|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Control objective:** To ensure the processes outlined in the DTMR Project Cost Estimating Manual are being followed before project cost estimate sign off and approval by Regional/District Director. | | |
| **Prepared by[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Checked by[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Date** |
| **Project name** | **Project number** |  |
| **Estimate type:** 🞎 Strategic 🞎 Proposal 🞎 Business case 🞎 Preliminary design 🞎 Detail Design 🞎 Tender | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Estimating business rule: project scoping | | Y/N[[3]](#footnote-3) | | Comments |
| 1. Is the estimate based on appropriate scoping for the stage of development?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.1 (project objectives, performance requirements, project definition, scope) | |  | |  |
| 1. Have factors influencing the estimate been considered during the project scoping process?   PCEM Ref Cl 5.1 (complete item omission, incorrect item/quantity, inappropriate item, unapproved variation, government and approval requirements) | |  | |  |
| 1. Has the “customer” agreed with the preferred solution?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.2. | |  | |  |
| 1. Has a site visit been undertaken and *Site Visit Checklist* completed?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.3 and Annexure A | |  | |  |
| 1. Has consultation been undertaken with key internal and external stakeholders, as to potential impacts of the project scope?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.2.1 & 7.4 (Customer, traffic, planning, community, industry, emergency services, service authorities) | |  | |  |
| B. Estimating business rule: estimate preparation and presentation | | Y/N3 | | Comments |
| 1. Has the estimate development been based on the current version of PCEM | |  | |  |
| 1. Has the appropriate estimating method been used for the project type/stage and approved by the Project Manager?   PCEM Ref Cl 9.2 (unit rate, first principles, global estimate, Types 1, 2 and 3) | |  | |  |
| 1. Is the estimate presentation compatible with OnQ/3PCM Unifier documentation?   PCEM Ref Chapter 7 (Construction/non-construction WBS, WBS level 3 and 4, project management/work management and Cost Breakdown Structure) | |  | |  |
| 1. Is the estimate broken into appropriate project estimate structure components?   PCEM Ref Fig 3.2 (DJC, IJC, contractor overheads and profit, DTMR costs, inflation) | |  | |  |
| C. Estimating business rule: pricing | | Y/N3 | | Comments |
| 1. Has the estimate been benchmarked against district benchmarking data?   PCEM Ref Chapter 8 (global rates, key item rates, construction production rates) | |  | |  |
| 1. Have work method studies been considered during the estimate development?   PCEM Ref Cl 5.1 (constructability, traffic management, haul quantities and distances, borrow and spoil requirements, construction methodology, site conditions) | |  | |  |
| 1. How Principal’s costs been calculated?   PCEM Ref Cl 3.3 + table 3.4 (as a percentage of the construction cost or from first principles) | |  | |  |
| 1. Do the Principal’s costs include all the components?   PCEM Ref Cl 3.3 + table 3.4 (project management, principal’s obligations, resumptions, PUP, principal supplied materials, service levies, environmental offset costs etc.) | |  | |  |
| 1. Have historic rates been used to prepare the estimate? If so have rates used been adjusted prior to use as per the conditions set out in PCEM?   PCEM Ref Cl 9.1.2 (inflation, site/market conditions, location, scale, overheads etc.) | |  | |  |
| D. Estimating business rule: risk | | Y/N33 | | Comments |
| 1. Has the appropriate risk assessment approach been used to produce P90 estimate? (*quantitative for Type 1* or *qualitative for Type 2)*   PCEM Ref Cl 3.4 & 10.3 (Type 1: risk register, benchmark information, strategic estimating matrix, @Risk package) (Type 2: past experience, common sense review) | |  | |  |
| 1. Has an appropriate risk assessment technique been used?   PCEM Ref Cl 10.3 (risk workshop, review past docs, talk to “wise old men”) | |  | |  |
| 1. Has the risk management process followed the Risk Management Process chart? PCEM Ref Fig 10.1 | |  | |  |
| E. Estimating business rule: contingency | | Y/N[[4]](#footnote-4) | | Comments |
| 1. Have the financial allowances made against risks and their treatment been used to determine the appropriate contingency allowance?   PCEM Ref Chapter 10. | |  | |  |
| 1. Is the project contingency allowance within contingency range for this stage?   PCEM Ref Table 3.6 | |  | |  |
| 1. For Type 1 projects, have appropriate contingency allowances been made against individual cost change categories?   PCEM Ref Cl 3.4 & chapter 10 | |  | |  |
| 1. Does the estimate allow for unmeasured, unidentified items?   PCEM Ref Cl 10.8.9 | |  | |  |
| F. Estimating business rule: escalation | | Y/N4 | | Comments |
| 1. Has the escalation been calculated in accordance with QTRIP guidelines? Which approach / how was the percentage used derived?   PCEM Ref Cl 3.5 | |  | |  |
| 1. Has the escalation calculator been used to value the escalation amount?   PCEM Ref Annex H | |  | |  |
| 1. Have all the escalation components been taken into account while determining escalation for Type 1 projects?   PCEM Ref Table 3.7 (inflation, market conditions, supply constraints, project complexity) | |  | |  |
| G. Estimating business rules: review and approvals | | Y/N4 | | Comments |
| 1. Has an estimate reality check been performed by the project manager prior to peer review?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.6 | |  | |  |
| 1. Has a peer review been undertaken? Is there written evidence of the reviewer’s feedback? Has that feedback been actioned to the reviewer’s satisfaction?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.11.1 | |  | |  |
| 1. **Large and complex projects**: where applicable, has an independent concurrence review been undertaken? Is there written evidence of the reviewer’s feedback? Has that feedback been actioned to the reviewer’s satisfaction?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.11.2 (State funded and cost >$10m or federally funded and cost >$25m or considered high risk or very complex) | |  | |  |
| 1. Has the estimator/reviewer(s) signed off Project Cost Estimate (Summary) and (Approval) forms?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.12 and Annexure L | |  | |  |
| H. Estimating business rules: programming and cost planning | | Y/N4 | Comments | |
| 1. Has the Project Cost Management Process been completed and peer reviewed for this project phase? Has cost control been regularly undertaken to inform on project plan variances (if required)?   PCEM Ref Cl 4.1.11 | |  | |  |
| 🞎 Satisfactory (expected process controls are in place and used satisfactorily)  🞎 Unsatisfactory (attach details of any controls that in your opinion are not in place and/or are not used satisfactorily)  🞎 Approved 🞎 Not approved | | | | |
| **Signature** | **Date** | | | |

1. To be completed by the estimator [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. To be checked by the Project Manager/Program Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. If yes, documentary evidence must be made available to the Region/District Director [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If yes, documentary evidence must be made available to the Region/District Director [↑](#footnote-ref-4)