

VICTERIX PRACTICAL GUIDE

Local Government Project Delivery Readiness

A practical framework for examining governance, coordination and delivery readiness

For Australian council leaders, project sponsors and delivery teams navigating complex capital, infrastructure and strategic projects.

Version 1.0 · 13 August 2026

How to use this guide

Use the readiness check to examine uncertainty, then apply the four practical tools to help make responsibilities, interfaces, decisions and commitments more visible.

1. Assess

Complete the 20 questions with the sponsor and core delivery team. Choose Yes, Partly or No based on evidence—not optimism.

2. Discuss

Compare answers. Differences in perception often reveal the interfaces most likely to slow decisions or delivery.

3. Prioritise

Address the highest-consequence gaps first. Assign an owner, action and due date for each agreed response.

4. Recheck

Repeat at material stage gates, after governance changes, or when risk, scope or stakeholder conditions shift.

Important boundary. This guide describes Vicerix's proposed process and provides general guidance. It is not evidence of completed Vicerix projects or guaranteed performance. It does not guarantee project outcomes or replace council statutory decision-making, delegated authority, procurement and probity obligations, or appropriately qualified legal, financial or technical advisers.

Who this guide is for

It is intended for projects involving multiple organisational, advisory, approval or delivery interfaces. It may be unnecessarily detailed for straightforward business-as-usual activities.

Suggested participants

Project sponsor, accountable executive, project lead, governance or PMO representative, procurement, finance, approvals/planning, communications or engagement, and the relevant technical leads.

Evidence to have nearby

- Approved business case, mandate or project brief
- Delegations and decision authorities
- Programme, budget and procurement strategy
- Risk, issue, action and decision records
- Stakeholder, approvals and assurance plans

READINESS CHECK

A. Mandate and outcomes

Question	Yes	Partly	No
1. Is the problem to be solved clearly stated and supported by current evidence?	☐	☐	☐
2. Are intended community, service and organisational outcomes explicit?	☐	☐	☐
3. Is the approved scope clear, including material exclusions and assumptions?	☐	☐	☐
4. Is there a named sponsor with authority and capacity to resolve escalated matters?	☐	☐	☐
5. Are success measures, constraints and stage-gate expectations understood?	☐	☐	☐

B. Governance and decisions

Question	Yes	Partly	No
6. Are decision rights and delegations mapped to the delivery pathway?	☐	☐	☐
7. Are governance forums, membership, cadence and terms of reference fit for purpose?	☐	☐	☐
8. Is there one controlled record of material decisions and their rationale?	☐	☐	☐
9. Are escalation thresholds and response timeframes agreed?	☐	☐	☐
10. Is assurance proportionate to risk and aligned with key decisions?	☐	☐	☐

READINESS CHECK

C. Interfaces and pathway

Question	Yes	Partly	No
11. Are internal teams, external advisers and their hand-offs mapped?	☐	☐	☐
12. Are statutory approvals, permits and consent dependencies visible?	☐	☐	☐
13. Are stakeholder and community commitments captured and owned?	☐	☐	☐
14. Is the procurement approach aligned with scope maturity, market conditions and probity requirements?	☐	☐	☐
15. Are critical dependencies, lead times and information requirements connected to the programme?	☐	☐	☐

D. Control and transition

Question	Yes	Partly	No
16. Are risks, issues, actions and decisions current, prioritised and linked?	☐	☐	☐
17. Does reporting distinguish facts, forecasts, decisions required and emerging concerns?	☐	☐	☐
18. Are change-control thresholds and baseline ownership clear?	☐	☐	☐
19. Are operational readiness, handover and benefits ownership addressed early?	☐	☐	☐
20. Can the team explain the next three material decisions, owners and required evidence?	☐	☐	☐

INTERPRET THE RESULT

Turn the check into action

YES

Evidence is current and shared

PARTLY

Some evidence or alignment is missing

NO

A material gap needs ownership

Do not treat the result as a universal risk score. A single “No” involving statutory authority, safety, funding, probity or a critical approval may matter more than several lower-consequence gaps.

Prioritisation conversation

1. Which gap could prevent or invalidate the next material decision?
2. Which gap creates the greatest exposure if left unresolved?
3. Which interface currently has no accountable owner?
4. What is the minimum credible evidence needed to move from No to Partly, or Partly to Yes?
5. Who will produce that evidence, by when, and who accepts it?

Immediate action register

Priority gap	Consequence	Action / evidence	Owner	Due

Practical rule: every material gap should end with an accountable owner, a defined output, an agreed due date and a clear decision or acceptance point.

Make accountability explicit

Effective governance is not the number of meetings. It is the clarity and speed with which the right people can make evidenced decisions within their authority.

Mandate

Why the project exists, what outcome it supports, what is included, and the constraints within which delivery must operate.

Sponsor

The person accountable for direction, organisational alignment, escalation and securing decisions beyond the project lead's authority.

Decision rights

What can be decided by the team, sponsor, executive, council or delegated authority—and what evidence each decision requires.

Assurance

Independent or internal challenge timed to improve decisions, proportionate to risk and separate from routine reporting.

Governance design questions

- Does each forum have a distinct purpose and decision remit?
- Are papers framed around the decision required rather than activity performed?
- Can urgent matters be escalated without waiting for the next scheduled meeting?
- Are actions and decisions recorded once, then reflected consistently in reporting?
- Is disagreement surfaced early enough to be useful?

Decision-ready reporting: state the decision, recommendation, evidence, options, material risks, financial or programme effect, consultation completed and next consequence.

Coordinate the interfaces

Hypothetical illustration. A council project may appear active while still not being ready for its next material decision. Technical advisers may be progressing work, procurement may be preparing documents and stakeholders may be receiving updates, while ownership of the next decision remains unclear. This hypothetical is included only to explain the concept; it is not a Vicerix project, client result or prediction.

The framework below is intended to help teams examine those interfaces and organise the questions they may need to resolve.



Stage	Questions to resolve	Useful evidence
Clarify	What outcome, scope and decision pathway are authorised?	Mandate, outcome map, assumptions and exclusions
Establish	Who decides, contributes, assures and escalates?	Governance map, RACI, delegations, assurance plan
Coordinate	What inputs, approvals and stakeholder commitments must converge?	Interface matrix, approvals pathway, integrated programme
Control	How will change, risk, action and decision status remain visible?	Baselines, registers, reporting and escalation thresholds
Transition	How will operations accept, use and sustain the outcome?	Readiness, handover, benefits and closure evidence

This sequence is a practical organising framework, not a guarantee or a substitute for council-specific governance and statutory requirements.

Interface matrix

Use this to make hand-offs explicit. Focus on interfaces where delayed, incomplete or misunderstood inputs could affect a decision, approval, procurement or mobilisation milestone.

Interface / hand-off	Input provider	Receiver	Required output and acceptance	Due / dependency	Status

Review prompts

- What does “complete” mean to the receiver?
- Is the due date connected to the decision or milestone it enables?
- Who resolves disagreement about quality or interpretation?
- What is the escalation point if the input will be late?
- Is the latest accepted output stored in one controlled location?

Decision log

A decision log preserves institutional memory and prevents settled matters being repeatedly reopened without new evidence.

ID / date	Decision	Authority	Rationale and evidence	Conditions / actions	Record link

Minimum decision record

- The exact matter decided and the date it took effect
- The authorised decision-maker or forum
- The recommendation, alternatives and material evidence considered
- Declared dependencies, conditions or follow-up actions
- Where the approved paper or formal record is controlled

Keep the distinction clear: a discussion, preference, recommendation or action is not necessarily an authorised decision.

Action and commitment tracker

Record material actions and stakeholder commitments in one view. Link each item to the decision, risk, approval or milestone it supports.

ID	Action / commitment	Source	Owner	Due	Evidence of closure	Status

Closure discipline

“Done” should mean the agreed output exists, has been reviewed by the appropriate person, and any dependent plan, register or decision paper has been updated. A verbal assurance alone is rarely durable closure evidence.

PRACTICAL TOOL 4

Risk and escalation view

Use a concise escalation view for matters that require attention outside routine project control. Keep it connected to the full risk and issue records.

Matter	Current consequence	Response underway	Decision / support required	Owner	Required by

Escalate with a decision frame

1. State what has changed and the evidence available.
2. Explain the consequence of acting, delaying or taking no action.
3. Identify what remains uncertain.
4. Present viable options and a recommendation.
5. Name the authorised decision-maker and decision deadline.

Avoid status theatre. Reporting should help the recipient decide or intervene. Activity volume is not a substitute for clarity about consequences and choices.

Work towards a clearer decision pathway

If the readiness check indicates unclear ownership, disconnected advisers, unresolved approvals or unreliable reporting, one possible starting point is to identify the next material decision and examine the dependencies that may enable it.

Three suggested actions

1. **Confirm the mandate:** document the authorised outcome, scope, sponsor, constraints and next stage gate.
2. **Map the interfaces:** identify the inputs, approvals, stakeholders and hand-offs that must converge.
3. **Create one control view:** connect risks, actions, decisions and milestones, with owners and escalation thresholds.

Where Vicerix may be able to support. Subject to an agreed scope and assessment of the circumstances, Vicerix can provide governance, coordination and delivery-oversight support across project definition, approvals coordination, procurement preparation, mobilisation and delivery. The appropriate scope depends on the council's mandate, internal capability, project conditions, procurement requirements and statutory context. Any engagement remains subject to the council's applicable procurement, delegation, probity and approval requirements.

Discuss your project-delivery conditions

Visit vicerix.com.au/contact-us/ to request a preliminary conversation about the mandate, governance interfaces, immediate decision pathway and areas that may require clearer ownership. A preliminary conversation does not create an obligation to appoint Vicerix and does not constitute project, legal, financial or technical advice.

This document explains a proposed process and provides general guidance only. It does not represent a record of completed Vicerix projects, client outcomes or government endorsement. Councils should apply their own policies, delegations, statutory and probity obligations, procurement requirements and professional advice. Vicerix makes no guarantee about approvals, compliance, savings, timeframes, risk reduction or project outcomes.