



WBS CHECKLIST

This is a checklist to use when reviewing the quality of a [Work Breakdown Structure](#).

- Does it define 100% of the work that will be produced by the [project](#)?
- Does each element represent a [deliverable](#)?
- Does it use a coding structure so that each element has a unique ID that shows its place in the hierarchy e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 1.1.1, 1.1.2?
- Will [project stakeholders](#) be able to understand the [project scope](#) from the [WBS](#)?
- Does it capture all external and internal [deliverables](#) including project management [deliverables](#)?
- Does each level represent 100% of the work required to deliver the parent level?
- Is the decomposition sufficient that the tasks required to deliver each [work package](#) can easily be identified?
- Is it in the format that gives a clear graphical, textual, or tabular breakdown of the [project scope](#)?
- Is a hierarchical structure used?
- Does it have a least two levels with at least one level of decomposition?
- Was it created by those who will be performing the work?
- Is it being regularly updated as [project changes](#) are approved?
- Can you identify one person who is accountable for each [work package](#)?
- Can you clearly define the acceptance criteria for each [work package](#)?
- Does it allow you to estimate costs accurately?
- Does the [WBS](#) have logical summary elements that can be used in tracking progress and performance?
- Does the [WBS](#) provide sufficient detail to create an Organisational Breakdown Structure and [Responsibility Assignment Matrix](#) or [RACI](#)?
- Is there an alignment between the [WBS](#) and project accounting structures?
- Is the [WBS](#) sufficient to support reporting at a team, [project](#), program and portfolio level?
- Does the [WBS](#) align with the size and complexity of the project? Is it sufficiently detailed to support planning and control, but not so detailed as to become cumbersome?