

# Appendix C:

## Review scope and method

### Scope of this review

**Who we examined**

We examined the following agencies:

Agency	Their key responsibilities
DE, DEECA, DFFH, DGS, DH, DJCS, DJSIR, DPC, DTF, DTP, Victoria Police	All agencies should comply with the Framework from December 2016 and the Data Quality Standard from March 2018.

**Our review objective**

Do Victorian Government agencies assure the quality of their critical data assets?

**What we examined**

This engagement assessed whether agencies have:

- identified their critical data assets
- assessed their critical data assets quality
- maintained required documentation for critical data assets
- established appropriate oversight of critical data assets.





**Why we conducted this review**

Government’s ability to make informed decisions is critical. Trusted high-quality data across government provides a foundation for confident decision-making, informs policy development and supports service delivery. It is required for data sharing between agencies and with the public. A recurring theme of our performance engagements is the presence of low-quality data or data of unassured quality. We have previously identified data quality issues in several critical datasets across agencies.




**Aspects of performance examined**

Our mandate for performance audits and reviews includes the assessment of economy, effectiveness, efficiency and compliance (often referred to as the ‘3Es + C’).

In this review we focused on the following aspects:

Economy	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Compliance
			

Key:

-  Primary focus
-  Secondary focus
-  Not assessed

# Conducting this review

**Assessing performance** To form a conclusion against our objective we used the following lines of inquiry and associated evaluation criteria.

Line of inquiry	Criteria
1. Do agencies meet the requirements of the <i>Data Quality Information Management Framework Standard</i> (Data Quality Standard)?	1.1 Agencies have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>processes in place to identify critical data assets in line with the Framework and the Data Quality Standard</li><li>a critical data assets register.</li></ul>
	1.2 Agencies can demonstrate that of each critical data asset's identified data custodian is responsible for data quality management, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>assisting in assessing data, and developing data quality management plans and data quality statements</li><li>documenting deviations from plans</li><li>confirming the status of data quality statements for critical data assets in the information asset register</li><li>ensuring processes meet internal data quality standards, guidelines and policies.</li></ul>
	1.3 For each identified critical data asset, agencies have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>prepared a data quality statement</li><li>developed and maintained a data quality management plan</li><li>assessed the quality of the data asset at least annually.</li></ul>

**Our methods** As part of the review we:

- conducted document reviews
- relied primarily on what agencies told us about including all critical data assets in their information asset registers.

**Level of assurance**

In an assurance review, we primarily rely on the agency's representations and internally generated information to form our conclusions. By contrast, in a performance audit, we typically gather evidence from an array of internal and external sources, which we analyse and substantiate using various methods. Therefore, an assurance review obtains a lower level of assurance than a performance audit (meaning we have slightly less confidence in the accuracy of our conclusion).

**Compliance** We conducted our review in accordance with the *Audit Act 1994* and ASAE 3500 *Performance Engagements* to obtain limited assurance to provide a basis for our conclusion.

We complied with the independence and other relevant ethical requirements related to assurance engagements.

**Cost and time** The full cost of the review and preparation of this report was \$310,000.

The duration of the review was 7 months from initiation to tabling.