He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mailhouse Transition project steering committee

Date: 10 September 2025 **Time:**

Attendees	
[Out of scope] (SRO),	Head of Finance
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
[Out of scope]	Manager DCE Office
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Team Manager, Levy Systems and Processes
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems and Operations Manager

Apologies: None

Link to agenda and pack

Agenda items and discussion	
1.	**Actions from previous meeting** • The steer comm reviewed the open actions. • [Out of scope] said she would close the action around address cleansing risk, this will be part of each release.
2.	**Overview – release one to three progress** • [Out of scope] provided an overview of the progress on release one to three.
3.	**Updated project target dates** • [Out of scope] outlined that she has done two scenarios as presented in the pack. Scenario one has an additional BA to complete the Service Delivery requirements. Scenario two continues with [Out of scope] writing all requirements. • [Out of scope] noted that the dates are not locked down/ confirmed as they are based on assumptions which have not been validated, eg Marketing Impact can not know how long their build will take until they see the requirements, and we do not know how long the new proofing approach will take until it is finalised and trialled. • [Out of scope] said that we are looking at using a BA from Marketing Impact for scenario one and that this may be the only option if additional FTE is not approved. • [Out of scope] said she supported using Marketing Impact for the BA. [Out of scope] commented that this was an advantage that was presented during the tender process. • [Out of scope] noted that he has met with Western Mailing about the extended timeline and they are onboard with this. Will be meeting with NZ Post Datam as well. • [Out of scope] said she was comfortable with the procurement around the time extension and [Out of scope] said that [Out of scope] was in the meetings with incumbants.

- [Out of scope] commented that she had received an email from [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] from Marketing Impact saying they appreciated the relationship and to pick her brains about working with other government agencies.

4. **Risks**

- The committee discussed the risks around the new project plan.
- [Out of scope] said that she thought the key person risk should probably be rated High. [Out of scope] noted that regardless of rating, we were identifying all the options we could to be proactive and will see how they play out, as well as doing right by [Out of scope]
- It was agreed to make key person risk High and keep it front of mind.
- [Out of scope] asked [Out of scope] to provide some bullet points on the impact of the delays on Service delivery. [Out of scope] noted that the busy period from a claims perspective is March to May so that should be considered.

5. **Project costs**

- [Out of scope] noted that the forecast costs do not yet include the extended timeframe
- [Out of scope] said that she was comfortable that the Financial Services budget would be able to cover the increased costs

Action points from this meeting

	What	Who	Status
1	Provide some bullet points on the impact of the delays on Service Delivery to Sonia	[Out of scope]	Closed
2	Update the Key Person risk to High in risk register	[Out of scope]	Closed

Open actions from Previous meetings

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
21/8/25	Share the resourcing paper with the Steering Committee	[Out of scope]	Open	
21/8/25	Bring the proofing risk framework and any material changes to the proofing recommendations to the steering committee	[Out of scope]	In progress	Proofing risk framework has been drafted and is out for review.
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope]	Open	
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of scope]	[Out of scope]	Open	

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

10 September 2025. 11am
Justice 12.02 Cricket or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of Scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of Scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Overview
3. Updated project target dates
4. Risks
5. Cost update

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	Action	Who	Status	Updates
21/8/25	Share the resourcing paper with the Steering Committee	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	Open	
21/8/25	Make sure mail house transition is included in finances for next financial year	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	Closed	Costs are included in outyears forecast
21/8/25	Bring the proofing risk framework and any material changes to the proofing recommendations to the steering committee	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	In progress	Proofing risk framework has been drafted and is out for review.
21/8/25	Revisit address cleansing risk with the Privacy team for future releases considering the content and volume of overseas addresses.	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	Open	Will be actioned for future releases
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	Open	
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with Joe	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	Open	
13/8/25	Assess and provide a new project timeline, including job order when recommendations and proofing approach is agreed.	Out of Scope Out of Scope Out of Scope	In progress	21/8 – updated timelines for R1 and R2 presented to the committee. 10/9 – Update to be provided today

2. Overview – Progress with releases one to three

Release one:

- Proofing is now complete with one low risk formatting error outstanding.
- Security testing has been completed. Some Medium and Low vulnerabilities were identified. Following discussion with Marketing Impact, two low issues have been identified for remediation. Marketing Impact are aiming to correct these before end to end testing starts and will be providing a cost estimate for this.

Release two:

- Marketing Impact are ahead of plan and have already provided proofs. We are working through how we can leverage aspects of our new proofing approach during release 2.
- A new tester is starting in October to support proofing, and will be available part time from next week.

Release three

- Requirements documentation is in progress but delayed.
- A new plan is being developed (see slide 5 and 6)

- Release one: **On track to new dates**
- Release two: **On track to new dates**
- Release three: **Being replanned**

Set up deliverables	
Solution design*	23-May-25
Test Plan	29-May-25
C&A	30-Jul-25
Mktg Impact Production Service Order	15-Aug-25
Service transition plan	30-Aug-25

Western Mailing & NZ Post Datam	
Contract extensions	31-Jul-25
Transition plans	31-Jul-25

KEY:

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables/	Release one	Release two	Release three
Requirements			
Service Delivery Letter content/branding	Not applicable	Not applicable	~~15-Jul-25~~
Requirements complete	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	~~8-Sept-25~~
Test files ready for MI	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	~~8-Sept-25~~
Transfer specifications complete	12-May-25		~~3-Nov-25~~
Development			
Marketing Impact development - ready for proofing to begin	30-Jun-25	22-Sept-25	~~27-Oct-25~~
Axway changes ready for E2E test	19-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	~~24-Nov-25~~
Testing			
System integration and DR testing complete	25-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	~~TBC~~
Document proofing approved	10-Sept-25	19-Dec-25	~~24-Nov-25~~
Baseline testing complete	11-Aug-25	19-Dec-25	~~TBC~~
Security testing	29-Aug-25	NA	~~NA~~
End to end testing complete	7-Nov-25	13-Feb-26	~~19-Dec-25~~
Go live			
Go Live	24-Nov-25	Late Feb/early March 2026	~~14-Feb-25~~

3. Updated Project Timeline

- The impact of the 1 April 2026 Levy changes on the project has become clearer over the last two weeks, and the impact on the project is now significant, reducing our capacity to develop requirements and provide these to Marketing Impact in a timely manner. The amount of time off the project for the BA has increased from 3 weeks in January, to 4 weeks in October plus capacity reduced to 50% from November to February.
- A new draft plan has been developed based on the reduced BA capacity. The plan assumes implementation of improvements to the proofing process and increased project resourcing as requested.
- The steering committee can expect these draft target dates to move. As we proceed through the implementation of the new proofing approach, onboard a contract BA for Service Delivery requirements and start work on the Levy changes, we will build our understanding of what realistic timelines are.
- The draft plan has been provided to Marketing Impact for feedback. They noted that they can not comment in detail on the time allocated to them for build, because until they receive the requirements they can not know how long the build will take. There has been a wide range of development times for the six jobs they have built so far.
- See over page for the draft target dates based on two scenarios – one adding an additional BA to focus on the remaining Service Delivery jobs and one with all requirements being written by [Out of scope]
- The later of the two target dates for each job is being included in transition plans with the incumbent suppliers.

Draft Target dates

TARGET DATES	With second BA writing Service Delivery requirements** - SCENARIO ONE			Lauren writes all requirements - SCENARIO TWO		
	Job	Requirements and test file to Marketing Impact	Go live	Job	Requirements and test file to Marketing Impact	Go live
Release one	GNA	Complete		GNA	Complete	
	#6 Client debt	Complete	24-Nov-25	#6 Client debt	Complete	24-Nov-25
	#5 CPX PC notifications	Complete		#5 CPX PC notifications	Complete	
Release two	#7 SER infosheets	Complete		#7 SER infosheets	Complete	
	#10 ER group structure notifications	Complete	2-Mar-25	#10 ER group structure notifications	Complete	2-Mar-25
	#11 MyA4B notifications	Complete		#11 MyA4B notifications	Complete	
Release three	#2 Claim acceptance letters	13-Oct-25		#2 Claim acceptance letters	13-Oct-25	
	#13 Client travel reimbursement	19-Sept-25	27-Jul-26	#13 Client travel reimbursement	15-Sept-25	8-Jun-26
	#9 ER Quarterly Claim reports	26-Jan-26		#9 ER Quarterly Claim reports	15-Jan-26	(EOS to Cloud freeze risk)
	#12 Client Payment notifications**	2-Mar-26				
Release four	#14 Provider payments**	27-Apr-26	12-Oct-26	#12 Client Payment notifications	6-Apr-26	28-Sept-26
	#1 WPC/ WPS and AEP invoices	11-May-26		#14 Provider Payments	27-Apr-26	
Release five	#3 CP and CPX invoices	15-Jun-26	16-Nov-26	#1 WPC/ WPS and AEP invoices	29-Jun-26	30-Nov-26
Release six	#4 BC notifications	24-Aug-26	9-Feb-27	#3 CP and CPX invoices	7-Sept-26	19-Jan-27
Release seven	#8 AEP Handback invoices	14-Sept-26	TBD (Before	#4 BC notifications	11-Nov-26	27-Apr-27
	#15 Adhoc letters	14-Sept-26	release 6)			
Release eight				#8 AEP Handback invoices	23-Nov-26	TBD (Before
				#15 Adhoc letters	23-Nov-26	release 7)

4. Key Risks to the new plan

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary in relation to new plan
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	Medium	[Out of scope] remains a key dependency for the critical path. Her capacity will be impacted by the scale of Levy change work, how much the new proofing approach reduces her input, and how effective an additional BA can be with requirements preparation.
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	High	The 1 April Levy change will take priority over the mail house project. To manage that we are aiming to have a shared plan so that resource use is optimised. However, there remains a risk of further impacts to timing.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	The new plan estimates the impact of changes that are being made to proofing and requirements writing, however this is unknown until we actually implement it. We will take learnings as we proceed and progress will be monitored so we get early warning if assumptions are wrong.
R17	If the new proofing approach is not comprehensive, then errors in the correspondence could be missed resulting in releasing communications with errors - customer comms errors, privacy breaches, regulatory breaches, incorrect invoices being produced, with significant impacts on customers and financial impact on ACC.	Low	The new proofing approach is a significant change from what has been done previously. Proofing will take a risk based approach and be led by an experienced tester. We will also take an iterative approach to implementation to build confidence.

6. Project Cost Update

- The forecast project costs do not yet include the additional resourcing and extended time line.
- The reforecast will be completed once approval is received.
- In general, the ARTS are not charging us as much as forecast.
- The Marketing Impact charges include the cost of envelopes for BAU, which were charged under the project cost centre plus change requests as outlined in the appendix.

	Total Forecast	Budget	Variance	FY24/25	FY25/26	FY26/27
ACC Personnel	621	586	+35	67	540	14
Contractors	275	277	-2	44	231	0
ACC technology/ ARTs	144	213	-69	31	113	
Marketing Impact	494	423	+71	183	311	
Other Costs	61	15	+46	11	49	0
Total	**1595**	**1560**	**+35**	**336**	**1244**	**14**

Appendix - Change requests

Approved minor change requests since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
24	Failed to send vs Suppression files	Missed requirement relating to the Failed to Send report	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
25	Candida Plates	Cost for Candida to create plates for envelopes in new branding (had assumed would reuse the True North plates)	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$41,477**

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

14 September 2025. 11am
Justice 12.02 Cricket or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of scope] (Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Project overview
3. Update on project timeline interventions
4. Proofing risk framework
5. Cost update
6. Risks update

Appendix – approved change requests

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
21/8/25	Share the resourcing paper with the Steering Committee	[Out of scope]	Open	
21/8/25	Bring the proofing risk framework and any material changes to the proofing recommendations to the steering committee	[Out of scope]	In progress	Proofing risk framework presented for discussion at this meeting
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope]	Open	
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of sc	[Out of scope]	In progress	End to end testing will simulate real operational processes and once complete this will be confirmed.

2. Project Overview – Progress with releases one to three

Release one:

- On track for end to end testing which starts on 16th October
- There is a risk around the go live date, if Guidewire to Cloud has issues (go live is 14 November), or if it is decided that a bigger gap is needed before our release can go live.

Release two:

- Proofing is underway to be completed in December, with some risk based testing strategies being applied.
- Planning for end to end and baseline testing has commenced.

Release three:

- The requirements documents for the first two jobs are now with Marketing Impact who are starting work on the build.
- The scope of this release will include another two or three jobs. The final scope will depend on what progress can be made with requirements documentation over the rest of the year while Levy Changes are underway, with some requirements being completed by MI and some by ACC.
- The go live date will also be dependant on the final scope – either beginning of June or late July – to accommodate Service Delivery end of year peak.

- Release one: **On track to new dates**
- Release two: **On track to new dates**
- Release three: **On track for requirements. Scope to be finalised.**

Set up deliverables	
Solution design*	23-May-25
Test Plan	29-May-25
C&A	30-Jul-25
Mktg Impact Production Service Order	15-Aug-25
Service transition package	30-Aug-25
Western Mailing & NZ Post Datam	
Contract extensions	31-Jul-25
Transition plans	31-Jul-25

KEY:

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables	**Release one**	**Release two**	**Release three**
Requirements			
Service Delivery Letter content/branding	Not applicable	Not applicable	15-Jul-25
Requirements complete	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	19-Dec-25
Test files ready for MI	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	TBC
Transfer specifications complete	12-May-25		TBC
Development			
Marketing Impact development - ready for proofing to begin	30-Jun-25	22-Sept-25	16-Dec-25
Axway changes ready for E2E test	19-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Testing			
System integration and DR testing complete	25-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Document proofing approved	10-Sept-25	5-Dec-26	TBC
Baseline testing complete	11-Aug-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Security testing	29-Aug-25	Not applicable	Not applicable
End to end testing complete	7-Nov-25	13-Feb-26	TBC
Go live			
Go Live (first letters sent)	24-Nov-25	Late Feb/early March 2026	27-Jul-26

* Solution design is still in review but marked as complete from project perspective as we have no further dependencies on this

3. Update on project timeline interventions

1. Additional project team members
    - Proofing lead from the ACC test team has started on the project and is working on how we evolve to a risk based proofing approach
    - Two team members from Revenue Operations have been identified for additional proofing support. They will be released from their day jobs for blocks of time to complete proofing.
    - The Proofing lead and new proofers have been trained in our current proofing approach, increasing our capacity for the next major round of proofing – SER Info sheets. For the next round of proofing, some of this increase in capacity has been offset by a change to the Levy BA team members which means we have lost one of our two most experienced proofers. As the next proofing job is very complex for new proofers, this creates some risk around that activity.
    - Approval has been received to extend the secondments for two BA's who we brought on to assist with the mailhouse project.
    - Approval has been received to recruit an additional Senior BA to assist with leading mailhouse operations.
2. Risk based approach to proofing
    - We are taking a gradual approach to rolling out risk based proofing.
    - For release two, we are not changing the approach for the first round of proofing – the BAs have made adjustments to their approach that moves towards risk based approach and its important we understand and leverage their work before making further changes. Instead, focus is on how we streamline the approach for subsequent rounds of proofing.
3. Outsourcing requirements documentation to Marketing Impact
    - Marketing Impact is being briefed next week to start on documenting Payments business requirements.
    - This will be a test of the practicability of outsourcing. There are concerns from within the project team about the effectiveness of this, and so building trust in the MI work and limiting rework is going to be challenging.

4. Proofing risk matrix

- The project team have identified guidelines for identifying the high risk rules and scenarios for proofing and these have bee n incorporated into a risk matrix, consulting with Privacy and Risk.
- As we progress through our proofing approach change, we will work with the business analysts on how to leverage the matrix to give confidence to the proofing outcomes. This may result in changes to the matrix.

Consequence

	Rules relating to...
Severe	Vulnerable individual(s) (e.g. sensitive and fatal claims) Something that if it is wrong we would have to stop the letters, and the delay would cause a regulatory or compliance breach.
Major	Sensitive personal information (e.g. health info, financial info) Invoice data and calculations, admin fees. Content open to review rights. Content required to meet regulatory requirements. A specific timeframe for the customer to respond. Where the consequence of error would be a significant impact on LSP for work arounds.
Moderate	Non sensitive personal information. Information about payment plans, due dates, direct debits, cover. Terms and conditions, forms.
Minor	Delivery method, enveloping. Suppression files.
Minimal	Look and feel, branding, layout. Spelling and grammar.

Likelihood

Almost certain	Rules that are complex with formulas and many if/then options
Likely	Rules that can be seen as ambiguous or hard to explain Rules that are interrelated with many other rules
Possible	Rules that Marketing Impact has got wrong before Rules that have many variables and options
Unlikely	Straightforward rules with multiple options
Rare	Simple binary rules, straightforward content

Risk matrix – *Use your likelihood and consequence to determine your risk rating*

Likelihood	Consequence: Minimal	Minor	Moderate	Major	Severe
Almost Certain	Medium	High	High	Very High	Very High
Likely	Medium	Medium	High	High	Very High
Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
Rare	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High

5. Project Cost Update

- The project costs have been reforecast to include:
  - All project team members extended out by 8 months to February 2027
  - The proofing lead
  - Marketing Impact drafting two requirements documents,
  - An estimate of additional costs for Marketing Impact project management. Other Marketing Impact costs have been spread over the extended timeline.
- Budget capacity within Revenue Operations will fund the over-spend on the project.
- Change requests resulting in additional cost increases are listed in the appendix.
- Further change requests are anticipated to cover more complex document composition and possibly project management. There is also a possibility that more time will be required for end to end testing than forecast

	Total Forecast	Budget	Variance	FY24/25	FY25/26	FY26/27	Total
ACC Personnel	972	586	-386	67	535	370	972
Contractors	744	277	-467	44	417	283	744
ACC technology/ ARTs	120	213	93	31	88		120
Marketing Impact	518	423	-95	183	335		518
Other Costs	210	15	-195	11	55	145	211
Total	**2,564**	**1,560**	**-1,004**	**336**	**1,429**	**798**	**2,564**

6. Update on Key Risks to the new plan

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	High	Actions are underway as outlined on slide 5. We will be monitoring the effectiveness of these actions. EOS to Cloud project has also reached out for SME support.
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	High	Levy change work has commenced and [Out of scope] is working around 70% of her time on that project.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	
R17	If the new proofing approach is not comprehensive, then errors in the correspondence could be missed resulting in releasing communications with errors - customer comms errors, privacy breaches, regulatory breaches, incorrect invoices being produced, with significant impacts on customers and financial impact on ACC.	Low	We are taking a cautious approach to roll out of the new approach, taking the best of the current approach and overlaying some testing rigor to streamline while managing risk.

Appendix - Change requests

Approved minor change requests since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
26	Security testing remediation	Remediate two items from the security testing	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
27	ER Group duplicate suppression rule	Addition of a new suppression rule to avoid duplicate letters	
28	CPX PC Notification pdf file naming	Fixing an error in requirements which would have resulted in archives not being uploaded to Guidewire	
29	SER Info sheets document composition	As reported at Steering Committee, this job took MI significantly longer due to the complex formatting and graphical content. MI have split this cost increase with ACC.	
30	Document template diagrams for release one and two	In the original solution, we were aiming to have a standard document template diagram across all jobs. This has not worked and we wish to have diagram for each job. This will make change management easier in the future. We can expect a few more CRs for document template diagrams as the project progresses.	
31	Guidewire to Cloud file testing	Additional testing of G2C files, as these were not available when we first provided our test files	
32	Address cleansing pre formatting	A change to the address cleansing report as a result of misaligned requirements	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$62,200**

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mail house transition project steering committee

Date: 14 October 2025 **Time:** 11am to 11.35am

Attendees	
[Out of scope] (SRO),	Head of Finance
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Manager Procurement Business Partnering
[Out of scope]	Manager DCE Office
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Team Manager, Levy Systems and Processes
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems and Operations Manager

Agenda items and discussion

	Introductions • The meeting opened with introductions as we have a new steering committee member – [Out of scope] is replacing [Out of scope] representing Procurement. • [Out of scope] noted that [Out of scope] is starting as Head of Finance in November and will replace [Out of scope] on the Steering committee. [Out of scope] will attend the November meeting with [Out of scope] to hand over.
1.	**Open Actions** • [Out of scope] gave an update on the resourcing paper, approval was received for a senior BA and the extension of existing secondments. This action can be closed • The proofing risk framework is agenda item 4 and so this action can be closed
2.	**Project overview** • [Out of scope] gave an update on the project. She noted that End to end testing start has been delayed two days so Guidewire to Cloud project can have the environment. This can be accommodated in the existing plan. • She described the risk of release one delays if the Guidewire to Cloud project has challenges at go live. [Out of scope] said that at the moment G2C is confident that it is on track and it won't be until they start the transition activities that we know if there are go live issues. • [Out of scope] noted that we will not lock in the scope for release three until we have more clarity on how requirements development is progressing and therefore what the final scope is. • [Out of scope] commented on the complexity of the Levy changes and the impact on communications and invoices. This is resulting in significantly more work for [Out of scope] [Out of scope] asked when the additional resource in the team resulting from the Senior BA can help the project, and [Out of scope] said he is working through this.
3.	**Update on project timeline interventions** • [Out of scope] described the significant upskilling required for the new proofing lead, and new proofers and that the first job to be proofed is very complex. As a result the next round of proofing is likely to take longer than planned. • [Out of scope] noted that moving to a risk based approach is a balancing act between traditional quality methods and the tried and true business proofing approach.

- [Out of scope] asked whether the payments work was connected with [Out of scope]. [Out of scope] said [Out of scope] has signed off all the content and there are some outstanding questions from [Out of scope] that we are working on.

4. **Proofing risk framework**
   - [Out of scope] noted that there is still ambiguity around how we are going to implement this framework and some concerns from the project team.
   - The High risk areas are driven by where we would have to stop the letters due to a regulatory breach and where rules are very complex. In those areas we would want to check every round and use our most experienced proofers. [Out of scope] commented that most communication holds review rights over it.
   - We will start using the matrix for round two in release two. The steering committee said they were interested in hearing more as this progresses.

5. **Cost update**
   - [Out of scope] queried the FY27 forecast and whether it is a forecast or budget.
   - [Out of scope] spotted an error in the FY26/27 and said she would review it.
   - [Out of scope] said the increase in costs should be funded by our programme costs and [Out of scope] said she and [Out of scope] need to have a conversation about this as she is going to be looking at budgets across ACC.
   - [Out of scope] wants to know what the additional costs are that had not been signalled.

6. **Update on key risks to the new plan**
   - [Out of scope] commented that [Out of scope] is not yet getting enough time on the Levy project and that [Out of scope] is wondering if there will come a time where the project needs to slow down to let [Out of scope] focus.
   - [Out of scope] asked if we have done any scan of what else is happening that might impact the project. [Out of scope] said not consciously. [Out of scope] said that the team is really well connected in the Levy space and she expects that would know if there were other impacts coming up.
   - [Out of scope] suggested connecting with the R&T portfolio, she doesn't think there would be but worth connecting.

7. **Change Requests**
   - [Out of scope] noted that she expected more change requests will come, particularly in relation to the complexity of setting up the jobs.
   - [Out of scope] said we probably need to push more contingency. [Out of scope] said we should assume that everything is going to continue to be more complicated that planned.

Action points from this meeting

	What	Who	Status
1	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to have a conversation about project budget.	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope]	Open
2	Review FY26/27 financial forecast for errors.	[Out of scope]	Closed
3	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Open

Open actions from Previous meetings

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope]	Open	
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of scope]	[Out of scope]	Open	20/10/25 - End to end testing will simulate real operational processes and once complete this will be confirmed

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

14 November 2025. 11am
Justice 12.02 Cricket or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of scope] (Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Project overview
3. Project resourcing changes and key person risk
4. Service Delivery proofing risk
5. Project insights from releases one and two
6. Project planning recommendation
7. Risks update

Appendix – change requests

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
14/10/25	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to have a conversation about project budget.	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope]	Open	
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Open	Not progressed
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope]	Open	Not progressed
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of sc	[Out of scope]	In progress	14/10/25 – session held with Marketing Impact to discuss operational processes around incidents including use of email vs automation. Next step is to document and embed into BAU.

2. Project Overview – Progress with releases one to three

Release one:

- End to end testing required an additional week of testing and is due for completion on Monday 17th.
- All confirmed defects have been remediated and are being retested this week. If anything goes wrong in our final week of E2E testing, the go live date will be at risk.
- The go live date was moved out one week to accommodate Guidewire to Cloud. There continues to be a risk around the project go live date, if the Guidewire to Cloud project has issues post go live.
- The project will provide early life support and complete proofing activities in the first few weeks post go live.

Release two:

- Proofing is not progressing to time, primarily due to the complexity of job #7, but also due to inexperienced proofers and concurrent activities for the project team.
- [Out of scope] has endorsed reducing the scope of this release from 3 jobs to 2 jobs, in order to achieve the date committed to Marketing Impact.
- Because E2E testing has taken longer in release one, release 2 E2E is also at risk.

Release three (Service Delivery jobs):

- Marketing Impact are progressing the documentation of the Payments requirements with some delays (page 7).
- Learnings from release one and two suggest that even with only the EOS jobs in scope, this release is likely to be unmanageable due to the large number of files (page 6 and 7)
- Detailed replanning of this release will be required.

- **Project status – Amber**
- Release one: **On track for go live on 1 December**
- Release two: **Amber – Proofing taking significantly longer than planned**
- Release three: **Amber – learnings from R1 and R2 indicate scope not achievable**

Set up deliverables	
Solution design*	23-May-25
Test Plan	29-May-25
C&A	30-Jul-25
Mktg Impact Production Service Order	15-Aug-25
Service transition package	30-Aug-25

Western Mailing & NZ Post Datam	
Contract extensions	31-Jul-25
Transition plans	31-Jul-25

KEY:

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables	Release one	Release two	Release three
Requirements			
Service Delivery Letter content/branding	Not applicable	Not applicable	15-Jul-25
Requirements complete	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	19-Dec-25
Test files ready for MI	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	TBC
Transfer specifications complete	12-May-25		TBC
Development			
Marketing Impact development - ready for proofing to begin	30-Jun-25	22-Sept-25	16-Dec-25
Axway changes ready for E2E test	19-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Testing			
System integration and DR testing complete	25-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Document proofing approved	10-Sept-25	5-Dec-26	TBC
Baseline testing complete	11-Aug-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Security testing	29-Aug-25	Not applicable	Not applicable
End to end testing complete	7-Nov-25	13-Feb-26	TBC
Go live			
Go Live (first files sent to MI)	1-Dec-25	Late Feb/early March 2026	27-Jul-26

* Solution design is still in review but marked as complete from project perspective as we have no further dependencies on this

3. Project resourcing changes and key person risk

Resourcing

- [s 9(2)(a)]
- This change has brought significant challenges to the project at a busy time where there has been a lot of proofing and testing underway. Project team members are all contributing to fill the interim gap.
- This is causing dissatisfaction and pressure on the remaining BAs who do not have the experience and confidence to fill the gap and need the support of a Senior for decision making.
- An additional BA from the Levy team started last week and is focussing on updating requirements for release one and two, and once that is in hand will start on preparation of the next Levy requirements document - #9 ER Quarterly Claim Reports.
- Additional structure, support and guidance will be provided through increased participation from Revenue Operations Leadership Team members.

Proofing

- As planned, two team members from Revenue Operations completed proofing for a month in October. The proofing took significantly longer than planned and the proofers found the work intensive. We need to work with Levy Systems and Operations to develop a sustainable plan for proofing resourcing so that team members allocated to the work are supported.

4. Service Delivery proofing risk

- There are four Service Delivery jobs in the scope of the project. These jobs are all due for proofing in the new year, starting in February.
- As noted by [Out of scope] in the September steer comm meeting, Service Delivery have a the busy period from a from March to May and then in June/July with the new financial year. More recently, [Out of scope] from the Payments team has also raised potential concerns about their ability to provide SMEs for proofing.
- The following factors further add to the challenge:
  - During the requirements documentation process, we have identified that for the four jobs there are actually eight files being sent to Marketing Impact. A key learning from the project to date is that this will increase the proofing time, as each file has a separate letter and needs to be proofed separately.
  - We have not identified anyone in ACC who has an end to end understanding of these jobs and who can review the requirements, so careful and thorough proofing will be essential.
- The following risk has been raised on the project risk register.
  - *If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.*
- Next steps are for the project to provide Service Delivery with a high level estimate of resource and timing, so that decisions can be made and a plan finalised.

Service Delivery Jobs	No. of files
#13: Client Reimbursement	1
#2: Claims Acceptance	2
#12: Client Payments	3
#14: Provider Payments	2

5. Project learns from release one and two

- Over the last month, we have been focussed on bringing release one to its conclusion, and at the same time progressing release two proofing while introducing a risk based approach and kicking off release three requirements with Marketing Impact. We plan on completing a project reviewonce release one is live, but in the meanwhile wanted to highlight to the steering committee, a number of key learns which are going to impact our ongoing project timeline:
- End to end testing
  - Our planning assumption was that E2E testing would take three weeks and one BA would work on testing in the mornings only, and would be available for other work in the afternoon.
  - In reality, E2E took four+ weeks with one BA working all day for most of the four weeks, and a second BA supporting with defect triage.
  - It is clear that the time required for E2E testing is directly proportional to the number of files being tested. Future releases have more than two files and so there will be a resulting increase in effort and time required.
- Concurrent workstreams
  - It has been challenging for the project team running with E2E, proofing and requirements concurrently.
  - We need to consider whether/how we can separate roles to reduce pressure and context switching for team members.
- Risk based approach to proofing
  - We took a risk based approach to round two testing for job #10 ER Group Structure Notifications. This reduced the volume of round 2 testing by about 75%.
  - This significant reduction in test volume reflects the small number and low risk of the defects identified in round one. The impact of introducing risk based proofing will not always be that significant, especially for round one proofing, where comprehensive coverage is essential.
- Outsourcing requirements documentation to Marketing Impact
  - Marketing Impact has made good progress on documenting requirements for the Client Payments job.
  - However, it is not possible for them to complete the documentation in isolation of ACC and they have had a lot of questions to clarify ACC requirements. With no single point of knowledge about the Client Payments job, it has not always been easy to find the answers and resolving these has involved multiple contacts across Payments, PART, Axway and Western Mailing. With our focus on release one and two, Marketing Impact are not able to move as quickly as they had planned.
  - Out sourcing the requirements documentation process would be more effective with a BA focussed on supporting the third party with queries.

6. Project planning recommendation

Context

To date, we have made two attempts to build a full project plan based on high-level assumptions and estimates. It is now evident that this approach has not provided an accurate forecast. As a result, delivery timelines continue to slip unpredictably. The core challenge is that detailed requirements for each job are only available progressively as the project advances, making early assumptions unreliable.

Proposed next steps

To address these challenges and establish a more adaptive planning framework, we recommend the following:

Step 1: Collaboratively Re-Baseline Planning

Hold an extended planning workshop with key project participants, including Levy team and vendor.

Review all remaining jobs leveraging available information and lessons from first two releases.

Outcome:

Develop revised assumptions grounded in actual experience.

Apply T-shirt sizing collaboratively to key phases for each job.

Establish a new baseline plan with shared ownership.

Step 2: Iterative Re-Planning

Implement a structured process to revisit and refine plans as requirements are finalised.

Each time a requirements document is completed for a job, as key team members revalidate and adjust assumptions and update timelines and dependencies.

Outcome:

A shared and adaptive plan that reflects reality.

Reduce risk of further unexpected slippage by continuously aligning scope, effort, and schedule.

Benefits of This Approach

- Create transparency and shared accountability across the project, business and vendor.
- Improve confidence in delivery timelines by grounding estimates in actual experience, while enabling flexibility to respond to evolving requirements and supporting project team members.

Next Steps

If this approach is endorsed, the next steps would be to consult with Marketing Impact and key business reps and project team members to flesh out whether/how this could work in practice and agree our timeline for planning the next few releases. There is may impact release 2 and 3 timelines in the short term.

Support required from steering committee

- Endorsement of change in planning approach.
- Acknowledgement that the project schedule will need to accommodate additional time for discovery and estimation cycles.
- Acceptance that future job delivery dates will be reconfirmed progressively

7. Update on Key Risks

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	High	See commentary on slide 5
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	Medium	[s 9(2)(a)]
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	See commentary on slide 7
R18	If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.	High	See commentary on slide 6

Appendix - Change requests

Minor change requests approved/ in progress since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
34	Change of cost centre	Due to change of cost centre for Service Delivery jobs, Marketing Impact needed to update the cost centre across a number of tasks in their workflow to ensure that all reporting and invoicing is correct.	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
35	CPX PC archive file/ zip file time stamps	Change to business requirements resulting from unknown Guidewire requirement identified during end to end testing. MI delivered to the business requirements, but Guidewire could not process the files	
36	Public holiday suppression file	End to end testing identified a misalignment of expectations relating to how files will be approved after a public holiday. The change moves the work from ACC to Marketing Impact to ensure operational efficiency in the levy team	
37	PGP on General Purpose workflow	E2E testing identified requirement to add PGP to the general purpose workflow to support Job #6 Client debt (and other payments jobs in future releases)	
38	Change in timing for CPX Notifications file	During E2E testing it was identified that as a result of Guidewire to Cloud, the time that the Guidewire files were produced and sent to the mailhouse changed from 1pm to 10pm. This change was subsequently reversed but not before this CR had been approved and actioned	
39	Marketing Impact project management costs for November	As a result of the ongoing complexity of the jobs being transitioned and reliance on Marketing Impact to support the project team, MI requested a continuation of the increased project management costs approved for three months from August to October into November. **Note: Marketing Impact have raised that they expect that increased project management costs will continue in 2026.**	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$69,125**

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mail house transition project steering committee

Dates: 14 November 2025 **Time:** 9am to 9.50am

Attendees	
[Out of scope] (SRO),	Head of Finance
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
[Out of scope]	Manager DCE Office
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Team Manager, Levy Systems and Processes
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems and Operations Manager
[Out of scope]	Manager IT Enterprise Planning

Agenda items and discussion	
	Introductions • As this was [Out of scope] first meeting, the steering committee introduced themselves and their role in the project.
1.	**Open actions** • [Out of scope] noted that the action related to the operational process with Marketing Impact is well underway • Other actions held over to future meetings
2.	**Project overview** • [Out of scope] gave an overview of the three releases currently being worked on, noting that the project is currently rated Amber. The key points she raised were: – Release one – working towards go live, with potential for Guidewire to Cloud release impacts being the key risk. – Release two – at the proofing stage, with proofing not progressing to speed because the team are only getting through one letter per day. [Out of scope] has endorsed reducing the scope to two jobs. Also based on release one end to end testing, there is potential for additional time being required for release two E2E testing – Release three – Service Delivery jobs – good progress being made with preparation of requirements by Marketing Impact, but the effort for ACC to respond to queries has got significant and so we are delaying progress. • [Out of scope commented that the lack of up to date requirements was impacting our ability to accurately plan and forecast the project, and that the work is more complex than expected resulting in pressure on timelines.

3. **Project resourcing changes and key person risk**

- [Out of scope] said that in relation to the key person risk, which the steering committee had discussed in several meetings, [Out of scope] has now moved off the project and [Out of scope] is in the process of recruiting and onboarding a senior BA. This has been a significant challenge.
- [Out of scope] explained that this resulted in pressure on the remaining team who are new to the work. The Revenue Operations leadership, in particular [Out of scope] are looking at how they can get more support and structure in place as quickly as possible.
- [Out of scope] noted that the other resourcing change is that the project has had two team members from Revenue Operations doing proofing in October. The work was intensive and they did a good job, but the approach is not sustainable. [Out of scope] said she needed to work with [Out of scope] to establish a sustainable model for resourcing proofing.
- [Out of scope] suggested having a further conversation with [Out of scope] [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] about this.

4. **Service Delivery proofing risk**

- The project has raised a new risk which is the availability of proofers from Service Delivery in the first half of next year.
- [Out of scope] added context about the impact of peak periods for Claim volumes and payments on SME availability, as well as the impact of EOS to Cloud.
- [Out of scope] needs to give [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] from Payments, a view on when proofing support will be required.
- [Out of scope] also noted that as we understand more about the Service Delivery jobs, they are bigger than expected because they have more than one file being sent to the mail house. So where the release had four mail house jobs, it actually has eight files to put through in terms of proofing and testing – this is more than can be accommodated in one release.
- It has also been challenging to find people with an end to end understanding of the jobs.
- [Out of scope] commented that requirements for the Payments jobs are being written by Marketing Impact and this is going well so far.
- [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] discussed potential impact of Rehab and Treatment programme on this project. [Out of scope] noted that she has raised the project as an area that we need visibility over.
- [Out of scope] talked about the need for managing relationship not only with Marketing Impact, but also the two incumbent suppliers – Western Mailing and Datam/ NZ Post.

5. **Project insights from releases one and two**

- [Out of scope] talked through four areas of insights from releases one and two and the impact on the future plan:
- **End to end testing taking two weeks longer than expected** - this impacts both the current release and multiplies out across the seven or more future releases
- **Concurrent workstreams** – the plan assumes that we are working on three releases at once – each at different stages, and this has proved challenging in terms of resourcing and context switching.
  - [Out of scope] asked if people were also doing their day jobs at the same time.
  - [Out of scope] said ideally not, but there are situations where they are.
  - [Out of scope] said that the Service Delivery people who were contributing are doing their day job

- ○ [Out of scope] said Quality lead was not full time on the project, and the proofers do have day jobs that they try to step out of, but they do still get questions etc.
- **Risk based approach to proofing** – this is reducing effort for proofing rounds 2 and onwards but we haven't been able to implement for round one yet and the impact wont be as significant.
- **Oursourcing requirements writing** – this is working well, but key learn is that for this to be successful, we need to allocate a BA to work alongside Marketing Impact.

6. **Project planning recommendation**

- [Out of scope] explained that she wants to take a more considered approach to building out the plan, where we look at each job and build a realistic plan based on evidence from release one and two, with clarity around what the assumptions are that we are making.
- [Out of scope] asked whether some jobs we were clear and others were more of a black box. [Out of scope] replied that without the key BA, we are lacking knowledge of most jobs.
- [Out of scope] said she wanted a plan with shared ownership with the project team members and Marketing Impact. But even then, once the requirements are finalised, we still may find we have not accurately forecast the effort.
- [Out of scope] commented that until we get jobs live, Marketing Impact are not making revenue and so its valuable including them in the planning.
- [s 9(2)(h)] [redacted]
- [Out of scope] said that she thought it was important to break the work down, as people will not be able to cope with the momentum/ volume

7. **Risks update**

- The top four risks were presented in the pack.
- [Out of scope] said that the Key Person risk was an issue now, rather than a risk, and that this would continue to be our challenge.
- [Out of scope] asked about the Service Delivery job risk and [Out of scope] said that operationally ownership sits in [Out of scop team, and the project expects to do most of the proofing. [Out of scope] said that Service Delivery needed to take some ownership and that she might need to get into that.

8. **Change requests**

- The minor change requests from October were listed in the appendix

- [Out of scope] noted that we are likely to face ongoing increased project management costs from Marketing Impact due to the ongoing complexity and effort.

Closing discussion

- [Out of scope] said that appointing a Senior BA as quickly as possible was critical, and then clarifying roles and responsibilities, and where decision making sits, then replanning. He said that resourcing proofing is going to continue to be a challenge. He noted that there are a lot of good ideas, but it takes time to bring it all together.
- [Out of scope] talked about the need to of slow down to speed up. [Out of scope] reinforced the importance of communication with the vendors and taking time to recalibrate and work through some of the points raised.

Action points from this meeting

	What	Who	Status
1	Give [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] from Payments, a view on when proofing support will be required	[Out of scope]	Open
2	Send [Out of scope] the risk register. Add the vendor risk to the risk register	[Out of scope]	Closed (sent with these minutes)
3	Discuss with [Out of scope] - Pressure on project team - Service Delivery ownership - Vendor relationships	[Out of scope]	Open

Open actions from Previous meetings

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
14/10/25	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to have a conversation about project budget.	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope]	Open	[Out of scope] to discuss with [Out of scope]
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Open	Not started
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope]	Open	Not started
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of scope]	[Out of scope]	Open	20/10/25 - End to end testing will simulate real operational processes and once complete this will be confirmed 13/11/25 – This action will be closed post release one go live

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mailhouse transition project steering committee

Dates: 11th December 2025 **Time:** 11.30am to midday

Attendees	
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Team Manager, Levy Systems and Processes
[Out of scope]	Manager IT Enterprise Planning

Apologies:

- [Out of scope]
- [Out of scope] (For [Out of scope])
- [Out of scope]

Agenda items and discussion

Introduction

- [Out of scope] opened the meeting talking about the ongoing complexity of the project and replanning and reset that is underway.
- [s 9(2)(h)] [redacted]

1. **Open Actions**

Meeting date	Action	**Who**	**Steering committee discussion**
14/11/25	Give [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] from Payments, a view on when proofing support will be required	[Out of scope]	Outline of requirements was sent this week following replanning. See separate agenda item. Action closed
14/11/25	Discuss with [Out of scope] • Pressure on project team • Service Delivery ownership • Vendor relationships	[Out of scope]	This is an ongoing discussion. Action closed
14/10/25	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to have a conversation about project budget.	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope]	The project forecast has been updated as of 8 December. Action closed

14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope	
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[Out of scope	This action closed as it is not a project requirement.
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of s	[Out of scope	Process confirmed and documented, currently being handed over to BAU team. Action closed.

2. Project Overview

- All releases are now green based on reduced scope, but the overall project is amber due to cost and time pressure.
- Release three is replanned with delivery at end of July. Marketing Impact is not happy with this date, but they are really critical jobs and we need to ensure they are properly tested.
- The steering committee discussed whether our letters more complex and sensitive that other Marketing Impact clients
- [Out of scope] noted that there is a tension between the pressure that project team members feel and Marketing Impact's expectations around volume.

3. Project reset and replanning activities

- [Out of scope] noted that the key themes that coming out of the reset are :
  - Needing better induction and onboarding of people as they join the project. Allowing time for them to come up to speed.
  - Providing more context of why there's pressure to deliver and move fast.
  - More clarity on roles, responsibilities, and decision making
  - Providing support and upskilling as BAs take on new tasks
- [Out of sc commented that clarifying roles and responsibilities is particularly important. With changes in BAs, IP has been lost and the team have had to figure things out as they go.

4. Cost pressures

- [Out of scope talked about the challenges of forecasting the cost and said he was working through what the overruns mean from a forecast and budget perspective.

5. Client payments job update

- [Out of scope] said that she was calling out the Client Payments job because it is complex and we have some specific differences from the Levys job. However, she reported that as of the meeting, the major issues have now been able to be resolved within the existing solution.
- The remaining point to be resolved is getting SME support for proofing. [Out of scope] talked about the impact of EOS to Cloud and TN and on Payments resourcing, and the need for experienced staff to do proofing. [Out of scope] [Out of scope] and [Out of scope are working on a solution.

6. Risks update

- No specific discussion

7. Change requests

[Out of scope] asked whether we had accounted for the E2E cost overrun in the future forecast and [Out of scope] said that yes it had now been included.

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

11 December 2025. 11.30am
Justice 12.02 Cricket or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of Scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of Scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Project overview
3. Project reset and replanning activities
4. Project costs
5. Client Payments job - resourcing and impacts
6. Risks update

Appendix – change requests

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
14/11/25	Give [Out of Scope] from Payments, a view on when proofing support will be required		Open	Request sent to [Out of Scope] for proofing requirements for first (Client Reimbursement). [s 9(2)(i)] has said that it is unlikely that Payments will be able to provide SMEs for the estimated time. More detailed information to be provided.
14/11/25	Discuss with [Out of Scope]: •Pressure on project team •Service Delivery ownership •Vendor relationships	[Out of Scope]	Open	
14/10/25	[Out of Scope] and [s 9(2)(i)] to have a conversation about project budget.	[s 9(2)(i)]	Open	The project forecast has been updated as of 8 December and will be confirmed after planning events on 9 and 10 December. [Out of Scope] to discuss with [s 9(2)(i)] after planning.
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of Scope]	Open	Not progressed
21/8/25	Discuss options for investigating switching overseas addresses to email with Levy team.	[s 9(2)(i)]	Open	Not progressed
21/8/25	Confirm the operational process for communicating with Marketing Impact and discuss with [Out of Sc	[Out of Scope]	Complete	Process confirmed and documented, currently being handed over to BAU team.

2. Project Overview – Progress with releases one to three

Despite good progress since the last meeting, the overall the project status remains Amber with cost, time and scope pressure. We are replanning and reforecasting costs.

Release one:

- Release one went live on 1 December.
- There were some minor teething problems which were quickly resolved with some learnings for future releases.
- The project team are in the process of handing over to the LSP team for day to day support.
- Western Mailing will be turning off their code before Christmas.

Release two:

- Release two is now rescoped to one job – MyA4B.
- ER Group Structure job has been postponed to a release later in the year, as this is an annual job with a February date. Releasing later avoids having to maintain and regression test the code for the rest of the year,

Release three (Service Delivery jobs):

- We are meeting to replan release three this week.
- Constraints around Payments proofing resource is the key risk for this release

- **Project status – Amber**
- Release one: **Complete**
- Release two: **On track with reduced scope**
- Release three: Being replanned this week
- Release four: for discussion in the new year

Set up deliverables	
Solution design	23-May-25
Test Plan	29-May-25
C&A	30-Jul-25
Mktg Impact Production Service Order	15-Aug-25
Service transition package	30-Aug-25
Western Mailing & NZ Post Datam	
Contract extensions	31-Jul-25
Transition plans	31-Jul-25

KEY:

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables	**Release one**	**Release two**	**Release three**
Requirements			
Service Delivery Letter content/branding	Not applicable	Not applicable	15-Jul-25
Requirements complete	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	19-Dec-25
Test files ready for MI	12-May-25	30-Jun-25	TBC
Transfer specifications complete	12-May-25		TBC
Development			
Marketing Impact development - ready for proofing to begin	30-Jun-25	22-Sept-25	16-Dec-25
Axway changes ready for E2E test	19-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Testing			
System integration and DR testing complete	25-Jul-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Document proofing approved	10-Sept-25	5-Dec-26	TBC
Baseline testing complete	11-Aug-25	19-Dec-25	TBC
Security testing	29-Aug-25	Not applicable	Not applicable
End to end testing complete	7-Nov-25	13-Feb-26	TBC
Go live			
Go Live (first files sent to MI)	1-Dec-25	Late Feb/early March 2026	TBC
Transition to business as usual	16-Dec-25	Mar-26	

3. Project reset and replanning activities

The following activities are underway to reset the project, led by [Out of Scope] and [s 9(2)(i)] . [s 9(2)(i)] and [s 9(2)(i)] will provide a verbal update on progress at the meeting.

- Team survey and feedback sessions
- Project process and decision point mapping, and identification of improvements
- Proofing resourcing review with Revenue Operations
- Replanning release two and three with Marketing Impact, with reforecasting release four and onwards planned for the new year
- Team values session
- Reforecasting the project costs

An action plan is being developed for delivery in the new year including review of our comms and meetings and looking at how we induct new staff.

4. Cost pressures

- Following the completion of release one, the following cost pressures are evident and are being built into our cost reforecast:

  - End to end testing
    - Additional charge of $[s 9(2)(i)] from Marketing Impact for release one, reflecting time and high level of engagement required, expected to continue across future releases
    - ACC tester costs increase when the E2E testing takes longer

  - Marketing Impact project management
    - Higher level of support required than forecast, expected to be ongoing

  - Marketing Impact change requests
    - Primarily relating to underestimated complexity, and also missed requirements/ errors.

  - Proofing
    - Additional time for testers and BAs to proof

  - Overall project timeline - additional project management and BA costs

  - Marketing Impact BA support
    - Leveraging Marketing Impact support for requirements documentation to release some ACC BA time

5. Client Payments job update

- The Client Payments job is planned for release three.
- Marketing Impact are drafting the requirements documents and will have this completed by Christmas.
- This is a complex job involving three daily files. Some sections of the legacy documentation have been difficult to interpret, and there were gaps in the information available. Additionally, a subject matter expert with full knowledge of the current solution has not been identified, which has made it challenging to define the solution that Marketing Impact needs to deliver. [Out of Scope] from Payments has supported the project to fill the gaps.
- There are a number of areas in the requirements where the Client Payments solution is quite different from the Levy solution. Most of these have been worked through and a compromise solution identified.

Outstanding issue

- However there is one outstanding issue to be worked through which could result in a material cost.
    - Unlike the Levys team, the Payments team do not do daily proofing of their letters each day.
    - Instead Western Mailing do some manual checks each day. We are seeking more information about what this manual check is.
    - Marketing Impacts solution is built around automation and assumes any daily checking is completed by ACC. Asking them to do manual checking is a substantial move from their solution and likely to have a significant impact on the build cost and time, as well as the ongoing cost.

Proofing

- We have been talking with the Payments team about providing proofers for their jobs, and as noted last meeting this is proving challenging given their priorities and workload. With release three now being replanned, more detailed information is being prepared for Payments to support our request.
- They have also suggested that if they do provide proofers that the project cover the cost.
- An alternative approach being considered is to use external proofers and have the Payments team do spot checking at the end. This would also have a cost impact on the project.

6. Update on Key Risks

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	High	Good progress is being made with derisking this issue through the onboarding of a new Senior BA, spreading responsibilities across a wider pool of people in the project team. Next year we will be documenting project processes and decision making more clearly which will further assist.
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	Medium	[Out of scope] is now focussed on the Levy change work, reducing the impact on the project.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	As part of our reset activities, we have workshopped our processes and ideas for improving and streamlined. These will be actioned in the new year
R18	If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.	High	See commentary on slide 7

Appendix - Change requests

Change requests approved/ in progress since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
40	Email bounce report changes	During end to end testing, a misunderstanding was identified in relation to what to display in a field in the email bounce report. Marketing Impact have shared this cost with ACC as this was due to a lack of clarity rather than an error.	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
41	Sharepoint site changes	During E2E testing, there the testers identified some usability concerns with thesharepoint site which the Levy team will be using to process approvals. This was resolved by the addition of a Notes field where the Levy team can write in additional details and a field to show who had approved the file to improve clarity.	
42	ER Group Structure notification comms channel	Change to agreed workflow to ensure the correct suppression rules are applied after an email bounces	
43	Release one end to end testing	Summary description is that Marketing Impact hours for end to end testing were 147 hours higher than planned.	
44	Te Kahu test files	Te Kahu sends test files to the mail house on a regular basis to ensure code is up to date. Marketing Impact will disable automation for job #6 Client debt so that when a file is sent, it sits there PGP encrypted and is deleted a set time later.	
45	Business requirements changes following release 2 proofing – naming conventions and reporting	During release 2 proofing, there were four defects identified which required changes in the business requirements for naming conventions and reporting. As a result Marketing Impact had to update their solution. These have been bundled into a single Change request	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$97,887**

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mailhouse transition project steering committee

Dates: 23rd January 2026 **Time:** 11am to midday

Attendees	
[Out of scope]	(Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
[Out of scope]	Principal Advisor (For Imogen Harper)
[Out of scope]	Client Service Leader (For Jeannie Coburn)
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems & Operations Manager
[Out of scope]	Team Manager, Levy Systems and Processes
[Out of scope]	Manager IT Enterprise Planning

Apologies: [Out of scope]

Agenda items and discussion	
1.	**Project overview** • [Out of scope] gave an overview of the status of releases two and three of the project. • While these two releases are tracking green the overall project is rated Amber due to the ongoing cost, time and scope pressure and replanning of releases 4 to 7 still to be completed.
2.	**Marketing Impact Relationship** • [Out of scope] talked through the recent meeting with the Marketing Impact CEO and GM. In the meeting, Marketing Impact outlined the commercial impact of the time the project is taking. As a result of the impacts, Marketing Impact have requested some additions to the contract. The paper outlining the requests was circulated to the Steering committee. There are three requests: 1. Increase project management hours from 33 to 100 per month, which more closely reflects the actual time 2. Charge all remaining original project tasks/SOWs at the contracted charge-out rates – all forward invoicing (rather than discounted as in the original SOW) 3. A variation be made to the term of the contract adding another 3-year period. • The steering committee discussed the request to add three years to the contract. [Out of scope] suggested Marketing Impact might want assurance that ACC will take the first right of renewal and that ACC would want this too. She noted that seven years is relatively short given the cost of transition. [Out of scope said he would discuss options for the contract with [Out of scope] and Legal

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

- [Out of scope] also noted that there is a bigger question around the budget which he will discuss with [Out of scope] when [Out of scope] has finished updating the forecast.
- [Out of scope] said that the total cost increase is not just what is listed in Marketing Impacts summary. There will also continue to be ongoing change requests. [Out of scope] is currently working on forecasting what the value of these is likely to be.
- [s 9(2)(h)]

3. **Client Payments proofing risks**

- [Out of scope] said that she had been working with [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to support this work. Because proofing is happening when they are dealing with TN, EOS to Cloud and other impacts – they are not able to provide a proofer for 6 weeks.
- [Out of scope] summarised the mitigations as outlined in the pack.
- [Out of scope] asked who owns the Client Payments letter and [Out of scope] said it is [Out of scope]. She also queried if this issue relates to the project delays – [Out of scope] said it was because of the months that proofing is scheduled coincides with other activities and the volume of proofing required.
- [Out of scope] asked if [Out of scope] is comfortable with the approach and what the risks are associated with the letter. [Out of scope] said that if the payment amount noted in the letter is incorrect this is a risk.
- It was agreed that [Out of scope] would work with [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to get endorsement of the approach before [Out of scope] can accept the risk. She will prepare a memo for [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] that outlines all the steps being taken to ensure that the letter will be correct and asks for their endorsement of the approach.

4. **Project reset and replanning activities**

- [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] gave an update on this work which will be ongoing over the next six or seven weeks.
- [Out of scope] focus is on team culture and skills and [Out of scope] focus is on clarity of project processes and roles and responsibilities.
- [Out of scope] talked about the challenges last year in terms of pressure on the team, perception of the risk and the pressure on timelines. He noted that the team are getting a more pragmatic view of risk.
- [Out of scope] noted the importance of continuing to reinforce the message and empower people, while balancing against visibility of what decisions were made and why, and prioritising what matters most to the team.
- [Out of scope] noted that we are just chipping away at this work on the side as the project continues.

5. **Risks update**

- [Out of scope] talked through the risks presented in the pack.

	Other business
	• [Out of scope] asked for clarification on the finances and whether this can be outlined in the Steer Comm pack in the future. • [Out of scope] noted that if the organisation had understood the nature of the work, the project would have sat in the change portfolio. So, the steering committee discussed how we bring the project into the fold so it is looked at it with an organisational lens, and gets the priority that it needs. [Out of scope] will talk with [Out of scope] to get this is in place.

Actions from this meeting

	What	Who	Status
1	[s 9(2)(h)]	[Out of scope]	Open
2	Add finance update into Steer Comm packs in the future.	[Out of scope]	Open
3	Talk with [Out of scope] about how we bring the project into the fold of the enterprise change portfolio	[Out of scope]	Open

Open actions from Previous meetings

Meeting date	Action	Who	
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

23 January 2026, 11am
Justice 14.02 or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of scope] (Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope] - Apology
[Out of scope] (for [Out of scope])
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]

Attending this month – [Out of scope] (for [Out of scope])

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Project overview
2. Marketing Impact relationship
3. Client Payments proofing risks
4. Project reset and replanning activities
5. Risks update

Appendix – open actions and change requests

2. Project Overview

Since the last meeting, we have replanned releases two and three in consultation with Marketing Impact.

We have left the overall project status at Amber with ongoing cost, time and scope pressure and replanning of releases 4 to 7 still to be completed.

Multiple releases are being worked on concurrently, and so we are focused on prioritising effort appropriately to deliver to deadlines while supporting the team.

Release two:

- Release two is on track to go live. End to end testing commences next week.

Release three:

- Release three is made up of Claim Acceptance letters and Client Payment letters. It will provides a considerable volume of work to Marketing Impact (estimating 1.2M letters per annum).
- While only two jobs, complexity is high - both send multiple files per day and Client Payments letters have around 30 variations.
- Current focus is on proofing Claim Acceptance letters and finalising requirements for Client Payments letters.
- Constraints around Payments proofing resource is the key risk for this release (see slide x)

Release four:

- There will be three or four jobs in this release, with one for Provider Payments and the remaining for Levies .
- Two of the jobs are well advanced in testing and Marketing Impact is currently working on requirements for a third job.
- We will be meeting with Marketing Impact over the next two weeks to plan this release and beyond.

- **Project status – Amber**
- Release two: **On track with reduced scope**
- Release three: **On track**
- Release four: Planning will be completed over next fortnight

KEY:

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables milestones	Release two	Release three	Release four
Requirements			
Requirements complete	30-Jun-25	9-Feb-26	
Test files ready for MI	30-Jun-25	27-Mar-26	
Transfer specifications complete		TBC	
Development			
Marketing Impact development - ready for proofing to begin	22-Sept-25	16-Dec-25	
Axway changes ready for E2E test	19-Dec-25	18-May-26	
Testing			
System integration and DR testing complete	19-Dec-25	Not applicable	
Document proofing approved	5-Dec-26	4-May-26	
Baseline testing complete	19-Dec-25	18-May-26	
End to end testing complete	20-Feb-26	4-Jul-26	
Go live			
Go Live (first files sent to MI)	9-Mar-26	3-Aug-26	Nov-26
Transition to business as usual	27-Mar-26	21-Aug-26	

3. Marketing Impact relationship management

- [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] are meeting with Marketing Impact MD and GM on Thursday 22 January to discuss the impacts of the delays in the project.
- Verbal update will be provided

- Link to Marketing Impact note

4. Client Payments proofing risks

- The key risk for release three is completion of Client Payments letter proofing. As discussed in earlier meetings, Client Payments are unable to provide proofers to meet our timeline, due to the concurrent impacts of TN, EOS to Cloud etc.
- There is also no expert in payments who understands all about how the letters work and can confidently sign off the requirements.

Mitigating the risk

- We have agreed that Client Payments will only be checking a sample of letters, rather than being fully involved in proofing.
- We will mitigate the risk with the following strategies:
  - Hold a risk session with the [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] before proofing starts to understand the key risk areas and so proofers know where to focus.
  - Provide ~40 letters covering the major scenarios to the payments team for review. They will not proof against requirements, but will read them to ensure that they make sense and are as expected based on the approved content.
  - Proofers will compare the Marketing Impact letters with Western Mailing letters for the same clients to look for unexpected variations.
  - So that we can meet our timeline commitments to Marketing Impact, we are requesting to take on a contract tester to provide the capacity for proofing that we were expecting from the Payments team and have built into the project plan.

5. Project reset and replanning activities

- Following the project reset activities pre Christmas, [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] are planning to complete the following activities over the next six or seven weeks.
- We are aiming to ensure each project team member has capacity to contribute to these activities:

  - Team values session
  - Review and redefine project meeting and communication approach
  - For each phase of the project (eg requirements documentation, proofing, business change etc), document the key process and roles and responsibilities to give clarity and consistency to team members
  - Use this information to develop a simple skills matrix and upskilling approach for project team members

6. Update on Key Risks

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	High	This risk may be able to be reduced to Medium in the coming months, given the positive impact of new team members, processes and leveraging Marketing Impact
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	Medium	[Out of scope] is now focussed on the Levy change work, reducing the impact on the project.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	We are working on how we onboard and upskill project team members as the project got a number of new team members late last year and following a resignation, Joe is recruiting another replacement BA for the project.
R18	If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.	High	See commentary on slide 6
R03	If pressure is put on the project to go too fast, we may not have sufficient time to ensure all requirements and testing is thorough and this could result in us releasing communications with errors - breaching leg, customer comms errors, privacy breaches, financial impact	Medium	This risk has been on the register since the project began, but I have added it here, as we are managing steady pressure from Marketing Impact for us to keep moving at pace.

Appendix - Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Open	11/12/25 - [Out of scope] will advise [Out of scope] who she is best to talk to in the new year

Appendix - Change requests

Change requests approved since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
46	Employer Claim Acceptance letter pagination	Requirements for the Employer Claims Acceptance letter required Marketing Impact to allow for certain maximum numbers of characters for Injury descriptions. Accommodating this in the new brand caused challenges with pagination needing additional time to resolve. MI split this cost 50/50 with ACC given learnings for MI.	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
47	PGP encryption removal	This was a misunderstanding in the way PGP encryption was applied which was not picked up during end-to-end testing. Issue was picked up post go live and required a production change.	
48	Client debt schedule and file not received notification fix	Update to the notification schedule for job #6 Client Debt requirements resulting from an error in the business requirements document that was picked up in E2E testing.	
49	MyACC for Business Connectivity and DR testing	Job #11 - MyA4B - does not use Axway and do a separate connectivity and DR test was required for release 2. This was not anticipated in the original MI solution and transition plan.	
50	Document template guides for release 3	Creation of document template layout guides for release three as the original assumption that one layout guide could be used for all jobs was incorrect: Relates to CR30 which covered releases one and two, and noted that further CRs would be required.	
51	Release two and three replanning	Replanning releases two and three in Nov/Dec. Includes formalising some of our proofing and testing processes .	
52	Job #10 and #11 testing overrun	This covers overrun of time required for Marketing Impacts input to proofing and testing for job #10 and #11. Includes defect management, meetings and alignment of BR docs across release one and two. Cause was job complexity and introduction of Jira to proofing process.	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$112,305**

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

20 February 2026, 11am
Justice 11.02 or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members
[Out of scope] Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope] (for [Out of scope])
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Project overview
3. Updated project timeline
4. Project budget
5. Marketing Impact relationship
6. Management of Service Delivery Gone No Address
7. Risks update

Appendix – change requests

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
23 Jan 2026	Discuss options for the Marketing Impact contract with [Out of scope] and Legal, and discuss Finance impacts of the Marketing Impact request with [Out of scope]	[Out of scope]	Closed	Update today
23 Jan 2026	Add finance update into Steer Comm packs in the future.	[Out of scope]	Closed	Included in this months pack
23 Jan 2026	Talk with [Out of scope] about how we bring the project into the fold of the enterprise change portfolio	[Out of scope]	Closed	
	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Open	11/12/25 - [Out of scope] will advise [Out of scope] who she is best to talk to in the new year

2. Project Overview

Replanning of releases 4 to 7 has now been completed (see slide 5).

The project status will move to Green as soon as budgets are confirmed.

Release two:

- Release two end to end testing finished 9 days early because there were no defects. While this reflected the simplicity of the release (only one job - MyA4B), our increased understanding of how the Marketing Impact solution works also helped and this will have benefits for future releases.
- Go live is next week on Tuesday. Go live activities are low risk and business impacts are low..

Release three:

- Three rounds of proofing have been completed for Claim Acceptance letters and proofs have been signed off this week. While we are aiming to complete in two rounds, round three testing was minimal.
- Version 1.0 of all requirements for release three were completed a week or so later than expected due to the complexity of the Client Payments documents and our lack of familiarity with them.
- Focus is now on preparing for Client Payments proofing. Due to early completion of end to end testing, the team were able to get a head start on release three scenario planning and test files.

Release four:

- Marketing Impact has been working on the final requirements document for Provider Payments notifications in February. This is a very old job, and the requirements do not cover all the output that is being produced.
- This creates a potential risk to the timeline as what the business thinks is happening does not align with what Western Mailing is actually doing.

- **Project status – Amber**
- Release two: **On track for go live next week**
- Release three: **On track**
- Release four: Planning will be completed over next fortnight

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables milestones	Release two	Release three	Release four	Release five
Requirements				
Requirements v1.0 complete	30-Jun-25	9-Feb-26	27-Mar-26	26-Jun-26
Test scenarios and test files ready	30-Jun-25	13-Mar-26	24-Apr-26	7-Aug-26
Development				
All proofs received from Marketing Impact	22-Sept-25	30-Mar-26	6-Jul-26	28-Sept-26
EOS changes ready for go live (CVR48)	NA	TBC	NA	NA
Testing				
System integration and DR testing complete	19-Dec-25	Not applicable	Not applicable	TBC
Document proofing approved	5-Dec-26	15-May-26	21-Aug-26	27-Nov-26
End to end testing complete	20-Feb-26	10-Jul-26	23-Oct-26	26-Feb-27
Go live				
Go Live (first files sent to MI)	25-Feb-26	3-Aug-26	16-Nov-26	15-Mar-27
Transition to business as usual	18-Mar-26	21-Aug-26	4-Dec-26	2-Apr-27

3. Updated project timeline

- We redeveloped the project timeline in February with the Senior BA, the Quality lead and Marketing Impact. The final release is now forecast to go live in July 2027.
- We will be socialising the plan with all members of the project team, and I expect the plan for individual releases to evolve as the project team improves their understanding of the individual jobs.
- Release three and four have a high level of unknowns as they contain Service Delivery jobs that the project team is not familiar with.
- Releases six to seven include the most complex Levy related jobs which are all being updated for the 1 April Levy change. The project team has a higher level of understanding of these jobs.

	Target Date (First file to Marketing Impact)
Release two • MyA4B notifications #11	25-Feb-26
Release Three • Claim acceptance letters #2 • Client payment notifications #12	3-Aug-26
Release four • Client reimbursement notifications #13 • ER Group structure notifications #10 • Provider Payment notifications #14 • SER Infosheets #7	16-Nov-26
Release five • BC notifications #4 • ER Quarterly Claim reports #9	15-Mar-27
Release six • WPC/WPS and AEP invoices #1 • AEP Handback invoices #8	10-May-27
Release seven • CP and CPX invoices #3 • Adhoc letters #15	12-Jul-27

4. Project Budget

Increase in costs reflects the extended project timeline, plus:

- ACC Personnel - increase from three to four Levy BAs
- Contractors - increase in testers from one to three. We have only committed until August 2026 for the additional two testers, but expect to need at least one to the end of the project.
- Marketing Impact:

  Committed

  - Additional project management and contract rate costs as requested by Marketing Impact for this financial year ($108k)
  - BA support from Marketing Impact for the rest of this financial year ($166k).
  - Change requests already actioned or approved ($120)

  Uncommitted

  - Additional project management and contract rate costs for next financial year ($238k)
  - Allowance for change requests to continue at the current rate ($238k)
  - Continued BA support from July to Dec 2026 ($120k)
  - Contingency ($270k)

PROJECT COST	Original Business Case	Revised
(Amounts in $000s)	Budget	Proposed budget
ACC Personnel	586	1,252
Contractor resource	277	1,210
ACC technology/ ARTs	213	159
Marketing Impact	423	1,656
Other Costs	60	13
TOTAL	**1,560**	**4,290**

FY24/25 and FY 25/26	FY26/27
Budget approved	Budget (to be approved)
617	634
519	692
100	59
862	794
13	
2,111	**2,179**

5. Marketing Impact relationship management

Update on Marketing Impact requests (Link to Marketing Impact note)

- Increase in costs for remainder of project
  - [Out of scope] has approved the requested additional project management time and contract rate for this financial year and a variation to the service order is being prepared.
  - The updated budget includes these additional costs through to the end of the project.
- Extension of contract
  - [s 9(2)(h)]
  - A memo is being prepared to get this approved before discussing the proposal with Marketing Impact

Marketing Impact – potential opportunities at ACC

- [s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
- [redacted]

6. Management of Service Delivery Gone No Address

- Service Delivery will have a change in process for management of the GNA (Gone No Address) mail following migration to Marketing Impact. This is delivered in releases three and four.
- In February, it came to the project's attention, that this change had not been socialised and endorsed by Service Delivery. Therefore we raised this with [Out of scope]. [Out of scope] has now reviewed the approach and endorsed it.
- The change in approach will reduce manual handling of envelopes at ACC. In addition, the project will be raising a backlog item with the PART to automate EOS GNA management, as is done for Guidewire. Note – this will not be delivered as part of this project, as it is out of scope.

Current State

- Service Delivery GNA letters go into PO Box 242 (head office)
- All GNA are sorted at Justice and couriered to Hamilton Hub. Client Admin do not process the GNAs (as agreed & approved with client admin leadership in 2023). The envelopes are stored at ACC for six months and then destroyed.

Post migration to Marketing Impact

- EOS and MFP GNA letters will be returned to the same ACC PO Box as Levy letters which is cleared by Marketing Impact. Letters will have a bar code on them. Marketing Impact will scan the bar codes as they do for Guidewire envelopes and send an electronic report of all the GNA letters scanned each day to ACC. The reports will automatically be stored in ACC files. Marketing Impact will destroy the GNA envelopes.
- If and when Service Delivery has resourcing to process the GNA report, access to the reports can be provided to the team to action.
- The only envelopes returned to ACC from Marketing Impact will be those that they were unable to scan. These envelopes will continue to be sorted at Justice and couriered to Hamilton hub. Note – there will be a long tail of GNAs still going to the current inbox as GNA envelopes are not returned immediately.

7. Update on Key Risks

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	High	No further update This risk may be able to be reduced to Medium in the coming months, given the positive impact of new team members, processes and leveraging Marketing Impact
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	Medium	Marketing Impact is now starting to prepare requirements for jobs that are impacted by the 1 April change. This is causing some minor delays, but this is manageable.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don’t really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Medium	We have now documented in detail our processes for proofing, and we are working on processes for requirements writing, business change management and end to end testing. This removes some of the uncertainty, but there will continue to be risks around the unknowns relating to each job, which are not uncovered until the team dig into the detail.
R18	If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.	High	No further update
R03	If pressure is put on the project to go too fast, we may not have sufficient time to ensure all requirements and testing is thorough and this could result in us releasing communications with errors - breaching leg, customer comms errors, privacy breaches, financial impact	Medium	No further update This risk has been on the register since the project began, but I have added it here, as we are managing steady pressure from Marketing Impact for us to keep moving at pace.

Appendix - Change requests

Change requests approved since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
53	#7 SER Info Sheets round one proofing updates	There were significant edits required following round one of proofing for SER Info Sheets, resulting in further over runs for both document composition and Marketing Impact testing. I expect another change request following rounds two and three of SER Info Sheets proofing	$8460
54	Change to SharePoint Expiry Date	This change request increased the days of data saved on the Sharepoint site from 31 days to 35 days to provide a buffer for ACC to download the data each month.	$220
		Total since last steer comm	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
		Previously reported	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
		GRAND TOTAL	**$120,985**

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mailhouse transition project steering committee

Dates: 20th February 2026 **Time:** 11am to midday

Attendees	
[Out of scope]	(Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
[Out of scope]	Principal Advisor (For [Out of Scope])
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems & Operations Manager
[Out of scope]	Manager IT Enterprise Planning

Apologies: [Out of scope]

Agenda items and discussion

1. **Open Actions**

Meeting date	Action	**Who**	**Steering committee discussion**
23 Jan 2026	[s 9(2)(h)]	[Out of scope]	[s 9(2)(h)]
23 Jan 2026	Add finance update into Steer Comm packs in the future.	[Out of scope]	Action closed Included in the February pack
23 Jan 2026	Talk with [Out of scope] about how we bring the project into the fold of the enterprise change portfolio	[Out of scope]	Action closed [Out of scope] said the project was discussed at the Enabling Portfolio review of mandatory projects for next financial year. NTK costs for the project had come up as a separate initiative and should be in the same initiative. The project was not endorsed as the portfolio wanted more information about project performance, confidence in deadlines and funding requirements. [Out of scope] will work with [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] to provide the information. [Out of scope] asked whether if it was endorsed it would be funded from the change portfolio. [Out of scope] said yes and it should have been funded from the change portfolio this financial year, but it fell through the cracks planning.
	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] agreed to complete this action this month.

2. Project Overview

- [Out of scope] provided a comprehensive update on the project's status, highlighting that all releases are on track, with end-to-end testing for release two completed early and releases three and four underway.
- Overall project status remains Amber until budget is confirmed
- [Out of scope] noted that there are challenges with release 4 due to lack of documentation and conflicting understanding of how the Provider Payments job works, but this is not impacting timelines at this stage.
- [Out of scope] asked whether the project had checked with [Out of scope] about the proofing approach and [Out of Scope] confirmed that he has approved the proofing approach and we have an additional proofer on board to boost resources.

3. Updated Project timeline

- [Out of scope] noted that the updated timeline is based on our best understanding and taking learnings from past releases. She will keep updating the plan as we progress,
- Release three and four have the greatest unknowns, and releases five to seven are very complex but there is subject matter expertise in the project team.
- [Out of scope] noted that he observes a real change in the way the project is performing.
- [Out of scope] said that she was working to ensure that there was cross skilling across the project.
- [Out of scope] talked about the cost of delay – how much does the cost increase, versus just moving the cost. [Out of scope] said that this would be helpful information.
- [Out of scope] noted that a lot of work had been done to bring the team back into a good space and it was important to keep the positivity and being clear on the escalation process as delays are inevitable, so we don't get too far into delays and fine we have no other option

4. Project Budget

- [Out of scope] gave the Steering committee a perspective on the budget changes.
- [Out of scope] said it's important to note that some of the cost we are incurring is because of the lack of documentation to start with. She noted that this challenge is not unique to this project at ACC. [Out of scope] said it would be good to have this recorded as it is an important part of the story.
- [Out of scope] asked if the $2.1M for this financial year was included in the current forecast and [Out of scope] said it was.
- [Out of scope] asked where the next financial year forecast was budgeted, and [Out of scope] said in his cost centre.
- [Out of scope] said that Change Management resources - project manager, testers - would need to be prioritised against other projects as we are constrained for change delivery. Regardless of where the funding is coming for – our ability to go out and get contractors is limited. [Out of scope] asked if there is a risk people on the project might get pulled off the project - [Out of scope] said yes. [Out of scope] to follow up.
- [Out of scope] said the cost of the project is getting to a level that needs organisational governance – we need to provide transparency outside the steering committee as it could impact other projects. [Out of scope] to talk to the EPMO and see what their thoughts are

5. Marketing Impact Relationship

- [Out of Scope] noted that Marketing Impacts request for a cost increase has been included in the forecast budget.

- [s 9(2)(h)]
- [Out of Scope] said that Marketing Impact have approached her about a programme they are doing with Enable as they are keen to share the work with people in ACC and see if there are opportunities within ACC. Jeannie said to reach out to [Out of Scope] the Portfolio Manager for the Enable contract.

6. **Management of Service Delivery Gone No Address**

- [Out of scope] explained that Service Delivery will transition from handling physical GNA mail to receiving electronic reports, the change has now been accepted by Service Delivery.

7. **Risks Update**

- [Out of scope] provided an update on key risks

Other business

- [Out of scope] noted that while the project status is left at Amber, but given the replanning and budget request, it feels appropriate once budget is approved to bring the project status back to Green.
- [Out of scope] said we wanted to align with the EPMO processes and that we were not intentionally going outside the project.

Actions from this meeting

	What	Who	Status
1	Follow up on securing change management resources for next financial year – Project Manager and testing	[Out of scope]	Open
2	Confirm organisational governance for next financial year to ensure appropriate alignment with EPMO	[Out of scope]	Open

Open actions from Previous meetings

Meeting date	Action	Who	
14/10/25	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	

Mailhouse Transition Project

Steering Committee Meeting

20 March 2026, 11am
Justice 11.02 or Teams Meeting

Prepared by [Out of scope], Project Manager

Steering Committee Members

[Out of scope] (Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] Business Owner)
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope] (for [Out of scope])
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]
[Out of scope]

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Agenda

1. Open actions
2. Project overview
3. Project budget update
4. Marketing Impact relationship
5. Risks update

Appendix – change requests

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	What	Who	Status	Updates
20 Feb 2026	Follow up on securing change management resources for next financial year – Project Manager and testing	[Out of scope]	Closed	Spoke with [Out of scope] (Testing) and [Out of scope] (Change Delivery) to confirm ongoing resource requirements
20 Feb 2026	Confirm organisational governance for next financial year to ensure appropriate alignment with EPMO	[Out of scope]	Open	
2025	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	Closed	11/12/25 - [Out of scope] will advise [Out of scope] who she is best to talk to in the new year 16/3/26 – [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] have discussed and contact made with Privacy and the owners of each of the Service Delivery letters.

2. Project Overview

The project status will move to Green as soon as budgets are confirmed.

- **Project status – Amber**
- Release two: **Complete**
- Release three: **On track**
- Release four: **On track**

Risk based proofing update

- Proofing for the Client Payments job is underway. This is the first job that we have been able to proof entirely using our risk based approach.
  - The main challenge is the large number of letter variations. Following our risk based approach, the test sample is much more focussed, but there are still over 200 letters to check.
  - [Out of scope] from Customer Engagement will review key variations as well as the proofers.
  - With Easter leave and some new proofers needing to come up to speed, there is potential that the proofing completion date will slip. We will monitor this closely.

Impact of bespoke requirements

- A key risk to the project is unexpected or bespoke requirements being identified resulting in potential for delays and/or increased costs.
- There were two examples of this in the last month. Impact assessments have been completed and both have been accommodated in the current timeline, with change requests for both to cover additional Marketing Impact effort/ cost:
  - Requirement for a control file for the Claim Acceptance job.
  - Real time emails for Client reimbursement job. To manage this impact, [Out of scope] approved a change to emails from real time to batched. This brings the job in line with the standard Marketing Impact workflow for ACC and aligns with the move from hourly to end of day travel reimbursement payments.

Not started
On track
At risk or delayed - being managed
Significant issues impacting timeline or cost
Complete

Release deliverables milestones	Release two	Release three	Release four	Release five
Requirements				
Requirements v1.0 complete	30-Jun-25	9-Feb-26	27-Mar-26	26-Jun-26
Test scenarios and test files ready	30-Jun-25	13-Mar-26	24-Apr-26	7-Aug-26
Development				
All proofs received from Marketing Impact	22-Sept-25	30-Mar-26	6-Jul-26	28-Sept-26
EOS changes ready for go live (CVR48)	NA	TBC	NA	NA
Testing				
System integration and DR testing complete	19-Dec-25	Not applicable	Not applicable	TBC
Document proofing approved	5-Dec-26	15-May-26	21-Aug-26	27-Nov-26
End to end testing complete	20-Feb-26	10-Jul-26	23-Oct-26	26-Feb-27
Go live				
Go Live (first files sent to MI)	25-Feb-26	3-Aug-26	16-Nov-26	15-Mar-27
Transition to business as usual	18-Mar-26	21-Aug-26	4-Dec-26	2-Apr-27

3. Project Budget

The project budget was reset and presented to the Steering committee last month.

Costs are tracking in line with the forecast and based on progress to over the last couple of months, we are reasonably confident that we will continue to track to budget

The main risks to the budget are:

Timing

- If the project exceeds the planned timeline, costs will increase incrementally for supporting the project team at ACC and MI.
- When the jobs are more complex or include unexpected bespoke requirements, this has down stream impacts for project complexity, regression testing and therefore time and cost.
- There is some contingency within the timeline and we continue to try and identify opportunities to where any changes to the timeline can be mitigated by working differently.

Marketing Impact variations/ change requests

- Marketing Impact request variations when the time taken to deliver ACC requirements is outside their initial quote.
- Change requests vary month to month. The forecast has change requests continuing at the rate in the first year of the project at around [s 9(2)(b)(ii)] per month.
- $24,500 has been requested since the last meeting which is above the forecast.

PROJECT COST	Actual cost to date	Forecast cost to date	Total budget	Budget remaining
(Amounts in $000s)				
ACC Personnel	399	404	1,252	853
Contractor resource	287	286	1,210	923
ACC technology/ ARTs	53	57	159	106
Marketing Impact	540	547	1,656	1,116
Other Costs	12	13	13	-
TOTAL	**1,323**	**1,338**	**4,290**	**2,967**

4. Marketing Impact relationship management

Update on Marketing Impact requests (Link to Marketing Impact note)

- Increase in costs for remainder of project
  - The Service order variation to increase in costs for this financial year is currently at the approval stage.
  - An additional variation for next financial year will be prepared once the full project budget is approved.
- Extension of contract
  - Megan Main has approved the memo to offer an additional 2 years for the Marketing Impact contract.
  - Next steps are to discuss with Marketing Impact.

5. Update on Key Risks

Ref	Risk description (from risk register)		Commentary since last meeting
R01	Key person risk - If subject matter experts and key people are not available or do not have enough capacity, then there may be issues that we do not pick up, and/or the project may be delayed	Medium	I have reduced this risk to Medium. We now have three established and one new BA on the project who are building their understanding of the work. We have cross skilled the majority of activities across at least two BAs and/or testers.
R04	There is a regulatory change during the project period which impacts the invoices that the project is moving. If we can not have our releases aligned with these changes, or if additional regulatory changes come up that we need to incorporate there is a risk of missing regulatory deadlines or we may have to stop working on the project to deliver these changes, resulting in delays to project delivery	Low	Rating reduced to low. The 1 April regulatory changes are now in hand with Guidewire changes implemented. The project is now able to get up to date data files etc and to proceed with documentation of the impacted jobs.
R07	Because this is the first time the team have done a project like this, we don't really know how long everything will take and so there is a risk that the project will take a lot longer than planned	Low	With processes documented and the team established, I have moved this risk to Low
R18	If Service Delivery is unable to release SMEs for proofing of their four mail house jobs, proofing will either be delayed, or will have to be completed entirely by Levy team members. This could result in project delays and/ or errors in outputs.	Medium	We have commenced proofing the Service Delivery jobs. Claire Lenssen from Comms has said she will also review all the major letter variations, adding an additional level of confidence.
R03	If pressure is put on the project to go too fast, we may not have sufficient time to ensure all requirements and testing is thorough and this could result in us releasing communications with errors - breaching leg, customer comms errors, privacy breaches, financial impact	Low	With our replan complete and accepted, I have moved this down to Low and will continue to provide visibility of progress. Risk to be removed from Steering committee pack from next month
R05	As current state is not well documented, unexpected requirements may be identified resulting in delays and/or increased costs and/or errors in correspondence	Medium	With a number of risks moving to Low, this risk has come up the priority queue. This risk is ongoing. As ACC and Marketing Impact dig into the detail of each job, new challenges are identified.

Appendix - Change requests

Change requests approved/ in progress since last meeting

#	Change	Rationale	Cost
55	Release three end to end testing	End to end testing overrun and defect management. An overrun is forecast for end to end on each release. This overrun for release 3 is significantly less than forecast.	[s 9(2)(b)(ii)]
56	Marketing Impact proofing for Claim Acceptance	Overrun to budget allocation for internal proofing for this job.	
57	Client Payments document composition	Client Payments consists of 21 different letter variations and the initial SOW budget was insufficient for document composition. A further variation is expected in March.	
58	Claim Acceptance control file	A control file is required to be sent with the Claim acceptance file each day. There is a significant change to the Marketing Impact workflow to accommodate this.	
59	Change Client Reimbursement emails from real time to daily batch	The travel reimbursement job currently has real time email delivery. Sarvesh Datt approved a change to batched emails which aligns with the move away from straight through processing of travel reimbursements and is cheaper to implement. The cost is to cover 1) MI time for investigating options for real time 2) changes to accommodate intraday files in the batch process and 3) requirements updates.	
		Total since last steer comm	
		Previously reported	
		GRAND TOTAL	**$145,485**

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

Minutes

Meeting: Mailhouse transition project steering committee

Dates: 20th March 2026 **Time:** 11am to 11.30am

Attendees	
[Out of scope]	(Senior Responsible Owner)
[Out of scope] (Business Owner)	Manager Treasury & Revenue Operations
[Out of scope]	Principal Advisor (For [Out of Scope])
[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
[Out of scope]	Levy Systems & Operations Manager
[Out of scope]	Manager IT Enterprise Planning

Apologies: [Out of scope]

Agenda items and discussion

1. Open Actions

Meeting date	Action	Who	Steering committee discussion
20 Feb 2026	Follow up on securing change management resources for next financial year – Project Manager and testing	[Out of scope]	[Out of scope] noted that she had spoken with [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] about retaining our project change team members into next financial year. Action closed
20 Feb 2026	Confirm organisational governance for next financial year to ensure appropriate alignment with EPMO	[Out of scope]	It is likely that the project will move into the EPMO world. [Out of scope] and [Out of scope] are comfortable [Out of scope] did not believe it would change much for the project [Out of scope] said that EPMO were also asking about the status of the project heading into the next financial year Action closed
2025	Connect with the Rehab and Treatment portfolio to get a heads up on potential future impacts	[Out of scope]	[Out of scope] and [Out of scope] have discussed and contact made with Privacy and the owners of each of the Service Delivery letters Action closed

2. Project Overview

- [Out of scope] noted the project is tracking well. RAG status is still Amber as budget is not confirmed.
- [Out of scope] gave an update on progress with risk based proofing noting that improvements are for consolidating test scenarios and the team are now looking at the test scripts.
- [Out of scope] asked about any impact of EOS to Cloud. [Out of scope] said that the proofing work was with MI and had no dependency on EOS to Cloud. Next week during PI planning we will be meeting with PART to get our EOS dependencies confirmed.

He Kaupare. He Manaaki. He Whakaora.
Prevention. Care. Recovery.

- [Out of scope] talked about the impact of unexpected bespoke requirements arising and said that the process to manage this is working and we have been able to accommodate two issues which arose this month.
- [Out of scope] asked [Out of scope] how the team are going. [Out of scope] said the team is going pretty well. A new BA started today. We are balancing need between making sure project is resourced versus other needs throughout Rev Ops.
- [Out of scope] noted that the downside of moving people into the project is while good people get a progression opportunity its disappointing for the team that loses them.
- [Out of scope] said we are having a quarterly planning day next week to ensure the team all get a chance to have input into the plan.

3. **Project Budget**

- [Out of scope] called out the key risks to the budget – time and Marketing Impact change requests.
- [Out of scope] asked whether we put any bid up for next financial year and [Out of scope] said no its all in his cost centre. It was also noted that there is also an NTK component. [Out of scope] said that we need to be conscious that some of the project costs under ACC personnel are existing staff who have been redirected onto the project.

4. **Marketing Impact relationship**

- [s 9(2)(g)(i)]

5. **Risks Update**

- [Out of scope] said she had reviewed the risk register and ratings of the risks. Next month the Low rated risks will not be included in the steering committee pack.
- In relation to the risk about unexpected requirements, [Out of scope] asked whether the project is documenting the requirements and [Out of scope] said yes and that we will be in a much better space next time
- [Out of scope] noted that the challenge is maintaining the documents and this is an enterprise risk, which we are seeing across the organisation.
- The committee agreed that when we are translating out of project mode, we need to ensure we identify who will be accountable for keeping the documents up to date both in Rev Ops and in Service Delivery. [Out of scope] said identifying who is on the hook to maintain them is key and that this could be something to raise with [Out of scope] .

6. **Change requests**

- [Out of scope] said that two kinds of change requests are coming through:
  - Overun of costs against what they originally quoted over a year ago
  - Change requests when something unexpected happens

Other business

No other business

No actions from this meeting

Terms of Reference

Mail House Transition Project Steering Group

The ACC Groups and Committees – Code of Practice and the details below form the Terms of Reference of the Group.

Details

Term	15 months from March 2025 to June 2026
Purpose	The purpose of this document is to provide clarity and understanding of roles on the Mail house transition Steering Group. This document provides details on roles and responsibilities for Steering Group members in delivering good governance for the project.
Decision-Making Authority	The project Steering Group supports the governance of the project and is not the formal authority for approving changes outside members' existing business and operational delegations. As a business-as-usual project, the project is governed by business-as-usual approval processes for project costs. The project Steering Group represents the interests of the involved business divisions and the customer. It provides overall direction and management of the project and has responsibility and authority for the project within its remit. The Steering Group is responsible for assurance that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcome(s). Steering Group members support the project Senior Responsible Owner in making decisions, and provide oversight, guidance and direction to the Project team. Steering Group: • Understand the context – what we are trying to do, why we are doing it and what we need to achieve to be successful

	• Understand how the defined outcome will be met through the project activities • Stay engaged in the progress and direction of the project • Bring insights from relevant broader context to the project • Ensure the Project remains aligned with the organisation's strategic direction • Evaluate risks and the effectiveness of mitigations • Question the thinking and assumptions behind project management deliverables • Act objectively and independently • Make timely decisions that are in the best interest of the organisation as a whole.
Responsibilities	The Steering Group is responsible for the successful delivery of the project, as agreed by the sponsor, and overseeing progress across all the project's components. The Steering Group is an escalation point for the project, providing answers and decisions for the project to proceed and to overcome any problems and acts as the key decision-making support for the project. As part of directing the Project, the Steering Group will: • Endorse all major plans and resources • Assess escalated Project risks and issues and approve recommendations for mitigating actions The Steering Group is required to carry out its responsibilities throughout the life of the project, as follows: <u>Plan</u> • Ensure all members are aware of and agree to their role and responsibilities • Endorse the overall Project plan timelines and milestones, seeking to ensure that they are sufficient to enable progress to be monitored clearly and effectively • Endorse Project to deliver. <u>Deliver</u> • Check the Project remains on track to achieve intended outcomes by monitoring progress

	• Commit to supplying required resources (or resources equivalent from elsewhere) to enable Project activities to be successfully achieved • Give direction and guidance to the Project SRO • Approve key Project documents • Ensure change and communication strategies and plans are adhered to, so that interested and impacted stakeholders are clear on Project objectives, impacts and deliverables • Review progress against agreed milestones and receive regular written and, as appropriate oral, reports from Project Manager providing evidence of deliverables, raising risks and mitigation and dependencies • Oversee and approve requests for change by applying a robust Change Control process • Oversee the spending of the Project budget in terms of resource, cost and time seeking to ensure that they remain within tolerances • Manage, or authorise the Project SRO to manage, escalated Project risks and issues • Approve Project to close • Where required, may recommend Project termination. Close • Check that all deliverables have been delivered satisfactorily • Confirm that operational and support groups are prepared to take responsibility for the Project's outcome • Confirm that the customer is prepared for handover • Celebration of success of Project • Endorse the Post Project Review Report • Endorse Project closure.
Risk Appetite	The risk appetite of the Portfolio Governance Group is aligned to ACC's Risk Appetite Statement and the Enterprise Risk Management Framework. Risk appetite is defined by a Risk Appetite Statement (RAS) which describes ACC's philosophy, approach, and tolerance to achieve our objectives. The risk tolerance is set by the Board, supported by our policies, risk ratings and risk metrics. Appetite Ratings: | Averse | Cautious | Neutral | Receptive | Open

The purpose of the Enterprise Risk Management Framework enables us to successfully achieve our objectives as an organisation by enhancing informed decision making and enabling the right kind of risks to be taken in pursuit of value and the achievement of strategic and performance objectives.

Meeting Frequency, Location, and Documentation

The Steering Group meeting will be held at monthly intervals unless it is agreed between the Project SRO and the Project Manager that a meeting is unnecessary due to there being no significant decisions to be made or actions to report.

Out of cycle meetings can be requested by any Steering Group member to the Project SRO when key decisions are required, key milestones are completing or starting or deliverables need to be signed off.

A Steering Group Pack is to be drafted by the Project Manager and approved by the project Business Owner. The final version of this pack is to be distributed to all Members by email no later than one working day before the day on which the meeting is held. Actions and decisions of meetings are to be distributed to Steering Group members within three working days of the meeting.

Membership

The quorum for a meeting is 50% of the members which must include the Project SRO and at least two members.

The membership of the Steering Group comprises:

Role	Name	Job Title
Project SRO	[Out of scope]	Head of Financial Services
Business Owner	[Out of scope]	Manager Treasury and Revenue Operations
Senior Suppliers	[Out of scope]	Head of Enterprise Procurement
	[Out of scope]	Manager Client Administration
	[Out of scope]	Team Manager Levy Systems & Processes
	[Out of scope]	Manager DCE Office

	Diane Musgrove	Technology

Additional attendees, at the Project SRO’s discretion:

Project Role	Name	Job Title
Project Manager	[Out of scope]	Project Manager – Change Delivery

Note: Additional attendees may only attend specific parts of the meeting, not the whole thing.

Additional attendees may be invited when particular issues are under consideration and they need to report on progress or answer questions.

In general, the practice of attending Steering Group meetings merely to be 'kept in the loop' should be discouraged as this can lead to each meeting having an unwieldy number of attendees and the focus on proper progress management being diverted into more generic discussion. Those present at a Steering Group meeting should be there either to report progress, answer questions or make decisions.

The invitation of other Project members or subject matter experts to attend for the discussion of items relevant to their responsibilities is at the discretion of the Steering Group.

Secretary	Project Manager
Additional/Special Conditions	Although not a recognised member of the Steering Group, the Project Manager has the authority to run the Project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Steering Group. The prime responsibility is to ensure the project delivers the required deliverables to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost.

He Kaupare. He Manaaki.
He Whakaora.
prevention. care. recovery.

Terms of Reference – Appendices

Mail house project Steering Group

The responsibilities below are in addition to responsibilities in the ACC Groups and Committees – Code of Practice.

1. Roles and responsibilities

Project Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)	• The Project SRO is the individual with ultimate accountability for the success of the Project. The Project SRO ensures that the Project represents value for money and follows a cost-conscious approach whilst balancing the needs of the customer and the business. The Project SRO 'owns' the Project's deliverables.
Business Owner (Member)	• The Business Owner represents the interests of the ACC end-users of the Project's deliverables and is the receiver of the Project's outputs: • Articulate business needs and requirements for the project. • Ensure project outcomes align with business objectives. • Offer feedback and input throughout the project. • Offer guidance and support to the project manager as needed.
Senior Supplier (Member)	• The Senior Suppliers represent the interests their business unit and are responsible for ensuring the delivered solution meets client specification and ongoing requirements. • The Senior Suppliers are responsible for providing the Project SRO with advice related to the feasibility and do-ability of the proposed solution throughout the life of a Project. • The Senior Suppliers are responsible for the resources providing design, development, facilitation, procurement and implementation of the Project's products.

Project Manager (Attendee)	• The Project Manager has the authority to run the Project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Steering Group. The prime responsibility is to ensure the Project delivers the required deliverables to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. • The Project Manager acts as the secretariat for this Committee with the support from the Lead BA.