operate in silos.

Risk 10. IDC Project Sponsor and Project Manager lack the legitimacy to ensure effective internal and external collaboration for a project of this type.

Risk 11. The Project Team fails to achieve internal and external legitimacy due to the lack of participation from senior-level biosecurity staff.

Risk 12. The HPO Project is constrained by the political sensitivities associated with the GIA project and fails to effectively engage stakeholders.

Risk 13. A change in Minister and/or Government changes MAFBNZ priorities.

Risk 14. The Project Team fails to achieve the necessary internal commitment to resource the project.

Risk 15. External stakeholders are unable to commit resources to the project to the extent required.

Risk 16. External stakeholders do not believe in the processes followed during the project.

Risk 17. The funding and human resource already secured from the Strategic Projects fund is insufficient to meet the requirements of the project following consideration of stakeholder consultation requirements.

Risk 18. The project team fails to establish a working environment of understanding and trust because project team members are unable to rise above their business as usual working practices and achieve an organization-wide perspective.

Risk 19. The project team fails to establish relationships that engender trust with external stakeholders.

Risk 20. The Project does not attract team members who can compromise, are flexible and adaptive, are good communicators, and have established official and informal networks representative of their area of the biosecurity system.

Risk 21. The Project Sponsor, Steering Committee and Project Manager do not provide effective leadership resulting in lack of buy-in, enthusiasm and cooperation, or unresolved conflict, within the Project.

10.1.2 Project Risk Management

The project team will establish a risk register at the initial team briefing. The register will be reviewed and any new risks identified and discussed at each subsequent project team meeting. Review of the risk register will also be a standing agenda item for the Steering Committee.

10.2 Assumptions, dependencies, constraints & impacts

This project plan assumes:

- Integration of mechanisms to designated High Priority Organism status with other MAFBNZ taxonomic, risk and statutory frameworks is a superior approach to creation of a further stand alone list
- Internal and external stakeholder engagement is important to ensure there is buy-in, but the need for the project to work quickly and efficiently, as well as the potential for sectoral interests to introduce bias, dictate a limited approach to consultation. The strategic approach is consultation on the information that will be used to make decisions, rather than the decisions themselves.
- A valid framework for weighing impacts across sectors (i.e. economic, environmental, public health and socio-cultural, as well as industries within the economic sector) can be constructed and will be supported by internal and external stakeholders. This is considered to be a pre-requisite if a determination of national priority is to be an outcome.
- A business process that ensures business as usual activities across MAFBNZ contribute to ongoing maintenance of the lists will receive buy-in and support from all necessary MAFBNZ business groups.
- The Organism Prioritisation Framework and associated lists constructed within this project as a table (e.g. Excel) or relational database (e.g. Access) requires no MAF Information Services support or approvals. Therefore this project is not considered to have an IT component requiring adherence to MAF IT project management. Any future integration of the High Priority Organisms list within the Organism Master Data solution certainly will, but this is excluded from the scope of this project.
- Funding for the project will be obtained.

11 Communication

11.1 Communication

The Communication Plan for this project is outlined as follows:

1. *Biosecurity* article introducing the project and sharing the vision. Following approval of the project plan, an article will be written and published in *Biosecurity* magazine outlining the context, vision, objectives and intended methods of the project, as outlined in this project plan.

2. Sharing the vision with MAFBNZ staff. Morning/afternoon-tea presentations for MAFBNZ staff at Pastoral House, Auckland Biosecurity Centre, Ballantyne House, Tamaki IDC, Wallaceville IDC, Lincoln IDC, SWPD.
3. Sharing the vision externally. Agenda item or conference presentations at the following stakeholder fora: NZ Biosecurity Institute, NETS, BMAC, CE Forum, BCG, sector consultation committees.
4. Development of a web presence for the project on the MAFBNZ website. Important documents will be posted here.
5. Creation of a stakeholder management plan, identifying and categorising all stakeholders with an interest in the project. The stakeholder management plan will identify those stakeholders already currently engaged through the Government Industry Agreement Project, and will integrate consultation requirements for the HPO project with the consultation plans of the GIA project.
6. Wide consultation on candidate organism long-list. Following compilation of an internal draft long-list using intelligence sources, the categorised lists for sectors will be sent to stakeholders with a request for any additions.
7. Internal focus groups. Two cross-MAFBNZ internal focus groups will be established at the outset of the project by requesting all Directorates to nominate a representative/s. The nominees will be grouped to provide two manageable sized groupings, each with pre-border, border and post-border representation. The focus groups will be provided summaries of draft reports and their feedback on these elicited in a facilitated manner.
8. External focus groups. Two cross-sectoral external stakeholder focus group will be established at the outset of the project by requesting targeted national associations representing economic (plant, animal, aquatic), environmental, public health and socio-cultural sectors to nominate a representative. The nominees will be grouped to provide two manageable sized groupings, each with cross-sectoral representation. The focus groups will be provided summaries of draft reports and their feedback on these elicited in a facilitated manner.
9. Wide consultation of the draft Organism Prioritisation Policy.
10. On final conclusion of the project, an article outlining project outcomes will be written and published in *Biosecurity* magazine.

11.2 Project Communication Management

The project will adopt an open approach to communications and information management.

Project Team Members will be encouraged to discuss their work in the project with their line managers and colleagues, in order to ensure their input to the project is based on a wide organisational perspective.

Similarly, focus group members will also be encouraged to discuss the information presented and processes of the focus group sessions with their colleagues and networks. Members will be invited to submit any views that arise from these discussions following the focus group sessions.

All draft and final project communications, reports and deliverables will be managed within the MAF File Classification System without restrictions on access. A project file structure has been established at the following location:

High Priority Organisms Project <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d864>

FCS Folder Location: <http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b3800077e0>

12 Project Profile

Scale

The HPO project is considered to be a medium scale project. This is because the project:

- Delivers a single goal of MAFBNZ's Strategic Plan and contributes to five other goals
- Has MAFBNZ executive leadership team focus.
- Risks exist, but these affect MAFBNZ (rather than other MAF groups) and should be manageable.
- Is expected to take approximately 8-9 months once delivery phase is initiated.
- Has significant internal staff costs but moderate direct costs.

Type

The HPO project is considered to be primarily a *Business systems and/or processes* project, but it also has some elements of *Cross government* and *Science, research, monitoring and forecasting*.

13 Authorisation

Project Manager: This combined business case and project management plan provides a realistic representation of the project's opportunity, requirements and benefits. The document identifies all the significant resources, risks and impacts that need to be taken into account in deciding whether to approve the project.

This document uses the standard template for a combined Business Case and Project Management Plan for **medium** projects.

1. No headings have been deleted or changed; where no information is available the section has been deliberately left empty so it is clear what is unknown when the project is approved.
2. Where there is additional material relating to this project and no suitable heading for it, we have added it as an appendix named: Appendix 2. Gantt chart outlining project plan.

Caveats

Matthew Stone Project Manager

Name	Position	Signature	Date
------	----------	-----------	------

Sponsor: I authorise this combined business case and project management plan (subject to the following caveats).

The document supports this decision. It provides a realistic representation of the project's opportunity, requirements and benefits, and identifies all significant resources, risks and impacts that need to be taken into account in deciding whether to approve the project.

Caveats

Hugh Davies Sponsor

Name	Position	Signature	Date
------	----------	-----------	------

As **Business Owner**, I approve and accept this combined business case and project management plan (subject to the following caveats), and agree to provide the required resource, including any funding. I also agree to the management and governance provisions outlined for this project, and that I am accountable for achievement of the benefits described in this document. I confirm that the Business has the ability to implement the project deliverables and to realise the benefits claimed.

Caveats

Barry O'Neil Business Owner

Name	Position	Signature	Date
------	----------	-----------	------

14 Document and project administration

Document preparation: The following people were involved in the preparation of this document.

Name	Title/Role
Matthew Stone	Incursion Investigation Manager HPO Project Manager

Consultation and Review: The following people/groups provided feedback on this document.

Name	Date	Feedback
Hugh Davies		
MAFBNZ Project Office		

Version History

Date	Author	Version	Status	Summary of Changes
11/1/08	MS	0.1	Draft	
19/2/08	MS	0.2	Draft	Incorporate most revisions suggested by Policy and Risk

Project Administration

Field	Select	Notes
Project number/code	475002.303.xxxx	
Business	MAFBNZ	
Type	<i>Business systems and/or processes project, with elements of Cross government and Science, research, monitoring and forecasting.</i>	
Scale	Medium	
Governance oversight	Project Sponsor: Hugh Davies Project Steering Committee: Selected MAFBNZ ELT members.	
Outcomes	An Organism Prioritisation Framework and associated organism lists available for MAFBNZ annual planning for the 2009-10 financial year.	
Strategic objective(s)	Develop a list of organisms not established in New Zealand considered to be of highest priority for reduction, readiness and response activities.	
Outputs class	245	
FCS ¹¹ : Project file address	http://fcs.maf.govt.nz/webtop/drl/objectId/0b0101b38027d864	

¹¹ FCS: File classification system

Appendices

A-1: Deliverables

Deliverable	Due Date	Acceptance Criteria	Success Measures
Business Case and Project Plan	27/5/08	Feasibility of delivery and likely acceptability of project processes by internal/external stakeholders.	Sponsor/Steering Committee/ELT support.
Vision	27/5/08		Sponsor/Steering Committee/ELT acceptance
Stakeholder plan for consultation on short-list	1/8/08	Comprehensive lists with sensible sectoral categorisation	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Unwanted Organism Categorisation Framework and associated criteria.	1/11/08	Logical and transparent connection to cross-system priority.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Candidate organism long-lists	1/11/08	Comprehensive intelligence scanning process and clear reflection of stakeholder priorities as determined through consultation.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Data Standard and prototype database	1/2/09	Covers all UO criteria. Clear link between criteria and categories. Simplicity of use.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Draft OP Policy	1/4/09	Clear description of all policy components.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Peer-reviewed candidate organism data populated into prototype database	1/06/09	Comprehensive and technically robust.	Project Manager acceptance
Finalised lists produced.	1/08/09	Logical and transparent.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Business system documented.	1/08/09	Efficient interaction with business as usual systems and activities.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance
Final OP Policy	1/08/09	Stakeholder feedback from draft policy consultation responded to.	Sponsor/Steering Committee acceptance

A-2: Gantt Chart outlining project plan (to come)