

Appendix C:

Review scope and method

Scope of this review

Who we examined

We examined the following agencies:

Agency	Their key responsibilities
Department of Treasury and Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing the state's Budget and finances and economic policy and strategy Providing advice on major projects performance to ministers Reporting on capital projects Preparing BP4 Overseeing HVHR projects Publishing the Capital Investment Dashboard
Coliban Region Water Corporation	Responsible and delivery entity
Court Services Victoria	Responsible and delivery entity
Department of Education	Responsible and delivery entity
Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action	Responsible and delivery entity
Department of Health	Responsible entity listed in BP4
Department of Jobs, Skills, Industry and Regions	Responsible and delivery entity
Department of Justice and Community Safety	Responsible and delivery entity
Department of Transport and Planning	Responsible and delivery entity
Homes Victoria	Responsible and delivery entity
Melbourne Arts Precinct Corporation	Responsible and delivery entity
Melbourne Water Corporation	Responsible and delivery entity
North East Link State Tolling Corporation	Responsible entity listed in BP4
South East Water Corporation	Responsible and delivery entity
SEC Victoria	Responsible and delivery entity
State Sports Centres Trust	Responsible entity listed in BP4
Suburban Rail Loop Authority	Responsible and delivery entity
Victorian Infrastructure Delivery Authority	Delivery entity
VicTrack	Responsible entity listed in BP4

Our review objective

To examine if public information provided by responsible entities to Parliament and the community can be used to assess the progress of major projects and the factors driving significant variations.

What we examined

The main focus of this engagement was effectiveness.

We looked at ...	which involved assessing ...
effectiveness	to what extent can public information provided by responsible entities be used to assess the progress of major projects and the factors driving significant variations?

Why we conducted this review

The Victorian Parliament and the community need high-quality information about the performance of major projects. This review aims to contribute to improving transparency and accountability of public sector reporting and performance.

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 public sector entities provide accurate and reliable information on major projects' progress and significant variations to cost, time, scope and benefits?	1.1 Are public sector entities implementing major projects according to approved scope, costs, time and benefits?
	1.2 Public sector entities report the factors that are driving significant variations for these major projects.

Our methods

As part of the review we:

1. identified any capital project or program with a TEI of \$100 million or more in BP4 2025–26
2. consulted with responsible public sector entities listed in 2025–26 BP4 and excluded:
 - ICT projects with a TEI of \$100 million or more disclosed in the Department of Government Services' Victorian Government IT Dashboard
 - land acquisitions projects (but we included projects where land acquisitions were part of a larger major project)
 - major projects in the water sector that do not yet have Treasurer approval
 - rolling asset maintenance and renewal programs or minor capital works programs
 - programs of works that include smaller sub-projects that are below \$100 million TEI
3. also identified sub-packages with a \$100 million TEI or more that are part of a larger major project in BP4. We surveyed these sub-packages as separate major projects. We deducted the value of these sub-packages from the overall major project TEI to avoid double counting.

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.

We also provided a copy of the report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Cost and time

The full cost of the review and preparation of this report was \$695,000.

The duration of the review was 8 months from initiation to tabling.