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**Audience**

*Assurance Reviews Process – A Handbook for Conducting Assurance Reviews.* This Handbook applies to non-corporate Commonwealth entities (NCCE) that are subject to reviews under the Australian Government Assurance Reviews Framework. It is primarily intended for use by review team leaders and members but may also be of relevance to other stakeholders of the assurance review process wishing to become more familiar with the conduct of the reviews.

**Key points**

- Assurance reviews are principle based, providing flexibility for refining and adapting to changing environments, including increasing financial risk and complexities associated with governance.
- The primary purpose of this Handbook is to provide a non-exhaustive, practical resource to assist assurance reviewers prepare for and conduct assurance reviews. However, NCCEs will also gain a useful insight into the process and their role in it.
- It is part of a series of guidance material developed by Efficiency, Assurance and Digital Government, within the Governance and Resource Management Group in the Department of Finance (Finance). The Handbook should be read in conjunction with its companion publication, *Guidance on the Assurance Review Process RMG No.106– Australian Government Assurance Reviews for Programmes and Projects* (the Guidance). Links to the Guidance and other related materials are provided under Resources, below.

**Resources**


The information in this publication is based on Gateway Review Pack—Best Practice (Version 2), published by the State of Victoria through the Department of Treasury and Finance in 2004 and the Successful Delivery Toolkit (Version 4.5), published by the United Kingdom Office of Government Commerce (OGC), in 2004. The Victorian Gateway documentation is subject to copyright protection by the State of Victoria and is reproduced with its permission. The Successful Delivery Toolkit is a Crown Copyright value-added product and is developed, owned and published by the OGC. It is subject to Crown Copyright protection and is reproduced under licence with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office and the OGC.

The Assurance Reviews Unit (ARU) within Finance provides a range of policy, guidance and assistance services in support of the assurance review function, including:

- providing guidance on the completion of the Risk Potential Assessment Tool (RPAT);
- assisting entities that are subject to an assurance review on administrative and operational matters;
- facilitating the provision of assurance reviewer training programmes and forums;
- developing reference and supporting materials; and
- periodically publishing lessons learned and better practice guidance from assurance reviews conducted.
The related materials listed below may be found at http://www.finance.gov.au/assurancereviews

Guidance

*Guidance on the Assurance Reviews Process RMG No.106* (the Guidance)

*Risk Potential Assessment Tool and Guidance RMG No.107* (the RPAT Guidance, Instructions and the RPAT form)

Information sheets

*Q&A for Review Team Members on the Assurance Review Process*

Contact information

Enquiries regarding the Australian Government’s Assurance Reviews Framework or the application of the assurance reviews methodology should be directed to:

Assurance Reviews Unit
Digital Government Investment and Assurance Branch
Efficiency, Assurance and Digital Government
Department of Finance
John Gorton Building, King Edward Terrace
PARKES ACT 2600

Email: AssuranceReviews@finance.gov.au

**Summary**

The Handbook should complement the expertise of assurance reviewers, providing a consistent framework from which to conduct assurance reviews across a range of different projects or programmes. It possesses examples of areas to probe and the types of evidence expected at various or key stages throughout programme design, implementation and delivery.
Introduction and Overview

Part 1: Australian Government Assurance Reviews

Assurance reviews are principle based, providing flexibility for refining and adapting to changing environments, including increasing financial risk and complexities associated with governance.


There are two key types of assurance reviews, they are:

1. Implementation Readiness Assessments; and

Gateway was phased in from the 2006–07 Budget, focusing initially on a representative cross-section of projects that satisfied the financial thresholds or were identified as high risk.

However, the complexity and implementation challenges that can accompany programme delivery, particularly cross-portfolio programmes, have led the Government to extend the application of the Gateway assurance methodology to apply to programmes as well (2011).

The broader application of the Gateway process to programmes underpins a more complete application of the assurance methodology across government, thereby supporting improved policy delivery.

The Government also introduced the IRA in 2011, after experiences demonstrated that the quality of delivery is improved when implementation issues are considered during policy design.

Assurance reviews provide independent and timely assurance in relation to appropriate, effective and efficient delivery of Government outcomes and objectives. They form an integrated package so the assurance process is cohesive rather than disjointed and one that has evolved over time to meet the needs of Senior Responsible Officials (SRO) and entities.

Experience and feedback has shown that assurance reviews assist:

- the development and maintenance of a robust Business Case with key milestones, deliverables and benefits clearly articulated;
- implementation design and planning;
- development of risk management strategies to address challenges associated with competing priorities, resources and capability as well as complexities and attendant risks, such as those attached to cross-jurisdictional responsibilities;
- the management of regulatory environments that may expose a programme to failure if not properly identified and managed;
- development of governance, accountability and reporting strategies to ensure appropriate support and oversight during implementation and delivery of outcomes and benefits; and
- the building of capability and cultivation of better practice through independent peer review and mentoring.
Part 2: Assurance Reviews methodologies

Risk Potential Assessment Tool (RPAT)

Each entity will assess the inherent risk factors associated with their New Policy Proposals (NPP). All NPPs include a risk assessment and the Risk Potential Assessment Tool (RPAT) assists entities to determine and communicate the potential risk of a proposal to ministers before seeking the Governments agreement.

The resultant risk rating can inform whether additional assurance processes should be applied. Finance will as part of the assessment process, consult with relevant stakeholders for the related proposal. Stakeholders for this purpose include:

- Portfolio entities; and
- Central entities;

Decisions to commission assurance reviews are made by Government, usually during the pre-budget considerations of NPPs and Portfolio Budget Submissions.

More information on the RPAT may be found at: http://www.finance.gov.au/assurancereviews

The Gateway Review Process (Gateway)

Gateway examines programmes and projects at key decision points during design, implementation and delivery. It aims to provide independent, timely advice and assurance to the SRO as the person responsible for delivering programme or project outcomes. Each review provides the SRO with an overall Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) on the progress of the programme or project and gives assurance that it can proceed successfully.

A review is a point-in-time, independent peer-review assessment that focuses on completed work and which takes up to five days. The process is intended to be supportive and forward-looking, taking into account future plans to deliver and intended outcomes and benefits. The use of highly skilled and experienced independent reviewers, sourced from the private and public sectors (many of whom are senior Australian Public Servants) is intended to increase the confidence in implementation. Gateway reviews demonstrably assist the SRO’s oversight and governance of major programmes/projects and assist with the delivery of agreed programmes/projects in accordance with the stated objectives.

For the best result, a review is carried out shortly before a decision point or stage transition to allow sufficient time for any recommendations to be implemented.

Gateway is not an audit process nor does it replace an entity’s responsibility and accountability for implementing decisions and programmes. Gateway has played a unique role in strengthening assurance practices, as well as building and sharing capability associated with the delivery and implementation of Government programmes and services.

Gateway applies to proposals undertaken by agencies which require government approval and which are assessed to be high risk and which satisfy certain financial thresholds (Note: Gateway does not apply to Defence Capability Plan projects assessed by Cabinet under the Kinnaird two-pass approval process):

Projects with:

- an estimated total cost of $30 million or more for procurement or infrastructure projects, or
- an estimated total cost of $30 million or more, including an ICT component of at least $10 million.

Programmes with:

- a total cost greater than $50 million.
These thresholds apply to the total value of a programme/project regardless of the timeframe for delivery, including the delivery of benefits.

Gates for Projects

There are six different reviews that occur at critical stages (Gates or decision points) of a project’s lifecycle. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Gate</th>
<th>Focus of Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gate 0</td>
<td>Business Need - assures that the scope and purpose has been adequately assessed, communicated, fits within the entity’s overall business strategy and/or whole-of-Government strategies and policies, and that the expected benefits have been identified and measures have been considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate 1</td>
<td>Business Case - focuses on the robustness of a project’s proposed approach to meeting the business requirement and whether it can be delivered within the timeframe and with the resources provided. Assures that a benefits management approach has been applied, improvements are clearly defined and can be quantified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate 2</td>
<td>Delivery Strategy – provides assurance that the procurement strategy establishes a clear definition of the project and a plan for its implementation and, has made an assessment of the project’s potential for success. Assures that benefits agreed upon in previous stages have been aligned to the delivery effort and assesses if the project is ready to invite proposals or tenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate 3</td>
<td>Investment Decision - provides assurance on the supplier selection, that the business needs are likely to be met through the project and contract management controls, and that the processes are in place for contract delivery. Assures that benefits management strategies and plans have been incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate 4</td>
<td>Readiness for Service - provides assurance on whether the solution is robust before delivery, assesses organisational readiness before and after delivery. Considers the basis for evaluating ongoing performance and assesses whether benefits are likely to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate 5</td>
<td>Benefits Realisation - focuses on measuring the project’s success to date in achieving its objectives. Considers expectations for the future and any potential remedial action required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stages for Programmes

There are three different review stages that occur for programmes, these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Stage or Gate</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First stage review</td>
<td>Conducted before or soon after Government approval. It assists entities in defining the programme by examining the business need and formulation of the business case. Can also be conducted whenever the priority or the scope of the programme changes significantly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mid stage review

Focus is on assessing the programme execution with the number of these reviews being determined by the complexity, timeframe and risks attached to the programme. These reviews can be conducted multiple times throughout programme implementation.

Final stage review

Focus is on programme closure, including programme controls, records management and the identification and application of lessons learned as well as the delivery of the intended outcomes and benefits.

### Implementation Readiness Assessments (IRA)

An IRA is a one-off review and in most cases occurs pre-decision. IRAs focus strategically on key areas in determining the capability and preparedness of the entity in planning to implement a proposal and, in doing so, provide entities with the opportunity to gain independent assurance on how well practical delivery issues are being addressed.

An IRA would typically occur at the final stages of the development process prior to consideration by decision makers.

It is a collective and collaborative effort to examine an issue from different points of view prior to taking a decision. An IRA assists with strengthening of policy design by building recognition of common values, shared commitment and emerging issues, and by providing an understanding of causal relationships.

Being structured as a time-limited review and by relying on interviews and existing documentation/material, the IRA is not anticipated to be unduly onerous for entities in terms of administration or preparation.

The outcome of an IRA is a succinct review report designed to clarify the key issues and risks and provide insights for managing and mitigating implementation risk.

Reviews are designed to:

- assess the programme implementation strategy against its specified objectives;
- provide early identification of any areas that may require corrective action, and
- increase confidence that a programme implementation strategy is effective and conclusive, draws on experience and better practices, has effectively identified risks to implementation and has plans to manage these.

Key attributes include:

- One-off review to provide additional assurance for high risk proposals to the responsible minister, entity accountable authority and Cabinet;
- Reviews provide a point in time assessment of the effectiveness in planning for implementation;
- Central entity stakeholders are also interviewed to inform the IRA review; and
- Review findings inform the brief leading into Cabinet deliberation on the proposal.

### The Review Report

The IRA review report is provided to the SRO on the last day of the review, with a briefing by the review team on the review's conclusions and recommendations. This briefing generally takes no more than an hour to complete. The report will contain the review team's assessment (defined below) and recommendations, indicating when action is required at that particular point in time.
Drafting of the report should commence as soon as practicable and as daily interviews are conducted. Typically, the review team will spend the penultimate day of the review finalising the report for presentation to the SRO as a draft. The review team will base their report on interviews conducted and documentation read, applying judgment and expertise.

The final review report should be signed by the SRO and all members of the review team when delivered on the last day of the review.

The review report will include:

- the review team’s assessment of overall delivery confidence (Gateway) or significant challenges to implementation (IRA); key findings and any recommendations, indicating when action should be taken;
- an overall conclusion on the programme/project’s status and its readiness to progress to the next phase (Gateway);
- background to the programme/project, including its origin, the outcomes it seeks to achieve, and how those outcomes link to the entity’s business strategy and/or high level policy objectives;
- the purpose, scope and approach of the review; logistics of the review, including review dates, SRO; review team membership, stakeholders interviewed and documents accessed; and
- where relevant, progress achieved against previous review recommendations.

### Sharing the findings of the Review Report

Gateway review reports are for the purpose of informing the sponsoring entity and as such, they are only provided to the SRO. It is up to the SRO to determine how the report should be communicated.

To have maximum impact the outcome and recommendations arising from assurance activities should be shared across the wider project/programme team and, in many cases, further afield to those affected by the project/programme. Not sharing can lead, for instance, to decisions being made in ignorance of the findings of assurance activities or can mean that stakeholders may be unaware of why changes to the project/programme are being proposed, possibly leading to delay and opposition to those proposed changes.

Sharing and reviewing the outputs of assurance activities underpins an effective integrated assurance model, and maintaining an integrated assurance log can be a useful tool. In a similar vein, the outcomes and recommendations from assurance should be escalated to the level where appropriate remedial actions can be sanctioned. SROs are encouraged, to circulate their reports to key stakeholders and governance arrangements. The aim is to ensure that the appropriate people are aware of issues arising and problems identified, and are able to take the requisite action.1

The Assurance Reviews Unit (ARU) receives copies of review reports to use as a key source of information for the preparation and dissemination of the lessons learned and better practice report.

IRA reports are also made available to the responsible minister, the portfolio entity secretary and/or entity accountable authority, and the Departments of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C), Finance and the Treasury. Finance will use the report to refer to the outcome of the IRA in a briefing provided to the Government.

---

1 OGC Lessons Learned Effective Project Assurance (June 2009)
Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) for Gateway

The DCA represents the collective view of the review team on the overall likelihood of success for the project or programme, taking into account the timing of the review and the stage within the project/programme lifecycle. A five-tier 'rating' system is used in Gateway reviews as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost, quality standards and benefits realisation appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green/Amer</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost, quality standards and benefits realisation appears probable however constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not become major issues threatening delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost, quality standards and benefits realisation appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These need to be addressed promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer/Red</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost, quality standards and benefits realisation is in doubt with major issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to address these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Successful delivery of the programme/project appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on programme definition, schedule, budget, quality or benefits delivery, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme/project may need to be re-baselined and/or overall viability re-assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This five-tiered rating system provides a level of granularity to help entities focus on emergent issues and appropriate mitigation strategies.

**Key Focus Area Assessment Rating Definitions for Gateway**

The review team will provide an assessment against each of the "key focus areas" probed. This will provide a level of granularity to assist agencies to identify and address the key issues. The overall assessment derived from the Key Focus Area Assessment is then translated into a DCA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>There are no major outstanding issues in this key focus area that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>There are issues in this key focus area that require timely management attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>There are significant issues in this key focus area that may jeopardise the successful delivery of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Scale for the IRA - Challenges to Implementation**

The IRA rating scale differs from that applied to the Gateway methodology. Given the nature of the IRA review occurring at the early stages of policy development and maturity, the indicator applied for the IRA assessment reflects the potential challenges to successful implementation of a proposal. For example, each topic area is rated using the below rating scale.
The summation of all the issues raised within the topic areas in regard to the challenge it poses on successful delivery, is then summarised in the body of the report which establishes an overall assessment on whether the programme can be implemented successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low - Low</td>
<td>The challenge would have some impact on the objective (implementation readiness) but it is not considered to be significant and can be managed within the entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The challenge would have some impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will escalate further if not addressed and managed appropriately – entity strategies to mitigate should include senior management governance control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>The challenge has a significant impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will need a strategy to manage – will require senior management governance controls and may benefit from independent oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>The challenge has a critical impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will need a strategy to manage – will require senior management governance controls and independent oversight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Recommendations Category Definitions**

The recommendations made within the assurance review reports are of significant focus. They are critical for both highlighting strategies required to address potential issues and for establishing the priority of the key actions to be taken. The review team provides these recommendations, which are prioritised in terms of urgency and which are categorised as below:

- **Critical (Do Now):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the project should take action immediately.
- **Essential (Do By):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the project should take action in the near future. Whenever possible essential recommendations should be linked to project milestones (e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe i.e. within the next three months).
- **Recommended:** The project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation. If possible recommendations should be linked to project milestones (e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe i.e. within the next three months).

**Previous Recommendations and Actions Taken for Gateway**

The SRO is responsible for implementing recommendations and taking remedial action. The SRO should maintain an official record of how review recommendations have been implemented or set out reasons for not implementing any recommendation.

Prior to the review, the entity should complete the ‘Action Taken’ column demonstrating the remedial actions taken in implementing previous review recommendations.

In reviewing the actions taken on previous Gateway Review recommendations by the entity, the review team should indicate in the 'Review Team Comments’ column whether a recommendation has been addressed as defined below, and where appropriate, provide further comments to explain the action taken:

- **Fully:** The recommendation has been fully implemented by the entity.
- **Partially:** The recommendation has been partially implemented by the entity.
- **Not Addressed:** The recommendation has not been implemented by the entity.
Enhanced Notification (EN) for Gateway

An EN process is in place so that, if a programme or project is experiencing problems, early remedial intervention can occur.

The EN is a staged escalation process, which involves the Finance Secretary writing to the relevant entity accountable authority to advise that the assurance review team has raised concerns, which may have a bearing on the likelihood of achieving the intended outcomes and benefits. This advice, which includes notification of all recommendations made in the Gateway review report, asks the entity to consider appropriate escalation action, including where appropriate advising the responsible minister/s, the Secretaries of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, and the Department of Finance, and further investigating the findings through separate in-depth inquiry or review. EN applies throughout the programme life-cycle and is triggered by incidences of red or sequential amber ratings.

The specifics of the three levels of escalation under the EN process are as follows:

1. First level (triggered by one Red or two sequential Amber/Amber Red Gateway review reports DCAs): the Secretary of Finance will write to the entity accountable authority escalating awareness that the programme has problems to address and that early rectification is required. While it is better practice to advise the responsible minister, it would be a matter for the accountable authority to decide.

2. Second level (the sequential receipt of two Red or three Amber/Amber Red Gateway review reports DCAs): the Secretary of Finance will again write to the entity accountable authority advising that problems remain; that the accountable authority is required to seek, within 30 business days, an action plan from the SRO advising how to address the problems raised and inform the responsible minister, the Secretary of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (PMC) and the Secretary of Finance. If the Secretary of Finance considers that problems are significant enough to warrant stronger intervention, this letter may also suggest that the accountable authority commence an independent review to assist them to decide on how to proceed.

3. Third level (the sequential receipt of three Red or four Amber/Amber Red Gateway review reports DCAs): a third letter from the Secretary of Finance to the accountable authority advising that very significant problems continue; that the accountable authority should undertake an independent review immediately. The accountable authority would be expected to inform the responsible minister, the Secretary of PM&C and the Secretary of Finance.

Assurance of Action Plan (AAP) for Gateway

Entities may be offered an Assurance of Action Plan (AAP) review at the second stage of the EN process, where the accountable authority is required to seek within 30 business days, an action plan from the SRO advising how to address the problems raised. The one-day onsite review, led by the Review Team Leader (RTL) from the preceding review is aimed at providing constructive and timely assistance to the SRO in finalising the action plans.

The AAP approach is consistent with existing remedial action planning applied, for example, under the Australian Government’s Capability Review Programme and Capability Initiative (P3M3©), where entities are required to develop an action plan and a Capability Improvement Plan (CIP) detailing implementation and prioritisation of recommendations stemming from a review.

Similar assurance processes have been shown to be successful and cost effective by enabling beneficial assurance to be received early during an entity’s remedial planning stages rather than ex-post where it would be too late.
Proceeding to next phase (Gateway)

Following the completion of a Gateway review, subsequent Gateway reviews will commence when the sponsoring entity informs the ARU of its intention to proceed to the next phase. Protocols around these notifications will be established between the sponsoring entity and the ARU at the Assessment Meeting.

Integration of Reviews

Assurance reviews have been designed to integrate with the pre-budget considerations, including ICT Two Pass Review and Two-Stage Capital Works Approval processes, and thereby coincide and to some degree inform the designing and planning stages of new initiatives.

In some circumstances during the initial phases of a programme/project there is a complementary overlap between Gateway and the ICT Two Pass Processes. For example the Gate 0/Gate 1 or First Stage programme reviews can best be scheduled shortly before the first and second pass business case respectively and can provide pragmatic and timely contributions to these.

Gateway reviews will integrate with existing reviews, and IRAs may replace early Gates or Stages of the Gateway review process.

Where a proposal may be subject to both a Gateway and an IRA review, both processes will be integrated to minimise the potential for review burden. For example, where Government has commissioned an IRA review for a proposal and where the proposal could also benefit from a Gateway review, the IRA would replace the pre decision review stages of the Gateway process (Gate 0 or First Stage).

Phased Gate Reviews

Phased Gate reviews can be conducted between Gateway reviews e.g. Gate 2a/2b.

The SRO, in discussion with the RTL can consider whether a phased review would add value. Things that may determine whether a phased review would be helpful are, for example, where there are discrete phase ‘releases’ that could benefit from targeted assurance or, the length of time to the next full review or other important decision points that will occur before the next review and on which the SRO would want independent assurance before committing to a course of action.

Combined Gateway Reviews

Combined Gateway reviews (e.g. a combined Gate 0 and 1) are not usually recommended but can be conducted when a project has reached the point in its lifecycle where the issues relevant to a subsequent Gateway milestone are pertinent to a programme/project at that point in time.

Intermediate Assessments

A significant lag can sometimes occur between assurance reviews. This is most manifest in complex ICT and construction projects – during the critical ‘build’ stages of implementation (between Gate 3 and Gate 4).

Intermediate Assessments are based on the principles of the existing Gate 0 Business Need Review, and provide entities with interim assurance focused on the strategic alignment, the strength of the business case and efforts to optimise benefits to Government. Additionally, the Intermediate Assessment can assist to highlight key risks and to reconfirm stakeholder commitment.

The timing of Intermediate Assessments will take into consideration planned reviews and key decision points, ensuring that no more than 18 months elapses between centrally commissioned reviews. In doing so, the Intermediate Assessment promotes better implementation by entities
and provides the opportunity for earlier intervention by government where delivery significantly slips.

**How does the IRA process interact with the Gateway Review process?**

Where a proposal may be subject to both a Gateway review and an IRA, both processes will be integrated to minimise the potential for review burden. For example, where the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet (ERC) has commissioned an IRA review for a proposal and where the proposal could also benefit from a Gateway review, the IRA would replace the pre-decision review stages of the Gateway process (Gate 0 or First Stage review).

**How do the ICT Two Pass and the Two Stage approval process for Australian Government Construction projects interact with the Gateway Review process?**

To assist government decision-making for proposals where levels of complexity, value and risk are key factors, a proposal may be subject to more rigorous requirements to enhance the quality of information made available to government deliberations such as the ICT Two Pass process, the Two Stage approval process for Australian Government Construction projects, or an independent Assurance Review such as Gateway or IRA. Such relevant ‘two-step’ approval processes and assurance reviews complement one another, but are separate processes with distinct purposes. Gateway assessments, for instance, are for a point in time, and the results form advice direct to the SRO.

For some proposals pre-decision assurance reviews can inform Two Pass /Two Stage processes. For example the Gate 0/Gate 1 or First Stage programme reviews may be scheduled shortly before the first and second pass business cases respectively, leveraging similar programme/project knowledge, where practical, and applying results to forward work plans.

**Part 3: Conducting an Assurance Review**

A well-conducted review should focus on areas that are critical to a project/programme’s success while ensuring that the review is thorough. In order to achieve this, review teams should:

- conduct reviews in an organised way, covering, but not limited to, the issues identified in this Handbook and adhering to the key steps in the review process as outlined in the Guidance;
- be united in purpose, following the principles and objectives of the assurance review process, not unnecessarily focused on any individual review team member’s concerns;
- involve participants in professional, focused, and harmonious peer discussions, and avoid a confrontational, inquisitorial approach to find problems and mistakes;
- recognise and respect examples of good practice in the work done to date; and
- provide recommendations that are clear and action-oriented.

**Gateway for Projects**

Gateway reviews are generally conducted within a five day period, at the sponsoring entity’s premises. They are point-in-time reviews which identify and focus on issues that are most important to the project, so that a project team’s effort is directed to those aspects that will help make the project successful.

Large or complex projects may require that multiple Gate reviews be conducted, where components of the project reach critical stages at different times. For example where there are multiple, significant procurements separated by long periods of time; or where there are significant and discrete delivery phases. There may be a need to repeat a review where the scope and risk thresholds change significantly.
Gate 0 – Business Need Review

Purpose of the Business Need Review

A Gate 0—Business Need Review is a broad, strategic review that occurs at the start-up stage of a programme or project, to inform decision-making, or during the implementation phase, particularly where there are protracted implementation stages, to confirm the alignment with the established outcomes. Gate 0 reviews may be undertaken several times throughout the life of particularly complex projects, in addition to the other Gate reviews that would occur in the normal application of the Gateway Review Process.

In a broader sense, this type of review provides assurance to the sponsoring entity responsible for the project, via the SRO, that the scope and purpose has been adequately assessed, communicated to stakeholders, and fits within the entity’s overall business strategy and/or whole-of-government strategies and policies. It also aims to test whether stakeholders’ expectations of the programme or project are realistic, by reference to planned outcomes, resource requirements, timetable and achievability.

Where a Gate 0 review is undertaken at the start-up stage, it occurs when the preliminary justification for the programme is drawn together. It is based on a strategic assessment of business needs, an analysis of the stakeholders whose commitment is needed to achieve the objectives, and a high level assessment of the project’s likely costs and potential for success. In this case, a Gate 0 review comes after the business need has been identified, before any further development proposal goes forward for approval.

In short, the Gate 0 review aims to test whether stakeholders’ expectations of the project are realistic, by reference to outcomes, resource requirements, timetable and achievability.

A Benefits Management approach should be applied at the start of the policy and maintained all the way through the life of the new capability. Benefits management is a key part of strategic delivery of business change. Applying a benefits approach assists the justification of the initiative by clearly showing where the expected improvements are to be found.

At this stage the NPP and Business Case are developed. Benefits statements should be included in the implementation plan supporting the NPP. The benefits statement should provide a clear description of the intended beneficiaries and expected benefits of the policy measure.

At this Gate, the Review Team would be expected to:

- ensure that the project contributes to the entity’s business strategy and to high-level government policy objectives and outcomes;
- review the business need to determine whether it requires a project or a programme of projects;
- confirm that the project’s potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of the sponsoring entity’s delivery plans;
- check that there has been an assessment of the market’s capacity to achieve the required outcome;
- ensure that benefits analysis has taken place;
- ensure the project is clearly understood and supported by users and stakeholders;
- review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the project;
- review the arrangements for identifying and managing the risks of the project, including external risks such as changing business priorities;
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• where the Gate is integrated with the Two Pass/Two Stage process ensure that the review supports development of the first pass business case;
• check that financing has been adequately assessed for the project; and
• check that the project is realistic, properly resourced and has authorised work plans through to the next stage of the project.

Project Documentation Required for the Business Need Review
To undertake the review, the review team may require access to:
• the NPP or Cabinet Submission/Decision;
• the entity’s Portfolio Budget Statement, business plan or equivalent documents. These documents should set out the entity’s outcomes and outputs, strategic direction, high level aims and objectives.
• a project brief that provides information about:
  • objectives—a high-level description of the purposes, outcomes sought, key deliverables and timelines;
  • critical success factors—the main criteria against which the success of a project will be measured. This could include a benefits management plan showing that the project is required, the expected benefits and the business changes and enablers that will be required for the anticipated benefits (these should be linked to the objectives);
  • background—an outline of the key drivers for the project, showing how it will contribute to policy outcomes and/or the business strategy;
  • scope—a high-level view of the boundaries of the project, the main assumptions, possible constraints and dependencies;
  • stakeholders—and how they will be engaged;
  • finance—the assessed costing and budget for the project and its components;
  • organisation—the way in which the project is to be organised, led, managed and monitored;
  • risks—the main risks identified so far and how they will be managed;
  • issues—a strategy for capturing and resolving issues; and
  • evaluation—an approach for measuring results and achieving outcomes.
• a work plan for the short to medium term, which:
  • identifies the components of the project;
  • shows the main deliverables and milestones for each component;
  • shows the contribution each component makes to the overall project outcomes; and
  • contains estimates of resource requirements.
These documents, and other information the review team deems relevant, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.

Areas to be Considered in the Business Need Review
This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 0—Business Need Review. Review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. Teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.
## 1. Policy and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1** Is the project innovative in planning to succeed? | • New approaches have been explored and existing systems challenged.  
• Confirmation that the project is structured to allow responsiveness and flexibility in achieving outcomes. |
| **1.2** Is there a clear understanding of the required outcomes of the project and are they soundly based? | • A description of the project policy drivers and outcomes and how they contribute to the business strategy and objectives.  
• An outline of the required outcomes, benefits derived and their relationship to outputs.  
• Confirmation that the way forward is likely to achieve the required outcomes, the expected benefits and the business changes and enablers required for the anticipated benefits. |
| **1.3** Does the project demonstrate a clear link with wider government objectives? | • An analysis which shows the relationship between the project and major government policies and objectives.  
• A demonstrated link between strategic objectives and outcomes and the deliverables of the project. |
| **1.4** Is the business strategy to which this project contributes robust? | • A clear direction set out in the business strategy, which is approved by all key stakeholders. |
| **1.5** Does the project, programme or policy require new governance arrangements e.g. cross-portfolios | • For cross-portfolios projects, programmes or policy, confirmation that all parties involved know how they are engaged in the project and are committed to its delivery  
• Clear governance arrangements to ensure sustainable alignment with the business objectives of all organisations involved. |
| **1.6** Does the project align with government policy and initiatives, the broad environment of the entity and the entity’s strategic objectives? | • Documented links between the proposed project and the entity’s policy, environment and strategy. |
| **1.7** Is the governance framework fit for the purpose? Is there commitment to key roles and responsibilities for this project? | • Documented commitment from top management and, where appropriate, minister(s) and a clear understanding of their continuing roles in achieving successful outcomes.  
• Clear allocation of key roles of responsible minister, SRO, and project managers.  
• Confirmation that all parties understand their roles in the project and are committed to the delivery of the project. |
1.8 Are the required skills and capabilities for this project available, taking into account the entity’s current commitments and capacity to deliver?

- Confirmation that the entity has brought together (or has credible plans for bringing together) the skills and capabilities it needs to plan and achieve the desired outcomes.
- Confirmation that the entity is realistic about the complexity of the project deliverables and how they can be managed.
- Documentation of allocation to individual officials of key roles within the project.

1.9 Is the entity able to learn from experience with this project and other projects?

- Confirmation that the entity has processes in place to incorporate lessons learnt from this project, and its components, into wider best practice.
- Confirmation that the entity learns from the experiences of others.

1.10 Does this project have a risk management framework?

- Defined roles, responsibilities and processes for managing risk across the entity and within the project, with clearly defined routes for escalating risk concerns to senior management.

### 2. Business Case: Scope and Stakeholders

2.1 Is the scope of the project understood?

A description of the project scope as far as it is known clearly showing what is in scope.

2.2 What is the full extent of the project envisaged and why?

A description of all project components and outputs, explaining how each will contribute to the required outcomes.

2.3 What will constitute success?

- A definition of key critical success factors and how the required quality of performance will be measured;
- A description of the main outcomes and an analysis of the leading and lagging indicators;
- A relationship between project outcomes and government targets, or major policy initiatives;
- Projected performance over the life of the project, with key performance targets and measures agreed with stakeholders; and
- The project can be evaluated in a practical and affordable way.

2.4 Who are the stakeholders and do they support the project?

- A list of principal stakeholders and statements of their needs and support for the project.
- A plan for communicating with and involving stakeholders in appropriate ways
- Clear lines of accountability for resolving any conflicting stakeholder requirements.
- Recognition of the need to involve external delivery partners, industry and the supplier.
### 3. Review of Current Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Does the project need to comply with broader government or departmental timing requirements?</td>
<td>• Links to government or entity commitments on delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 Is the project on track? | • The project report and plan updated.  
• Milestones achieved as planned;  
• A plan for benefits measurement has been developed and achievement of benefits is on track.  
• The risk register is current.  
• Highlight reports created for constituent work-streams.  
• Reports on resources and funding used to-date are current. |
### 3.3 Have options for potential ways forward been identified?

- A listing of high-level options for meeting the business need is maintained.
- Options analysis or feasibility studies, are maintained, if available.

### 4. Management of Intended Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Have the required outcomes from the project been identified?</td>
<td>A current list of the main outcomes and desired benefits, linked to strategic outcomes and to the deliverables from specific projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2 Are the planned outcomes still achievable, or have any changes in scope, relationship or value been properly agreed, and has the business case been reviewed? Is the project time critical? | Outcomes identified, together with their relationships to each other.  
Credible plans for the achievement of outcomes.  
Documentation showing ongoing commitment from stakeholders to the outcomes and their achievement.  
Documentation showing ministerial agreement to scope changes. |
| 4.3 Are key stakeholders confident outcomes will be achieved when expected? Is it on track to deliver? | Confirmation of time-critical issues and a realistic schedule to achieve them.  
Mechanisms for collecting performance data are in place and a plan for evaluating the impact of the project is in operation.  
Confirmation that the project board is confident that planned milestones will result in good quality deliverables that will achieve the necessary outcomes.  
A commitment from key stakeholders that project deliverables will achieve the desired outcomes. |
| 4.4 Is there a plan for achieving the required outcomes? | A benefits management plan and a plan to ensure that outcomes are delivered in terms of performance measures and/or key performance indicators.  
Plans identify appropriate baseline measures against which future performance will be assessed.  
Plans to carry out performance measurement against the defined measures and indicators;  
Where planned outcomes have not been achieved, confirmation that the problems have been identified and plans are in place to resolve them.  
There is clarity on how the objectives from the projects link to the outcomes of the programme. |
### 5. Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.1** Have the major risks been identified? | • A current list of the major strategic, political and/or reputation, environmental and legislative risks to the overall project, analysed by likelihood and impact.  
  • Early warning indicators identified.  
  • Consideration of the risks of success, e.g. take-up or usage greater than expected and contingencies identified.  
  • Confirmation of regular review of risks, mitigation options and contingency plans. |
| **5.2** How will risks be managed? | • Confirmation that the risks to the success of the project (e.g. take-up or usage greater or less than expected) have been considered and mitigation strategies and contingencies identified.  
  • Documentation of regular review of risks, mitigation options and contingency plans.  
  • Details of the risk allocation (to whom allocated and why) with high-level plans for managing risks.  
  • Action to manage the risks identified and, where appropriate, action taken. |
| **5.3** Have assurance measures for the project been put in place? | • ‘Critical friends’ to the project (for example probity auditors, internal audit, specialists and/or peer reviewers) appointed, with documentation showing that they challenge assumptions, decisions and risks.  
  • Confirmation that advice from ‘critical friends’ is acted on.  
  • Gateway reviews, health-checks and/or policy reviews incorporated into plans. |
| **5.4** Is there a contingency plan and business continuity plans? | • Decisions about contingency and necessary business continuity arrangements are made with appropriate plans.  
  • The project’s effects on public services is analysed and decisions taken about those for which contingency arrangements will be needed.  
  • Confirmation that milestones relating to contingency measures are in plans and the milestones are being achieved as expected. |
| **5.5** Have lessons from similar projects been considered? | • Details documented of issues identified from previous, or similar projects and their application to the current project.  
  • Consideration of findings from P3M3© or within Capability Reviews and Capability Improvement Plans. |

### 6. Readiness for Next Phase (Business Case)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.1** Affordability: Are the funds to reach the next phase of the project available? | • Budget provision for initiating project(s) and preparing the high level business case.  
  • Agreed costings from Finance to validate estimates, where appropriate. |
6.2 Are the required internal/external resources available, suitably skilled, and committed to undertake the work?

- Resources management plan including documentation on resources identified showing, for example, who needs to be involved, when, and what they must deliver as well as any additional training needs required for their role.
- Allocation of identified individuals who will fill key roles (such as SRO, project steering committee, and project manager).
- Confirmation that these resources will be available when needed throughout the next phase.

6.3 Achievability: Are the plans for the ‘Business Case’ phase realistic?

- A plan showing deliverables/milestones, activities, timescales, resources, costs and stakeholder involvement.
- Plans for managing the transition to new ways of working/structures/policies, with key barriers identified (such as cultural resistance to change) and the approach to overcoming them agreed.

6.4 Are appropriate management controls in place?

- Defined project management controls and reporting mechanisms.

Where a Gate 0 review is undertaken at a stage in the project later than the start-up stage, the areas to consider in the topic ‘Readiness for Next Phase’ are likely to vary from those listed above. Suggested areas to consider are provided in the following table.

The reason for undertaking a Gate 0 review will be dictated by the circumstances of the particular project, more so than for other reviews. Consequently, the review approach is likely to require more development by the review team than at other Gates.

### 7. Readiness for Next Phase (Post-Business Case and beyond)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.1 Is there a continuing need for the project? | • Project outcomes still aligned to ministers’ and entity’s strategy.  
|                                 | • Confirmation of continuing commitment from stakeholders.  
|                                 | • Demonstrated confidence that the project is organised to deliver the outcomes when needed and the benefits management plan is robust. |
| 7.2 What assumptions have been made about the project? | • A listing of major assumptions made in preparing the project business case, updated to reflect any changes that could affect success.  
<p>|                                 | • Current assessments of the validity of all assumptions. |
| 7.3 How will change be managed? | • Plans for managing the transition to new ways of working/structures/policies, with any key barriers identified (such as cultural resistance to change) and the approach to overcoming them agreed. |
| 7.4 Affordability: Are the funds to reach the next phase available? | • Budget provision for the project. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>Are the required internal/external (individuals and organisations) suitably skilled, available and committed to carrying out the work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **•** Information showing who needs to be involved, when and what they must deliver  
**•** Key roles in place, with skills matched to the nature of the work.  
**•** Confirmation that these resources will be available when needed throughout the next phase. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.6</th>
<th>Achievability: Are the plans for the next phase realistic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong> A plan developed showing: streams of work (sub-programme, projects, etc.); deliverables/milestones and the ‘roadmap’ to achieve them; timescales; organisation; costs and resourcing; stakeholder involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>Are appropriate management controls in place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **•** Accountabilities allocated to SROs  
**•** Programme management controls and reporting mechanisms defined.  
**•** Plans for ongoing management of the delivery chain. |
Gate 1 – Business Case Review

Purpose of the Business Case Review

At the commencement of a project, an entity will develop a document (typically a business case) that articulates the impetus and business need for the project, together with an assessment of the project’s likely costs, benefits and potential for success. The Gate 1—Business Case Review comes after a business case has been prepared.

The Gate 1—Business Case Review focuses on the robustness of a project’s business case. It provides assurance to the sponsoring entity, through the nominated SRO, that the proposed approach:

• has been adequately researched;
• can be delivered within the allocated time; and
• can be delivered with the proposed resources.

At this Gate, understanding and articulating expected benefits provides guidance to options analysis and potential delivery approaches. This approach helps increase confidence in decision makers. It also allows a risk assessment to be undertaken against options and their likelihood to achieve the pre-defined benefits.

At this Gate, the Review Team would be expected to:

• confirm that the business case is robust (that is, it meets the business need, is affordable and achievable, with appropriate options explored and is likely to achieve value for money);
• confirm that potential options for the delivery of desired outcomes have been identified and analysed and appropriate expert advice has been obtained as necessary;
• establish that the feasibility study or assessment has been completed satisfactorily and a preferred way forward has been determined;
• confirm that the market’s likely interest has been assessed;
• ensure there is internal and external authority, if required, and that support exists for the project;
• ensure major risks have been identified and a risk management plan has been developed;
• confirm quality and benefits management plans are in place, including key performance indicators for the project and its outcomes;
• establish that the project is likely to deliver its business goals and that it supports wider business change where applicable;
• confirm that the impact of business process changes on internal and external stakeholders have been assessed;
• confirm that the scope and requirements are realistic, clear and unambiguous;
• ensure that the full scale, intended outcomes, timeframes and effect of relevant external issues have been assessed;
• ensure plans exist for the next phase;
• validate assumptions in the plan to confirm the project team can deliver the next stage;
• confirm that overarching and internal business and technical strategies have been assessed; and
• establish that quality assurance strategies/plans for the project and its products are in place.

Project Documentation Required for the Business Case Review

To undertake the review, the Gateway review team requires access to documents (including the business case) that provide:
• the project brief or mandate with the project’s scope and an explanation of the need for the project;
• a project initiation document or equivalent;
• details of the project approach, including how to deliver the intended outcome;
• a strategy outlining the approach to business change arising from the project (including staff training, new facilities etc. as appropriate);
• an initial assessment of the current and proposed physical and technical environment (e.g. IT infrastructure, workspace facilities);
• a report on the project’s expenditure to date versus its forecasted budget (for example, cost of scoping or feasibility study versus budget);
• a high-level definition of the business requirements and total scope of the project;
• a description of how the project’s success will be evaluated;
• a business case addressing business need, affordability, achievability, value for money and range of options estimating the project’s costs and benefits, including some form of feasibility study, sensitivity analysis and market research;
• a communications strategy to keep stakeholders informed of the project’s progress;
• a quality assurance management strategy;
• a list of the major risks, with draft plans for managing them;
• a high-level activity, time and resource plan for the whole project;
• plans to move the project through to the next stage, Gate 2—Delivery Strategy;
• how performance is to be reported and monitored;
• project organisation—key roles and governance/reporting arrangements;
• business impacts, for IT-enabled projects;
• estimates and source of funds to cover all work to Gate 2—Delivery Strategy;
• the authority and approval to proceed;
• a benefits management plan; and
• benefits profiles.

Documents containing this, and other information deemed relevant by the Gateway review team, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.
Areas to be Considered in the Business Case Review

This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 1—Business Case Review. Gateway review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. The teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.

1. Business Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1.1 Is there a clear and agreed understanding of the business objectives and how they will be delivered? | • Business objectives for the project clearly stated and SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely).  
• A strategy for achieving business objectives defined and agreed with the stakeholders.  
• Total scope, including timeframes, documented and agreed with stakeholders (including end users or their representatives) and technical authorities.  
• Delivery approach and mechanisms defined and agreed with stakeholders.  
• For IT-related projects: IT developments defined as component(s) of wider programme of business change.  
• Documentation showing options reviewed and a case for their selection. |
| 1.2 Is the impetus for change described in the business case? | • Comprehensive justification of any changes to existing arrangements, including input from stakeholders.  
• References to related project approvals, where appropriate. |
| 1.3 Are all relevant government initiatives being addressed? | • Documented links to relevant government strategies and policies. |
| 1.4 Is the business case sufficiently linked to the entity outcomes and project with the investment objectives? | • Confirmation that the investment fits within the organisational objectives of the entity  
• How the business case contributes to the entity outcomes and project objectives and how the investment affects the efficiency and/or effectiveness of project delivery. |
| 1.5 Have internal and external factors affecting the project been identified and assessed? | • Assessment of the objectives, timeframes and scale of the project.  
• Legislative, policy and regulatory issues taken into account.  
• Assessment of the stability of the current business environment and strategic direction.  
• Assessment of internal and external dependencies (e.g. other programme and projects) that could affect current priorities or the project.  
• Assessments of the impact on existing physical and technical environment (e.g. brownfield site, current infrastructure and legacy systems).  
• Identification of key external (non-government) dependencies, if any, likely to impact on the project. |
| 1.6 | **What factors are critical to ensure success?** | • The critical success factors for each of the main objectives are documented. |
| 1.7 | **Can the critical success factors be quantified or measured?** | • Explanation of how the factors will be measured.  
• Identification of what constitutes success. |
| 1.8 | **For IT projects, will the business case make a significant contribution to entity IT objectives?** | • Appropriate documentation and consideration of the flow-on effects from IT investment, especially where it represents a significant change in the entity’s IT direction.  
• Documented links to the entity’s IT strategy. |
| 1.9 | **Has the business case examined a wide range of options that will meet the business need?** | • Options explored for collaboration with other government agencies and projects.  
• Range of options considered includes maintaining the status quo.  
• Rigorous assessment of the pros and cons of each option to determine its potential to meet the critical success factors.  
• Thorough assessment of options for the procurement process.  
• Market research indicating that suitable solutions can be provided. |
| 1.10 | **Is there a clear ’best option’, or would several options meet the business need?** | • Options appraised in accordance with principles which are relevant and appropriate for responding to the business need.  
• Examination, and ranking, of all options that are acceptable in principle.  
• Clear analysis of whole-of-life costs for each option.  
• Use of software metrics to test robustness of costs for IT projects. |
| 1.11 | **If there are several options, how was their robustness tested?** | • Sensitivity analysis of all appropriate options.  
• Major sensitivities included in the list of identified risks.  
• Cost-benefit analysis performed accurately and consistently across all options.  
• Economic analysis is supported by clear and unambiguous assumptions. |
| 1.12 | **Is the argument for the ’preferred option’ sound?** | • Documentary evidence that the preferred option has been selected from an appropriately wide range, rigorously assessed and satisfies the project objectives (including contribution to the business strategy), is likely to offer value for money, and is affordable and achievable.  
• Confirmation that appropriate sources of expert advice have been consulted.  
• Confirmation that it is possible to align the contracting strategy with the entity’s overall objectives. |
| 1.13 | **Does the preferred option meet wider government and entity objectives, standards and business change programme?** | • Assessment against a list of wider government and entity objectives, policies, business change programme and standards.  
• Assessment of the business need justification as stated in the high-level business case. |
For construction projects, compliance with the Australian Government Implementation Guidelines for the National Code of Practice for the Construction Industry, occupational health and safety standards, and sustainability initiatives.

1.14 Does the business case demonstrate that the opportunities for sharing services across entities have been investigated?
- Options to share services considered and if rejected, justification for rejecting the option.

1.15 Has contract management been considered?
- Requirements for the contract management capability have been considered.
- Arrangements for managing single/multiple suppliers have been considered.
- Where multiple suppliers are likely to be appointed, high-level plans for managing the liaison.
- The appropriate relationship has been determined, with the optimum scale of contract(s) appropriately considered.

1.16 Were the feasibility study and business case completed within time and cost budgets?
- Project budget and timetable reports

1.17 Have assumptions been identified and their validity checked?
- Assumptions identified and accepted.
- Plans to verify the assumptions, if any, that are included in plans for the next stage.

1.18 Has the Department of Finance agreed the costings for the project?
- Documentation of consultation with Finance on costings and sign-off, where relevant.

2. Project Governance and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Has the project governance been considered and is there an overall project management process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decisions made on reporting/authority boundaries, composition of the project team, and external resources/people needed, if any (e.g. expert advisers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear articulation of the roles and responsibilities of key players in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreed project management process and project organisational structure, including a design methodology where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Senior management’s commitment to the project and their key role in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Has a steering committee, or equivalent, been established to oversee the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear articulation of the role and decision-making power of the steering committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Details of the process for providing information to the steering committee and frequency of meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Details of the type of information to be provided to the steering committee, such as budget reports, risk management reports and action items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Have all the likely stakeholders been identified and are their interests clearly understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal and external stakeholders identified and documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders’ roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
defined and agreed.
- End-users for the project identified and documented.
- Confirmation that that the decision-making process includes all the relevant stakeholders and is both efficient and effective.
- Analysis of potential conflicts between stakeholder groups and contingency plan for dealing with such conflicts.
- Results of consultations documented as part of the communications strategy.

| 3.2 | Do stakeholders support the preferred option? (This includes the potential or recommended delivery approach and mechanisms.) | • Documentation supporting the consultation, involvement, support and endorsement of stakeholders. |
| 3.3 | Are stakeholder issues being addressed? These include: • communications • public relations • environmental issues • personnel • statutory processes | • A communication plan for dealing with various stakeholders showing responsibilities. • Plans for dealing with statutory consultation requirements. • Flexibility and ability to react to changes in stakeholder interests and concerns. • Governance arrangements clearly articulate opportunities for stakeholder concerns to be aired and addressed. |

4. **Risk Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> Are there processes in place to identify, assess and monitor current, anticipated and emerging risks?</td>
<td>• A list of risks and key issues, categorised as strategic, political and/or reputational; legislative, implementation and operational service risks including business, technical, financial and commercial and/or contractual risks. • For IT-enabled projects, information security risks; for e-government, risks relating to poor take-up. • For construction projects, risks relating to health and safety. • For policy projects, regulatory impact assessment carried out. • A risk management strategy developed in accordance with best practice. • An individual identified as responsible for managing risk across the project, mitigation options and contingency plans. • Defined roles, responsibilities and processes for managing issues and risk with clearly defined routes for bringing issues and risks to the attention of senior management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2</strong> Have any issues raised in a previous review been resolved satisfactorily?</td>
<td>• Updated issue and risk logs, with details of actions taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3 Have the risks for each of the options been evaluated?
- Current, emerging and anticipated risks classified by likelihood, consequence, mitigation strategy and residual risk.

### 4.4 Have the risks for the preferred option been fully assessed?
- Involvement of senior stakeholders in assessing strategic risks.
- An assessment of risks, costs and benefits to demonstrate the appropriate balance of risk and reward in the preferred option, demonstrating planned risk taking and support for innovation where appropriate.
- Plans for managing the risks with the preferred option.
- For IT-enabled projects, information security risks and risks relating to poor take-up considered.
- For construction projects, risks relating to occupational health and safety considered.

### 4.5 Have the ‘worst case’ costs associated with risks been assessed?
- Complete cost assessments of the risks documented.
- Contingency funding based on assessment of financial implications of risks.

### 4.6 Are risk management costs and time implications included in the cost and time estimate or are they treated as a contingency?
- Costs and time for managing risks separately identified.
- Where risks cannot be reduced, the costs of managing these risks separately identified and included within the base estimate, or as contingency funding.
- For construction projects, decisions on how residual risks are being insured.

### 4.7 Does the project break new ground?
- Examination of leading-edge projects to assess the project’s effect on the business, stakeholders and end-users.
- Information from similar projects or activities from which lessons may be learnt.
- Innovative solutions assessed by experts.
- Consultation with the market to help refine the approach, and identify risks and ways in which risks might be mitigated.
- For PPP projects, evaluation of project
4.8 Should the project be broken down into a series of small steps?

- Documentation of the chosen approach and justification for taking that decision.
- The business case should detail any phased delivery or expected improvements over time.

## 5. Readiness for Next Phase (Delivery Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Is there an overall project structure for the delivery stage?             | • A definition of the procurement approach to be adopted.  
                                                                                    • A draft procurement plan, including details of how proposals will be evaluated.          |
| 5.2 Is there a realistic plan to reach the next stage of the project (Gate 2 — Delivery Strategy)? | • Objectives, planning assumptions, constraints, activities, deliverables and milestones defined and agreed for the next phase as well as for the remaining phases.  
                                                                                    • Information demonstrating that the project addresses both short-term and long-term business requirements.  
                                                                                    • Information confirming that suitable solutions are available from the market and that it has sufficient capacity.  
                                                                                    • Information confirming that the proposed procurement strategy is consistent with the **PGPA Act** and Rules, entity Accountable Authority’s Instructions (AAIs) and entity Operational Guidelines. |
| 5.3 Have any requirements for external specialist advice been determined? Are the necessary internal and external skills available at the right time and in the right numbers? Is there a training need, and if so, what is it? | • Requirements for specialist expertise considered and resourced.  
                                                                                    • A resource plan for internal staff, including an assessment of training needs, if any.  
                                                                                    • Skills appraisal and plans for addressing shortfalls.  
                                                                                    • Training assessment and plans, with training sources identified.  
                                                                                    • Information demonstrating that external advice is being used appropriately. |
| 5.4 Is the project timetable realistic? Does it take into account any statutory lead times and time required for approvals? | • A timetable identifying statutory lead times and a realistic assessment of the time needed for approvals and pre-procurement activities.  
                                                                                    • Senior management commitment to the timetable.  
                                                                                    • A procurement timetable justified and not longer than necessary. |
| 5.5 Is there a clearly defined project organisation for the next stage of the project, with agreed roles and responsibilities? | • Project organisation and methodology governance/ reporting arrangements.  
                                                                                    • Roles and responsibilities of personnel involved, with the project clearly defined and understood. |
- For collaborative projects, a single SRO assigned and senior officials from each collaborating entity.
- Individuals named in the following key positions:
  - Project sponsor/SRO.
  - Project manager.
  - Stakeholder manager.
  - User representative.
  - Project steering committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.6</th>
<th>Are the necessary funds to reach Gate 2—Delivery Strategy identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation on appropriate budget provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial controls for expenditure are documented and in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gate 2 – Delivery Strategy Review

Purpose of the Delivery Strategy Review

Following the Gate 1—Business Case Review, the project governance board or steering committee and/or SRO will have determined whether the project is feasible and has a robust high-level business case.¹

The Gate 2 review focuses on evaluating the procurement strategy to provide assurance to the project steering committee and/or SRO that the selected procurement approach is appropriate for the proposed acquisition and that it:

- establishes a clear definition of the project;
- establishes a plan for its implementation; and
- has made an assessment of the project’s potential for success.

It also provides assurance that the project is ready to invite proposals or tenders from the market.

During the delivery stage of a programme, a clear understanding of the expected benefits helps focus on the delivery of the activities that will achieve the expected benefits. Some interim benefits may be achieved during this stage, which provide an excellent indicator for the ongoing viability of the programme.

At this Gate, the Review Team would be expected to:

- confirm the business case, now that the project is fully defined;
- ensure that the procurement strategy is robust and appropriate and provides an exit strategy, if necessary;
- ensure that the project’s plan is appropriately detailed and realistic, through to completion, and includes a change management strategy;
- ensure that the project’s controls and organisation are defined (financial controls are in place and the resources are available);
- confirm funding availability for the whole project;
- confirm that the development and delivery approach and mechanisms are still appropriate and manageable;
- check that the supplier market capability and track record (or existing supplier’s capability and performance) are fully understood;
- confirm that the procurement approach will facilitate good client/supplier relationships;
- confirm that the procurement plan facilitates an outcome providing value for money;
- confirm that appropriate project performance measures and tools are being used;
- confirm that quality assurance procedures have been applied consistently with the previous review;
- ensure that delivery outputs are being mapped to expected benefits;
- confirm compliance with IT infrastructure and security requirements, as appropriate for IT projects; and
- confirm compliance with building codes, occupational health and safety and sustainability requirements, as appropriate for construction projects.

Project Documentation Required for the Delivery Strategy Review

To undertake the review, the Gateway review team requires access to documents (including the business case) that provide:

---

¹ Terminology for the governance arrangements will differ from entity to entity. The purpose of the project governance board or project steering committee is to provide oversight and guidance to the project.
• an updated business case containing a plan for realising benefits;
• a report on the project’s expenditure to date versus its forecasted budget, where appropriate;
• a plan for managing the business change;
• specifications of the project’s expected outputs and outcomes;
• the procurement strategy and justification for the approach;
• draft tender documents, including the evaluation plan and draft contract;
• a description of the high-level requirements of the project;
• the proposed implementation strategy for implementing the new service/works contract;
• a current risk management plan, risk register and issues register;
• current and planned business/technical policies, strategies and constraints (for example, occupational health and safety standards);
• an outline of project plans to completion, and detailed plans for the next stage;
• the results of any business, commercial or technical benchmarking;
• market intelligence and research material;
• the current communications strategy and plan;
• project quality documentation;
• a strategy for measuring project performance, including occupational health and safety, as appropriate for construction projects;
• benefits management strategy;
• benefits profiles; and
• benefits realisation plan.

Documents containing this, and other information deemed relevant by the Gateway review team, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.

Areas to be Considered in the Delivery Strategy Review

This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 2—Delivery Strategy Review. Gateway review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. The teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.

1. Business Case and Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Strategic fit: Does the business case continue to demonstrate the business need and contribute to the business strategy?</td>
<td>• Continued confirmation that the project will meet business needs (including confirmation that priorities remain unchanged where any external factors might have an effect).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Options explored: Is the preferred way forward still appropriate?</td>
<td>• Continued confirmation of the way forward, supported by an assessment based on indicative assumptions about factors such as interdependence with other projects, reliance on partners to deliver etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.3 Value for money: Is the proposed commercial arrangement likely to achieve value for money? | • The bases for calculating costs (value of requirements) and comparison of tenders agreed with key stakeholders. • The business case updated on the basis of the full project definition, market assessment and initial benefits plan. • The procurement strategy reflected in the business case. • An assessment of value for money consistent with the procurement plan. • Examination of the sensitivities and financial
implications of handling major risks, and an assessment of their effect on project return.

| 1.4 | Affordability: Are the costs within current budgets? Is the project’s funding affordable and supported by key stakeholders? | • Reconciliation of projected total project costs with available budget, reviewed and accepted or approved by key stakeholders (for example, appropriate approval provided in accordance with the PGPA Act and Rules) • Project costs are within forecast entity spending plans as agreed by Government. |
| 1.5 | Achievability: Is the entity still realistic about its ability to achieve a successful outcome? | • Comparison with similar projects (and similar entities); assessment of track record in achieving successful change; plans to manage known weaknesses; plans for incremental/modular approaches where applicable; contingency plans in place. |
| 1.6 | Is there a clear definition of the total project scope? | • A document showing the updated total project scope including business change, where applicable (Gate 1—Business Case Review). |
| 1.7 | Are the issues relating to business change understood? Is there an initial plan to address these issues? | • Change management strategy documented, with key stakeholders’ views, business process implications and communication requirements clearly understood. • Issues relating to business change logged, with a plan for each. |
| 1.8 | Is the entity fully committed to the project? Do stakeholders support the project? | • Documented involvement of, and endorsement by, the entity itself and all stakeholders. |
| 1.9 | Are the benefits to be delivered by the project understood and agreed to with stakeholders? Is there an initial plan for realising benefits? | • A plan for realising benefits, showing costs offset by improved quality of service. |

### 2. Delivery and Procurement Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Will the project be attractive to the market?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Are the business objectives clearly understood by the entity and likely to be understood by suppliers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.3     | Are the project outputs/outcomes accurately reflected in the requirement specification? | • Depending on the nature of the procurement, an appropriate specification of requirements that has been reviewed and endorsed by stakeholders.  
• An appropriate mechanism to articulate the requirement to potential suppliers; it should be quality assured to ensure that suppliers will understand what is required. |
| 2.4     | Have options for the proposed procurement approach been evaluated, including sources of supply? | • All appropriate sourcing options examined (e.g. single or multiple suppliers, opportunities for collaboration); for infrastructure projects, documentation showing that integrated procurement approaches have been fully evaluated.  
• For IT-enabled projects, a sound decision to contract for an output.  
• Where a PPP is the proposed option, confirmation that it is appropriate.  
• Comparison with similar projects and analysis, supported by commercial intelligence on market capability.  
• Reasons for selecting sourcing options justified and documented. |
| 2.5     | Is the procurement strategy consistent with the approved business case? | • Documented material showing that the procurement strategy aligns with the business case. |
| 2.6     | Is the selected procurement strategy defined and endorsed? | • A clearly defined procurement strategy, showing reasons for selection, and agreement by stakeholders.  
• Confirmation that business continuity and a future exit strategy have been considered at a high level.  
• Confirmation of development, involvement and endorsement of the procurement strategy by appropriate individuals.  
• Strategy to include: sourcing option (e.g. PPP); procurement approach (e.g. open tender); timetable (with milestones) consistent with relevant procurement rules, plus time needed for pre-procurement activities, implementation and contingency in the event of unavoidable slippage; assessment of market place/potential suppliers, roles, resources and skills needed to manage the procurement strategy; alignment with plans for implementation. |
| 2.7     | Have factors that may affect the procurement strategy been addressed? | • Confirmation that key factors influencing the procurement strategy have been taken into account.  
• Confirmation that the efficiency and predictability of the procurement process have been considered, with a process in place for addressing the effect of any deviation from the plan and timetable; plans for two-way communication with stakeholders and suppliers. |
| 2.8     | Will the procurement strategy facilitate communication and co-operation between potential suppliers and the client? | • Communication strategy and support mechanisms in place.  
• Confirmation that the procurement strategy will include: the early involvement of suppliers to ensure the design is fully informed by the delivery process; and clearly defined performance criteria with key performance indicators and a system for measuring performance. |
| 2.9 | Has the proposed procurement procedure been evaluated? | • An open, select or direct route is identified  
• Reasons for following the procedure are understood; related risks (such as effect on timescales and tender costs for suppliers) are evaluated, and the decision is justified and documented. |
| 2.10 | Is there adequate knowledge of existing and potential suppliers? | • Confirmation that adequate knowledge of existing and potential suppliers has been considered.  
• Confirmation of commercial market intelligence, market sources and potential suppliers.  
• Documentation of the consideration of track records from the public and private sectors, showing:  
• The public sector’s ability as a client to work in this way.  
• The private sector’s track record in meeting similar or equivalent business need.  
• Indications of the types of suppliers most likely to succeed in delivering the required outcomes. |
| 2.11 | Is the contract management strategy robust? | • Contract management strategy takes account of key factors such as the required skills, proposed relationship, and management of single or multiple suppliers; and  
• Documentation showing the continuity of key project personnel. |
| 2.12 | Has the project team complied with the relevant procurement policies and guidelines in preparation of the tender documents? | • Documentation of the procurement process complying with the PGPA Procurement Rules and the entity’s AAs.  
• Tender documents reviewed, and shown to be complete and containing an accurate description; for construction projects, include requirements for suppliers to provide relevant occupational health and safety information. |
| 2.13 | Is the evaluation strategy (including how to demonstrate value for money) accepted by stakeholders and compliant with the Commonwealth Procurement Rules? | • Evaluation criteria and model(s) approved by stakeholders.  
• Key evaluation criteria linked to business objectives and given appropriate weighting.  
• Separated financial and non-financial aspects of the evaluation.  
• Evaluation criteria and weightings included in tender documents.  
• For construction projects, adherence to building code, occupational health and safety guidelines, and sustainability requirements. |

### 3. Review of Current Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 | Is the project being managed in accordance with its governance framework, stakeholder engagement plan, project plan and other critical documents? | • The project running to schedule and costs within budget, as shown in project budget and timetable reports.  
• A governance framework in place and the project is managed accordingly. |
| 3.2 | What caused any variations such as over-runs or under-runs? | • Reconciliations made against the budget and timeframe, according to risk allowances.  
• Reconciliations supported by variance reports |
which explain the reasons for, and actions taken in response to, variances.

### 3.3
**What actions are necessary to prevent variations recurring in other phases?**

- Project management documentation, showing current analysis and plans which are continually reviewed and updated.

### 3.4
**Were there any assumptions made at Gate 1, or earlier reviews that have not been verified?**

- A log of outstanding assumptions, with plans to verify them; (should be categorised and managed as issues where applicable).

### 4. Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.1** Are the major risks identified, understood, financially evaluated and considered in determining the procurement strategy? | • A log of major issues and risks.  
• Interdependencies with other projects and programmes identified.  
• For construction projects, occupational health and safety risks identified.  
• For IT-related projects, risks relating to IT innovation, infrastructure, security and take-up identified.  
• Each risk assessed financially and included in business case as a sensitivity or contingency.  
• An escalation process is in place for upward referral of risks.  
• A log of issues and risks regularly reviewed by project team; evidence of appropriate action taken. |
| **4.2** Are there risk management plans in place? | • Risk management plans for each risk, with responsibilities for managing them clearly identified and allocated; plans are approved by stakeholders.  
• A process for the ongoing identification, allocation and management of risks, approved by stakeholders, where appropriate.  
• A risk reporting process in place for upward referral of risks.  
• A contingency plan, if required. |
| **4.3** Have all issues raised in previous review(s), and during the course of the project, been satisfactorily resolved? | • The risk management plan and issues register/log is regularly reviewed by the project team; with evidence of appropriate action taken. |
| **4.4** Are the following external issues being addressed:  
- statutory processes  
- communications  
- public relations  
- environmental issues? | • A list of external issues and related stakeholders.  
• An external relations plan developed and implemented as part of communications plan/strategy. |

### 5. Readiness for Next Phase (Investment Decision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong> Is the project plan for the remaining phases realistic?</td>
<td>• A project plan detailing clear objectives, deliverables, resourcing and milestones for the remaining phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.2 | Are the project’s timelines reasonable and compliant with relevant procurement policies and guidelines? | • Timelines likely to meet business and legislative needs.
• Documentation showing that timelines have been verified with suppliers.
• Comparisons with similar projects.
• Relevant procurement policies and guidelines and their affect on timelines taken into account.
• An analysis of the effects of slippage that could affect the project or its suppliers, with a supporting sensitivity analysis. |
| 5.3 | What are the arrangements for the next stage of the project? Have its activities been defined and resourced? | • A plan showing the roles, responsibilities, training requirements, internal and external resources, skills requirements and any project management mentoring resources available.
• Involvement and perspectives considered from business, user and technical stakeholders.
• Appropriate plan for the selected procurement approach, identifying all key review and decision points, and preliminary reviews, if any. |
| 5.4 | Does the project have resources with the appropriate skills and experience where required? | • A commitment to provide the required internal and external resources.
• Job descriptions for key project staff.
• A skills audit and plans for addressing, shortfalls if any.
• Project relationships such as teamwork and partnering considered, with a plan to implement them where appropriate. |
Gate 3 – Investment Decision Review

Purpose of the Investment Decision Review

The Gate 2—Delivery Strategy Review considered the procurement strategy prior to inviting proposals or tenders against the fully developed requirements specification. Prior to the Gate 3—Investment Decision Review, potential suppliers and partners should have submitted their proposals or tenders, and the evaluation panel should have analysed these and recommended the proposal that offered the best value for money.

The Gate 3—Investment Decision Review should be conducted before taking the procurement action recommended by the evaluation panel. This review assesses the appropriateness of the supplier selection process, how business needs are being met and the processes in place for contract delivery. It also determines:

- how well the process has been managed;
- the approach undertaken to determining value for money is consistent with the procurement plan criteria for doing so;
- how both the entity and the supplier can implement and manage the proposed solution; and
- that processes are in place to achieve a successful outcome after contract award (or equivalent).

At this Gate, the Review Team would be expected to:

- confirm the business case and benefits realisation plan, now that firm proposals have been received;
- check that all the policy, statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement process;
- confirm that the recommended contract decision is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and that value for money has been adequately assessed;
- confirm the existence of an exit strategy and arrangements for retendering;
- ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion;
- ensure there is continuing support for the project;
- confirm that the approved procurement strategy has been followed;
- confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the entity and the supplier/partner are sound and achievable;
- check that the entity has prepared for developing new business processes, where needed, and for implementing and operating new services or facilities, as well as the transition process;
- confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management, quality management, key benefits management and change management (technical and business) and that these plans are shared with suppliers;
- confirm that technical implications of a project have been addressed; and
- confirm that the proposed procurement is within the approved financial limits.

Project Documentation Required for the Investment Decision Review

To undertake this review, the Gateway review team requires access to documents (including the business case) that provide:

- project management information, including:
  - strategies for managing the risks and issues, including plans and risk log showing that risks are being identified and managed;
  - the plans for implementing business process change and handling changes in requirements;
• the quality management plan describing the how the quality of project deliverables will be assured;
• the service management arrangements defining service management responsibilities for the entity and supplier, service delivery procedures and supplier performance is to be measured;
• the benefits management strategy, plans and responsibilities for delivery;
• the procurement strategy;
• any operational requirements; and
• the draft contract.

• confirmation that the procurement strategy approved at the Gate 2 review has been followed;
• confirmation that the negotiated and agreed solution(s) remain within the original criteria;
• plans and assessments of probity throughout the procurement process;
• adequate plans from the supplier for development and implementation;
• an evaluation report containing recommendation and justification of the selected supplier and plans for debrief of unsuccessful suppliers;
• draft project plans through to completion and detailed plans for the next stage;
• a project timetable proposed by suppliers as part of their tender;
• an updated communications plan;
• confirmation of adequate financing and budget, and authority to proceed.
• benefits management strategy;
• benefits profiles; and
• benefits realisation plan.

Documents containing this, and other information deemed relevant by the Gateway review team, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.

**Areas to be Considered in the Investment Decision Review**

This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 3—Investment Decision Review. Assurance review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. The teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.

**Business Case and Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Is the project still required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmation that the project still aligns with strategic objectives, including government/entity objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmation that external factors or findings from the procurement process have not affected current priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Are the requirements of the business case complete or does the tender decision require the business case to be amended and/or reassessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A reassessment of the business case requirements, including strategic, economic, financial, commercial and project management factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An updated business case if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Does the recommended way forward meet the business need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key objectives revisited against final tender and proposed solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Has the most appropriate option been selected?

- A cost-benefit and risk analysis against final bid information and results of evaluation, including sensitivity analysis.
- The preferred option complies with the requirements/specifications and meets evaluation criteria.

1.5 Does the commercial arrangement represent value for money, with an appropriate level of quality over the whole life of the project?

- Market assessment, other entity benchmarks and previous experience.
- Results of evaluation, demonstrating how value for money is achieved.
- An assessment of the supplier’s funding arrangements, if appropriate.
- For PPP projects, PPP guidelines.

1.6 Is the entity realistic about its ability to manage the change?

- A documented understanding of cultural implications, where appropriate.
- Comparison with other similar projects.

1.7 Does the business case still demonstrate affordability when incorporating the proposal?

- An updated business case incorporating the following bid information.
- Changes to established budget.
- Returns and value recalculated with a new benefits plan.
- Costs compared with budget and pre-tender estimates.

1.8 Is there an agreed plan for the realisation of anticipated benefits?

- A benefits management strategy and plans.
- Critical success factors
- A list of the individuals responsible for delivering and achieving benefits identified.
- The agreed process for measuring benefit.
- A post-implementation review plan identifying areas to be assessed.
- Payment mechanisms linked to benefits realisation, where appropriate.

1.9 Have suitable stakeholders been involved and, if so, what has been their involvement?

- Involvement of stakeholders and business or user representatives in the quality and proposal reviews
- Stakeholder representation on the evaluation team.
- Approval by the project steering committee and SRO.

2. Assessment of the Proposed Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Does the proposed solution still meet the business needs and government and entity objectives? | - The recommended bid fully complies with all requirements.  
- Documented consultation with stakeholders during evaluation. |
| 2.2 Have the suppliers proposed any alternatives or other options in addition to a fully compliant bid? | - An assessment of options showing how they are beneficial to the project’s outputs/outcomes and are still within the scope of the tender documents. |
| 2.3 Will the proposed bid deliver the business need described in the business case? | - Analysis showing the proposal is defined in terms of the required outcomes.  
- Confirmation that the business can achieve the necessary organisational and business process |
| 2.4 | Has the proposed solution affected the strategy for business change? | • An updated plan for managing the business change on the basis of the proposed solution, which is agreed by project steering committee, and SRO.  
• Analysis of differences from the original plan. |
| 2.5 | Has the proposed solution affected the expectations of business benefits? | • An updated plan for benefits realisation and benefits profiles.  
• Analysis of differences to the original position.  
• Changes documented and agreed with users and stakeholders. |
| 2.6 | Are the entity and supplier prepared for the development (where there are new systems and processes), implementation, transition and operation of any new services? | • The proposed supplier’s development and implementation plans are included in the bid and presented to the appropriate entity endorsement and governance bodies/committees.  
• The entity’s implementation plan is agreed by users and other internal/external stakeholders. |
| 2.7 | Are there plans and processes to address future issues, both business and technical? | • A strategy for managing change is agreed by all parties, including the supplier. |
| 2.8 | Is there clear allocation and understanding of responsibilities between all parties, in addition to any contractual obligations? | • Responsibilities defined and allocated among the entity officials, the supplier organisation and personnel.  
• For cross-portfolio projects, a Memorandum of Understanding (or equivalent), defining responsibilities, relationships and interaction between entities.  
• Documentation identifying internal relationships and interactions (describing ‘who does what’) with the supplier.  
• A statement from the supplier outlining reciprocal arrangements, including senior management roles.  
• If a single supplier, a description of how the project management team will manage the supply chain.  
• If multiple suppliers, details of how the entity will manage the interaction.  
• Documentation confirming that the entity and supply team will work together as an integrated project team.  
• A documented exit strategy exists. |
| 2.9 | Are resources available for the supplier to fulfil its obligations within the contract? | • A plan for implementing the new contract, identifying the quantity, type and quality of resources required.  
• Formal management acceptance of resource requirements. |
| 2.10 | Have the technical implications been assessed? | • Documentation demonstrating that the proposal is technically acceptable and has considered relevant implications such as sustainability and legacy systems etc. |
### 2.11 Does the project have resources with the appropriate skills and experience to achieve the intended outcomes of the investment?

- Plans for building client capability, with nominated staff allocated to the major roles
- Confirmation of internal and external commitment to provide the resources required.
- Job descriptions for key project staff.
- A skills appraisal undertaken, with plans for addressing shortfalls, if any.

### 2.12 Is the proposed procurement within financial approvals and is there adequate budget to accommodate the procurement?

- Documentation confirming that required financial approvals exist.
- Documentation detailing the required budget and timing of milestone payments, referring to the relevant budget measure(s).

### 3. Review of Current Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Is the project under control? (i.e. running to plan and budget)</td>
<td>• Confirmation that project is running to schedule and costs are within budget. • Confirmation that project governance entities/structures are fulfilling their roles and actively overseeing the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What caused any variations?</td>
<td>• Reconciliations against budget and timetable criteria. • Advice provided to the project steering committee or SRO, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 What actions are necessary to prevent variations recurring in other phases?</td>
<td>Analysis and plans are included in project documentation and documentation is continually reviewed and updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Have all the assumptions from Gate 0, 1 and 2 reviews been validated?</td>
<td>• Validation of project assumptions, with assumptions that cannot be validated being stated in the risk management plan/issue register, assessed and discussed with potential suppliers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Have all the required entity procurement and technical checks been undertaken?</td>
<td>• Review of tender management and approval processes. • Confirmation of compliance with the AAIs, procurement policies and operational guidelines. • Confirmation that the evaluation strategy, underpinning models and criteria has been followed. • Demonstration of compliance with statutory requirements (e.g. planning and building regulations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Did the project team follow the planned steps in the procurement strategy?</td>
<td>• Documentation confirming that the activities and processes in the procurement strategy and plan have been followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Has the procurement process adequately managed probity?</td>
<td>• Confirmation of compliance with an entity probity management plan or probity processes. • Sign-off by a probity auditor (where appropriate).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Are risk and issue management plans up to date? Are they being</td>
<td>• The risk management plan and the issue register/log are regularly reviewed, updated and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Have all major risks that arose during this stage been resolved?

- The updated risk management plan and risk register contains appropriate methods for dealing with risks.
- All risk issues assigned and dealt with by specified team members.

4.3 Are there arrangements to minimise risks to the business in the event of major problems during implementation and rollout?

- A documented business continuity and contingency approach, agreed with stakeholders and suppliers.
- Business or entity continuity and contingency plans.
- An assessment of the supplier's continuity and contingency plans.

5. Readiness for Next Phase (Readiness for Service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 Is the working relationship likely to succeed? | • A realistic assessment of management style/behaviours of entity and supplier.  
• Reporting arrangements identified at appropriate levels of entity and supplier.  
• Plans for integrating the project team, where appropriate. |
| 5.2 Are all resources and internal funds in place? | • Budget provision (including provision for future years).  
• The provision of human resources is agreed.  
• An authorisation/approval process for payments to suppliers  
• A process for expenditure reporting and reconciliation. |
| 5.3 Are the supplier’s project, risk and management plans adequate and realistic? | • Confirmation that the supplier’s project plan meets timeframes for achieving the outcome of the investment.  
• Confirmation that the supplier has adequate insurance arrangements  
• Confirmation that the supplier has realistic implementation and risk management plans. |
| 5.4 Does the entity’s plan reflect the supplier’s plans? | • The updated project management plan reflects tender proposals.  
• Personnel and responsibilities have been defined and organised for the entity.  
• Supplier’s personnel have been vetted to meet project requirements.  
• A process exists for resolving issues, and is agreed with supplier.  
• Confirmation that all plans have been reviewed, agreed and included in the contract. |
| 5.5 Are the long-term contract, administration plan and performance measurement process complete? | • A long-term plan with a contract management strategy and a detailed service delivery plan exists.  
• Key performance measures agreed with supplier.  
• An analysis of the project plan showing that resource requirements are identified, planned, budgeted and available when required.  
• Required resources and sourcing identified. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Are all mechanisms and processes for the next phase in place?</td>
<td>- Roles and responsibilities have been defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Are the service management plan, administration and service level arrangements complete?</td>
<td>- The project plan confirms arrangements for management, monitoring, transition and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Is the management process for service change complete?</td>
<td>- A documented service management strategy and plan for the entity. - Defined and agreed service level management, service levels, service quality and measurement between the entity and supplier is confirmed. - Responsibilities for each party agreed. - Defined and agreed standards for services exist. - Defined and agreed monitoring, reporting and review mechanism exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Is there an acceptance strategy or commissioning strategy, as applicable?</td>
<td>- Change control procedures (both technical and business) defined, agreed and included in the contract. - Management process and responsibilities are defined and agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Is there an implementation strategy?</td>
<td>- An acceptance/commissioning strategy and plan exist with fully documented and timetabled decision paths. - Decision-makers are clearly identified and informed about their role in acceptance. - The acceptance criteria are agreed with supplier. - A validated acceptance testing plan, including technical and business components exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gate 4 – Readiness for Service Review

Purpose of the Readiness for Service Review

The Gate 3 – Investment Decision Review covered the activity leading up to contract; including the assessment of the process for arriving at the procurement decision prior to commitment. Once the investment decision has been executed, the project can be delivered in accordance with the business requirement specifications.

The Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review determines:

• that the solution is robust before delivery;
• how ready the entity is to implement the business changes that occur before and after delivery; and
• that there is a basis for evaluating ongoing performance.

For infrastructure projects, this review takes place as soon as practical (preferably before commissioning), to take advantage of the availability of the procurement team. For IT-supported business change, this review takes place after all testing has been completed, including business integration and assurance testing, and before roll-out or release into production.

As the outputs are ready to be embedded into the entity, business change effort ramps up to ensure that the outputs can be effectively implemented, with as little impact on current operations as possible. A benefits focus ensures that business change can be linked directly to achieving the stated benefits. Not only does it help drive the change effort, measuring benefits before and after business change also shows the effectiveness of the change.

At this Gate, the Gateway review team should:

• check that the contractual arrangements are up to date, and that the current phase of the contract is properly completed and documented;
• confirm that there are plans for managing the working relationship with the supplier, with agreement at appropriate levels;
• confirm that all parties have agreed plans for managing risks;
• confirm key benefits documentation has been aligned to delivery;
• check that risks and issues are being managed effectively and do not threaten implementation, and evaluate the risk of proceeding with the implementation, if there are any unresolved issues;
• confirm that commissioning plans have been developed and that they identify and address key areas such as business integration, change management and business continuity management. Agencies should refer to internal policies and industry best practice in preparing these plans;
• check that the commissioning plans have been assessed for risks, affordability and robustness;
• confirm that the business process changes are being implemented;
• confirm that entity and supplier implementation plans are still achievable;
• confirm the business has the necessary resources and is ready to implement the services and the business process change(s);
• confirm that there are management and organisational controls to manage the project through implementation and operation;
• confirm that all parties have agreed plans for training, communication, roll-out, production, release and support;
• confirm that any required testing (e.g. commissioning of buildings, business integration and user acceptance testing) is done to the end-user's satisfaction and that the project's Senior Responsible Official is ready to approve implementation;
• check that there are feasible and tested contingency and exit arrangements;
• confirm that defects or incomplete works are identified and recorded;
• check that the business case is still valid and unaffected by internal and external events or changes, and that the original projected business benefit is likely to be achieved;
• check that lessons for future projects are identified, recorded and are proposed for dissemination; and
• ensure processes and procedures are in place to ensure the long-term success of the project.

**Project Documentation Required for the Readiness for Service Review**

To undertake the review, the Gateway review team requires access to:

• an updated requirements definition, with any changes agreed during the period up to Gate 3 review;
• an updated business case and plans for benefits realisation which reflect the effect of any requirements changes, and the plans for service delivery;
• a plan for performance measurement;
• a risk management plan;
• a benefits management plan;
• close-out documentation (if the project ends at implementation and a new one begins) and status reports and reconciliations for;
• cost versus budget
• actual versus planned schedule
• risk management plans
• communication and external relations plans
• environmental performance documentation
• adherence to statutory requirements
• the updated contract;
• an assessment of contractual issues during the project to date;
• details of any facilities not provided to the required specification and any missing or deficient items, with agreed plans for addressing any outstanding issues;
• draft project plans through to the completion stage and detailed plans for the next stage;
• a test plan and test reports;
• progress reports on development and construction;
• updated risk and issues logs, including residual risks;
• updated contingency and reversion plans;
• the plan for managing change, including expected changes to requirements over time;
• an updated occupational health and safety file, for construction projects;
• records of building site visits;
• updated contingency and reversion plan and information assurance documentation (accreditation), for IT-enabled projects;
• lessons learnt during the project (if the project ends at implementation);
• operational and maintenance instructions and warranties;
• capability assessment for operating and maintaining the solution;
• operational governance models;
• deployment/transition plan;
• implementation strategy and plan;
• operational resource plan;
• operational plans;
  • business/technical support models;
  • business continuity and disaster recovery; and
  • back-up, restore, archive and retention procedures.
• data management, and data quality plan;
• architecture and design specs – particularly those relating to the following and how they will be maintained, monitored and reported:
  • specifications for externally available interfaces;
  • availability requirements;
  • performance requirements; and
  • capacity requirements;
• security threat and risk assessment;
• security support model – covering monitoring, reporting, denial of service attacks, user access controls;
• application software maintenance plan, strategy, manuals covering installation, configuration and maintenance documentation;
• updated benefits realisation plan.

Documents containing this, and other information deemed relevant by the Gateway review team, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.

Areas to be Considered in the Readiness for Service Review

This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review. Gateway review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. The teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.

1. Business Case and Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Is the project still required? | • Approval of changes to requirement defined at Gate 3 Review (Investment Decision), which remain within the scope of the original tender specifications.  
• Reconfirmation with stakeholders.  
• Project steering committee endorsement of:  
  • updated business case and benefits plans;  
  • reviews with evidence of the solution against the requirement;  
  • where appropriate, a review of the supplier’s IT solution for its effect on the business change project;  
  • reconciliation of current government and entity objectives with those defined at Gate 3 Review (Investment Decision); and plans for modular/incremental implementation, where required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does the project still meet the business needs and objectives of the relevant users and stakeholders (i.e. government departments, interest groups etc.)?</th>
<th>• Confirmation that the operational service or facility is approved by stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Is the business case still valid? | • An updated project plan and business case justifying implementation that the deliverable(s) are:  
  • likely to meet the business need;  
  • likely to deliver value for money;  
  • affordable; and  
  • achievable, with implementation broken down into modules/increments where appropriate. |
|   | Are there any changes between contract execution and completion of transition/testing stages that affect the business change project? | • Change management documentation exists for:  
  • the impact analysis;  
  • products, design or operational changes;  
  • justified and approved changes;  
  • an updated business case and benefit plan for the business change; and  
  • updated processes, procedures and activities. |
|   | Is the entity ready for business change? | • Agreed plans exist for business preparation, transition and operational phases, and, where appropriate, for information and communications technology.  
  • Communications plan exists.  
  • Informed and trained staff are available to undertake the business change activities. |
|   | Can the organisation implement the new services whilst maintaining existing services? | • A resource plan, exists showing that the entity can demonstrate capacity and capability and that resources are available to meet commitments. |
|   | Are there appropriately skilled and experienced staff available? | • Confirmation that there is internal and external commitment to provide the staff required.  
  • Job descriptions exist for key project staff.  
  • Skills appraisal and plans exist for addressing any staffing shortfalls. |

### 2. Review of Current Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 | Do the products and/or services delivered meet the acceptance criteria? | • Justification and authorisation of any changes to original specification (Gate 3 Review).  
  • Analysis of products and/or services to show how the solution complies with acceptance criteria. |
| 2.2 | Is the project under control (i.e. running to plan and budget)? | • Reconciliations of cost with budget and actual with planned schedule.  
  • Updated risk and issue logs, apart from commissioning issues.  
  • Status reports for communication and external relations activities.  
  • Reports on environmental performance, where applicable. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3       | Have all the stakeholder issues been addressed?                          | - Compliance with statutory requirements (e.g. occupational health and safety, data protection).  
- Confirmation that contractual issues are resolved and recorded. |
| 2.4       | Are all testing and commissioning/acceptance (or transition) procedures complete? | - Progress reports completed detailing resolution of issues, and circulated as part of the communication plan for stakeholder information. |
|           |                                                                          | - Commissioning/testing team with relevant skills and experience.  
- Commissioning/testing plans, results and analyses of products and/or services against acceptance criteria.  
- Ratified test reports and logs.  
- Confirmed 'end-to-end' testing, including changed or new business processes  
- Testing documentation exists, taking into account future modules or deliveries.  
- Where there are missing or incomplete items; agreed corrective action is documented.  
- For IT-enabled projects, information assurance tests exist. |
| 2.5       | Have all parties accepted the commissioning/test results and any required action plans? | - Documented acceptance of plans, procedures and results by supplier and entity. |
| 2.6       | Are there workable and tested contingency and back-out plans for roll-out, implementation and operation? | - A fully documented approach with timetables, for key aspects and events, for example, IT components and decisions about roll-out.  
- Decision-makers to be be informed and clearly identified in the documentation.  
- Roles and responsibilities listed; resources allocated and staff trained.  
- Commissioning/testing documented and showing they represented the expected scenario(s).  
- Plans for the transition to new ways of working, where applicable.  
- Plans for handover to facilities management, where applicable.  
- Training plans and relevant supporting material exist, if required. |
| 2.7       | Have the supplier and all internal and external parties agreed on the implementation plans? These could include:  
management of change  
migration and data transfer  
client and supplier implementation  
roll-out  
post-implementation review. | - All required plans in the contract have been agreed.  
- All parties, or their representatives, are aware of their responsibilities and have agreed to them. |
2.8 | Have any changes to the contract been previously forecast, accurately recorded and approved? | • The contract documentation shows appropriate authority for all changes since the awarding of the contract, including rationale for the change.

2.9 | Is there a training plan and curriculum? | • Training plans and relevant supporting material exist.

### 3. Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 | Have the risks and issues that arose in the awarding of the contract award and implementation phase been properly managed? | • Confirmation that risks are resolved—no outstanding issues.  
• Any remaining risks are associated only with commissioning and service delivery - these risks are to be fully quantified, and dealt with by applying suitable risk management plans. |
| 3.2 | If there are unresolved issues, what are the risks of implementing rather than delaying? | • An assessment of all remaining issues and risks, with responsibility for management of residual risks clearly defined.  
• An evaluation report on the risk and effect of cancelling, delaying or proceeding with implementation that considers:  
  • the project outcome and wider programme of change;  
  • benefits realisation;  
  • the consequences for supplier, client, business, stakeholders, users etc.;  
• options and management plans for all scenarios, and a recommendation based on the sensitivity analysis; and  
• appropriate process followed, through project governance mechanisms, for any recommendation to delay or proceed with implementation. |

### 4. Readiness for Next Phase (Benefits Realisation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 | Are all project elements ready for service? | • Updated schedules.  
• Occupational health and safety file  
• Handover certificates.  
• Testing and commissioning data.  
• Plans for transition in place.  
• Plans for 'operate contract'/service phase available.  
• Business continuity and contingency plans in place, if required.  
• Technical documentation available, including:  
  • drawings;  
  • operating manuals;  
  • maintenance manuals;  
  • instructions and  
  • information assurance documentation. |
| 4.2 | Is the entity ready to adopt new ways of working, where applicable? | • New business processes have been thoroughly worked out, tested and are ready to be implemented.  
• Information and support is available (e.g. client
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.3 | Is the long-term contract management process in place? | • Detailed and aligned plans, roles, responsibilities and organisation in place for client and supplier, with reporting arrangements at appropriate levels.  
• An appropriate number of suitably qualified staff are appointed by client and supplier, with continuity planned, skills appraised and plans made for addressing shortfalls, if any.  
• Staff managing the contract are aware of and trained for their contract management role; they are familiar with the contract’s aims and purpose.  
• Plans for managing service delivery, changes to the contract, and the relationship with the supplier. |
| 4.4 | Is there a process to manage and measure performance? | • Performance management plans in place.  
• The performance enhancement process is agreed with the service provider and documented in the contract before awarding of the contract.  
• The means of measuring performance is agreed with the service provider/partner. |
| 4.5 | Is there a process to manage measure and report benefits? | • Benefits management plans are in place, linked to intended project outcomes, where applicable.  
• Means of measuring benefits are agreed with the service provider/partner.  
• Reporting lines are clear, with stakeholder involvement clarified.  
• For collaborative projects, all parties understand and agree to their responsibilities and arrangements for benefits realisation. |
| 4.6 | Have ongoing operation and maintenance been considered in detail? | • Issues and ongoing costs relating to maintenance (buildings, physical and/or IT infrastructure and applications as appropriate) are addressed and monitored against expectations. |
| 4.7 | Is there a process for post-implementation reviews? | • Plans for post-implementation reviews are endorsed by the supplier and internal and external stakeholders. |
Gate 5 – Benefits Realisation Review

Purpose of the Benefits Realisation Review

The Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review assessed whether the solution was robust before delivery, and that the entity was ready for the implementation and had a basis for evaluating ongoing performance.

A Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review is not a post-implementation review. It takes place after the entity has carried out a post-implementation review or similar major review. It makes use of findings from that internal review, together with an assessment of organisational learning, as evidence of good practice but may or may not include a full review of plans for the future.

The Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review focuses on ensuring that the project delivered the benefits and value for money identified in the business case and benefits realisation plans. It should be held six to twelve months after commissioning of the product(s) or introduction of the service, when evidence of the benefits is available.

The scope and frequency of Gate 5 reviews will vary depending on the project and contract characteristics. A single Gate 5 review should be enough for most projects.

At this Gate, the Gateway review team should:

• assess whether the business case for the project at Gate 3 and at Gate 4 was realistic;
• assess whether the anticipated benefits are being delivered;
• confirm that the responsible entity or supplier continue to have the necessary resources to successfully manage the contract;
• confirm continuity of key personnel involved in contract management roles;
• assess the ongoing requirement for the contract to meet the business need. Ensure that if circumstances have changed, the service delivery and contract are adapting to the new situation. Changing circumstances could affect partner, relationship, service, change, contract, benefits and performance management;
• where changes have been agreed, ensure they do not compromise the original contract;
• ensure there is ongoing contract development to improve value for money;
• assess the application of the contract management procedures to date to manage the contract;
• confirm that there are plans to manage the contract to its conclusion;
• assess lessons learnt and methodology for sharing these with peers within the agency and across government; and
• confirm the validity of the exit strategy and arrangements for retendering, where applicable.

Project Documentation Required for the Benefits Realisation Review

To undertake the review, the Gateway review team requires access to documents that provide:

• an updated business case that reflects actual operating conditions, compared with the business case reviewed at the Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review;
• report on the findings of any post-implementation reviews (or equivalent major post-project reviews);
• an assessment of the benefits delivered to date and expectations for the future;
• a summary of contract changes since the Gate 4 review;
• plans for contract and service improvement;
• resources, skills appraisals and personnel plans to continue managing the contract;
• reports on stakeholder issues;
• plans for disposal of any assets at the end of the contract (for example resources, buildings, staff, intellectual property rights);
• adherence to building code, occupational health and safety, and sustainability requirements, for construction projects;
• adherence to security documents, for IT-enabled projects;
• contract management reports; and
• project records regarding change and dispute management.

Documents containing this, and other information deemed relevant by the Gateway review team, will be requested at the Planning Meeting or during the course of the review.

**Areas to be Considered in the Benefits Realisation Review**

This section contains topics that would commonly be considered when conducting a Gate 5—Benefits Realisation Review. Gateway review teams are expected to use their own expertise in determining the relevance and appropriateness of these topics for the specific project under review. The teams may determine that additional topics are considered critical to the assessment of the project.

**1. Business Case and Benefits Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.1** Is the business case still valid? | • Confirmation that the business case still fits with the strategic objectives priorities of the entity:  
• the business case is still achievable and affordable; and  
• there is ongoing stakeholder commitment. |
| **1.2** Have the business benefits been realised as set out in the business case? Did the entity achieve other benefits? | • Findings from the post-implementation review, or the post-project review or equivalent major review, including:  
• the project’s success criteria was met;  
• project performance criteria and key performance indicators met or exceeded;  
• total project value targets achieved;  
• contribution to programme/project benefits (as appropriate) and strategic outcomes tracked;  
• updated business and benefits realisation plans are compared to the Gate 3—Investment Decision Review and the Gate 4—Readiness for Service Review;  
• assessment of benefits in current operating regime using the benefits measurement basis defined in the Gate 4 Review; and  
• anticipated future benefits identified. |
| **1.3** Have the needs of the business and/or end-users changed? | • A comparison of current business and end-user needs with those identified in the Gate 3 and Gate 4 Reviews.  
• Periodic reviews of business and end-user needs and a projection of future changes. |
| **1.4** Have all the governance and stakeholder issues been addressed? These include:  
• the statutory process  
• communications | • Updated operational communications strategy, communications plan and issues log.  
• Governance structure reciprocated in both client and provider organisation.  
• Issues addressed at the appropriate level in client and provider organisations. and  
• Staff empowerment to make decisions and
• external relations
• environmental issues
• personnel.

stakeholder involvement.

1.5

Are the users satisfied with the operational service?
• Details of user groups, outputs and the feedback process.
• Indication of advance preparation for changes in way services are delivered.
• User-friendly guide to the services provided.

2. Review of Operating Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Is the service/facility operating to defined parameters? | • Documented operating parameters, updated as needs change.  
• Updated service level agreements, where applicable.  
• Service delivery is measured against defined parameters.  
• Confirmation that the measures used to address poor or non-performance are effective  
• The facility is safe to operate and maintain.  
• Sustainability targets are met or exceeded.  
• Client/stakeholder satisfaction and experiences are assessed. |
| 2.2 Have the project documentation, training material and training programme been delivered and kept up to date? | • New staff trained and existing staff skills updated.  
• Updated training material.  
• Responsibilities for updating training material and documentation defined.  
• The occupational health and safety record updated as required. |
| 2.3 Are the contractual relationships satisfactory? | • Project records demonstrating effective contract management procedures.  
• Supplier and client staff who are enthusiastic, mutually respectful and united in their objectives.  
• Improvements to the contract.  
• Regular reviews between supplier and client.  
• Action plans exist.  
• Measurement of contract improvements.  
• Reports on work done and plans for expected work. |
| 2.4 Are there plans for continued contract management? | • Ongoing forward resource plans, as required;  
• Succession planning for key roles.  
• Skills appraisal and plans for addressing shortfalls |
| 2.5 Are plans for ongoing risk management up to date? | • An updated risk register, risk reporting and management.  
• Business continuity/contingency plans are updated as required  
• Occupational health and safety aspects considered. |
2.6 Have the contract management procedures been successful to date?

- Contract management reports, which demonstrate successful project implementation.
- Project documentation should record plans for change management and dispute management.

### 3. Plans for Ongoing Improvements in Value for Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 What is the scope for improved value for money? Can more be done for less? Could the provider deliver better service quality at the same price? Can maintenance costs be reduced? | - Analysis of value for money to date against scenarios for future service use.  
- Commercial intelligence about the supplier’s track record on other projects and/or comparison with supplier’s offering similar services.  
- Details of efficiency gains, both expected and achieved. |

| 3.2 Has the entity benchmarked its contract-related processes by comparing them with other equivalent organisations involved in similar relationships? | - Benchmarking assessments of processes such as:  
- demand management;  
- service planning and development;  
- service quality;  
- investment decisions/project justification; and  
- benefits management. |

| 3.3 Are commercial mechanisms providing appropriate incentives? | - Payments to the provider are dependent on benefits derived from implementing a particular programme of change.  
- The provider has incentives to deliver and to ensure that individual investments are well planned, achievable and will deliver value.  
- A clear business case with robust benefits identified on each occasion.  
- Target incentive mechanisms, where work is task-based.  
- The provider is given incentives to submit optimum resource estimates for a task, with equitable sharing of risks and benefits, between the entity and supplier, in exceeding or undercutting those original estimates. |

### 4. Plans for Ongoing Improvements in Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Is the entity setting realistic targets for continuous improvement year-on-year from this service?</td>
<td>- Understanding and use of key techniques such as Balanced Scorecard, ongoing stakeholder analysis, benchmarking etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2    | Is the entity tracking its progression to improved performance and the flow of results through key milestones and the business planning cycle? | • Documented performance information which is clearly linked to planned outcomes and enables ready assessment of effectiveness, efficiency and service quality.  
• Core sets of performance information that meet multiple purposes, are consistent and complementary.  
• Ongoing assessment of the appropriateness of performance information.  
• Responsibilities for performance management are defined and understood by the entity and supplier.  
• Direct links exist between planning and results.  
• Ongoing monitoring of performance and periodic evaluation.  
• Integration with corporate and business planning.  
• Consistency with the principles set out in the operational strategies of the business. |
| 4.3    | Does the entity have performance measures to cover all aspects of the contract? | • Performance measures exist in relation to:  
• cost and value obtained;  
• performance and client satisfaction;  
• delivery improvement and added value;  
• delivery capability;  
• benefits realised; and  
• relationship strength and responsiveness. |
| 4.4    | Do the performance measures selected offer clear and demonstrable evidence of the success (or otherwise) of the contract? | • Performance measures chosen have the following attributes:  
• are meaningful and visible to an entity’s management group;  
• properly reflect user and stakeholder perceptions; and  
• can be used to identify the need for support or remedial action as part of contract management activity. |
| 4.5    | Are performance measures related to delivery or capability improvement tracked against an existing baseline? | • A baseline has been established in the business case for the contract.  
• Performance measures are tracked against that baseline. |
| 4.6    | Are there performance assessment measures for:  
• ongoing service delivery  
• the desired results of individual programmes of change or improvement, the implementation of projects  
• the overall results or effect of the deal? What does the entity want to have achieved | • Service level agreement approaches and related measures.  
• Investment appraisal and benefits management techniques are constructed on a case-by-case basis.  
• Objectives are identified during project scoping and in preliminary business analysis activity; and should be rooted in the organisation’s long-term business strategy.  
• For construction projects, confirmation that user satisfaction has been or will be monitored as required. |
5. Readiness for the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Is there an ongoing need for the service?</td>
<td>• An updated business case, linked to the current business strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.2 If the service will be needed in the future, what is its likely scope? | • The options appraisal to include some or all of the following:  
  • ‘do nothing,’  
  • retain the scope of the existing contract;  
  • split the scope of the existing contract;  
  • broaden the scope of the existing contract;  
  • completely rethink the requirement for the contract;  
  • consider single/multiple sources of supply; and  
  • combine new services with similar or complementary services. |
| 5.3 Are there any major issues with the current contract that could affect the approach to retendering the service? Factors to consider include:  
  • the range of services—could the provider cope with the range of services provided or were there significant weaknesses?  
  • the flexibility of the contract—how adaptable was the relationship to both foreseen and unexpected changes in the nature and level of demand?  
  • clients’ reaction and adjustment to outsourcing—how well did users adapt to services provided by a third party? Was management confident that the provider could be relied on to provide the service? Is the organisation now ready for a greater dependence on outsourcing? | • An updated risk management plan and issue register/log.  
• Exception reporting from regular client/provider progress meetings.  
• Reports from contract and service management functions.  
• An exit strategy and details of handover arrangements. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Review of Organisational Learning and Maturity Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.1** | Does the entity have a well-defined and effective process implemented for identifying lessons learnt from the project, embedding them internally and sharing them across government? | • A mechanism for capturing and recording the initial data.  
• An internal evaluation of lessons learnt.  
• Mechanisms and policy for making information available within and outside the organisation.  
• A process for providing feedback to entity project teams.  
• Relevant feedback is considered in the context of the business case.  
• Entity staff participation in knowledge-sharing forums. |
| **6.2** | Has there been a review of how well the project was managed? | • Confirmation from a formal review that is conducted at project closure. |
| **6.3** | Are suppliers encouraged to learn from experience? | • Incentives for suppliers to improve project delivery exist.  
• A commitment to long-term relationships with integrated project teams exists. |
Gateway for Programmes

Purpose of Programme Reviews

The primary purposes of a Gateway Programme Review are to review the outcomes and objectives for the programme and, confirm that they make the necessary contribution to the overall strategy of the organisation and its senior management, and interfaces effectively with broader high level government policy objectives and initiatives.

First-Stage Programme Reviews are conducted before or soon after government approval, in that way, any pertinent outcome/s can be addressed in time to contribute to the Government’s deliberations. Where this is not practical, (for example rapid/urgent decisions) the review should be conducted as soon as possible after the Government’s approval, but before substantial programme design, definition and implementation. This review would also help to define the programme by examining the business need and business case.

These reviews will assess whether stakeholders’ expectations of the programme are realistic, by reference to outcomes and benefits, resource requirements and capability, and timetable and achievability.

A programme review conducted at the start up or Budget pre-decision stage is particularly valuable as it helps to confirm the way forward is achievable before implementation plans have been finalised and major investment occurs. These reviews will assess whether stakeholders’ expectations of the programme are realistic, by reference to outcomes and benefits, resource requirements and capability and timetable and achievability.

This type of review may assist entities in defining the programme by examining the business need and formulation of the business case and can be conducted whenever the priority or the scope of the programme changes significantly.

A Mid-Stage Programme Review will assess the programme execution with the number of these reviews being determined by the complexity, timeframe and risks attached to the programme.

These reviews may be conducted multiple times and on a regular basis (generally at intervals of no more than 12 months), depending on the outcomes of previous reviews and/or where there is a lengthy period between decision-points, staged implementation or an opportunity to assess the programmes’ maximisation of benefits.

The scope of each review is reached through discussions between the entity, the assurance review team and Finance.

A Final-Stage Programme Review will focus on the realisation of benefits, this confirms the links to the business case are still robust and that senior management support clarity of understanding about the required outcomes. It also confirms that expected outcomes are being achieved against the entity’s performance indicators and targets (i.e. as set out in the Portfolio Budget Statement) and that no outstanding issues remain.

These reviews focus on programme closure including programme controls, records management and the identification and application of lessons learned as well as the delivery of the intended outcomes and benefits.

Blended Reviews

Programmes do not always fit neatly into the existing structured Gateway process for projects (from Gates 0 to 5) because programmes can represent a series of interrelated projects with a common objective, or a broad framework or policy concept that may result in a series of largely independent smaller projects (potentially all at different stages of implementation).
A 'blended' review approach (where a programme review is combined with the review of a constituent project that may be critical to the overall success of the programme) can help to reduce the review burden on agencies while simultaneously providing programme strategic alignment and project milestone delivery assurance.

Identifying the critical factors in a multi-project programme, including the issues that need to be addressed to realise benefits, is an important component of the blended review approach.

Programme reviews will assess the significance of any one project to the overall success of the programme, and where the single project could benefit from a focused review, the overall programme review will accommodate a combined focus of programme and project review.

Noting that there are three types of programme reviews (first stage, mid-stage and final stage) there will be opportunities to offer a blended methodology approach to reviews, for example:

- blend Gate 0 and 1 at a first-stage programme review; or
- blend Gate 2, 3 and 4 reviews in mid-stage programme reviews.

thus providing a scenario where a full suite of Gateway Reviews (Gates 0 to 5) does not have to be undertaken for every project.

Please note the blended review approach should only be conducted after consultation with the ARU.

Key Focus Areas and Evidence Expected

This section outlines the six key focus areas, the context and scope for each review stage, and guidance on areas to probe, including examples of the types of evidence expected. Note that the six key focus areas remain constant between the three stages (First, Mid and Final), with the emphasis for the review reflecting the stage of development for the programme.

Recognising that each programme is unique and that as circumstances change, the areas to probe tabled below should be used as a guide rather than a complete checklist of mandatory items.

Assurance review teams are expected to apply their own expertise to determine the relevance and appropriateness of each topic for each review stage.

1. Policy context and strategic fit

Assess the policy context and strategic fit with the entity’s and the Government's high-level policy objectives and initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to use this section for:</th>
<th>When this review is conducted very early in the programme lifecycle, information may be uncertain as options are being explored. Plans for achieving outcomes are likely to be unclear; however, there should be evidence of high-level plans for the way forward or a set of options for consideration, with a preferred option identified. There should also be a reasonably clear indication of critical success factors and how they will be measured. Strategic fit: there must be a demonstrable link to the entity corporate strategy. For instance, why is this programme needed? Governance: the governance framework will be in outline, but there should already be a clear owner for the programme. Delivery: capability to deliver will be considered at a high level, ideally supported by estimates based on evidence from similar initiatives. Lessons learned: there should be mechanisms in place to...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
learn lessons regardless of the stage in the programme lifecycle.

Risks: major risks should be identified at a high level, even at this early stage, with an indication of how they will be managed, including requirements for contingency plans. Implementation risks that may undermine the timely and effective achievement of intended outcome as is advice on mitigation strategies to reduce these risks.

At programme initiation, all areas in this section will need thorough investigation as they provide the foundation for successful delivery.

### Mid Stage Programme Review

The focus at this stage is whether assumptions or circumstances have changed, for example a change in policy direction, continued availability of skilled resources.

### Final Stage Programme Review

The critical area at the Final-Stage Review is to confirm the link to business strategy is still robust and supported by senior management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key focus areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> Is there a clear understanding of the required outcomes and are they soundly based?</td>
<td>• The programme is structured to allow responsiveness and flexibility in achieving outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1.2** Does the programme break new policy ground? | • Innovative solutions are assessed by experts.  
  • There are similar initiatives from which lessons may be learnt. 
  • Consultation with the market to help refine the approach, identify risks, and ways in which risks might be mitigated. 
  • For PPP initiatives, evaluation of the programme is consistent with methodology in |
| **1.3** Does the programme sponsor and governance group agree with the business strategy and is the strategy robust? | • A clear direction set out in the corporate and business plans, government policy documents, for example the Administrative Arrangement Orders or entity objectives. |
| **1.4** Does the programme demonstrate a clear link with wider government and the agency’s objectives – does it reflect the current business policy and environment and is it aligned with the business strategy? | • Documents showing the programme owners/entity accountable authority/responsible minister, have agreed the scope of the programme and its alignment with policy objectives, entity strategy and/or change priorities, for example:  
  • NPP / Cabinet Submission, endorsed by the responsible minister and entity accountable authority. 
  • Business Case/s, including two pass approval business cases. 
  • Where there are significant changes in policy priorities, in stakeholders’ views, or the key objectives: details of a reappraisal of the programme. |
| **1.5** Is there a continuing need for the programme? | • The desired outcomes of the programme remain aligned to the entity strategy.  
  • Continuing commitment from stakeholders demonstrated. 
  • Confirmation that the programme is organised to deliver the outcomes as needed. 
  • The programme brief or programme business case has been updated and remains valid. |
| **1.6** Have other delivery options been considered? | • An analysis of delivery options. |
| **1.7** Are there any strategic risks arising from the implementation of this | • The main risks identified at the outset with nominated risk owners’, options for mitigating these risks considered, and the need for contingency and business continuity plans |
programme?

recognised.
• Risks identified in the NPP, Business Case and risk documentation.

1.8 Does the programme involve other entities or portfolios?

• For cross-entity or portfolio policy or programmes, confirmation that all parties involved know how they are engaged in the policy or programme and are committed to its delivery.
• Clear governance arrangements exist to ensure sustainable alignment with the business objectives of all entities involved, including where relevant the objectives of the appointed lead entity.

1.9 Has the entity managed similar programmes?

• The entity has processes in place to incorporate lessons learned from this programme and its components into wider best practice.
• The entity has demonstrated that it learns from the experiences of others.

1.10 Are the key programme assumptions explicit and are they still valid?

• A list of major assumptions made in preparing the programme brief, updated to reflect any changes that could affect success and current assessments of the validity of all assumptions.

1.11 Are the programme’s milestones defined by legislation or by government commitment?

• Confirmation that there is an ongoing commitment from stakeholders to the achievement of the outcomes.

2. Business case and stakeholders

Assess the programme’s business case which sets out overall costs and the planned benefits realisation. Ensure the programme is supported by a business case and stakeholders, and takes into account the risks, potential change impacts and integration with other internal and external programmes.

How to use this section for:

First Stage Programme Review
The level of detail and completeness of the business case will reflect that amount of certainty associated with the programme at that point. Initially, the programme may tolerate high levels of uncertainty; estimates will be very approximate, with high levels of potential variance. The business case should be developed in tandem with the programme and benefits realisation plans.
There must be a clear understanding of the programme outcomes from the early stages, even though the overall scope and the way forward may not be clear. The measures of success will be in the programme outline.
Key stakeholders should be identified and engaged, especially for those programmes, which involve several entities.
The components of the programme, sub-programmes and projects and their resource requirements will not be certain at this stage.
There should be early indicators of the additional factors affecting success, which will vary significantly depending on the programme.
Programme controls will not have been established in detail.
At programme initiation, all areas in this section will require thorough investigation.
### Mid Stage Programme Review

These reviews provide an opportunity to revisit programme assumptions such as stakeholder support, programme affordability and the effectiveness of programme controls.

It is essential to have effective change control mechanisms in place relating to programme scope, interdependencies, master programme schedule development and resources (for example a change in policy direction, capability and continued availability of skilled resources).

Assumptions will need to be revisited, in particular:
- whether stakeholders remain supportive;
- whether the programme is still affordable;
- management of issues relating to additional factors that could affect success; and
- the effectiveness of programme controls.

### Final Stage Programme Review

The main areas to investigate are continued clarity of understanding about the required programme outcomes and support for stakeholders as the programme closes.

Consider programme controls and records management.

### Key focus areas to probe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key focus areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2.1** Is there a robust business case for the programme, with links to the individual sub-programmes and projects? Is it up to date? | • A description of the programme’s business or policy drivers and objectives and how they contribute to the overall objectives.  
• An outline of the required outputs or outcomes and their relationship to each other.  
• A definition of the benefit profiles for the programme for each of the benefits expected.  
• Confirmation that the way forward is likely to achieve the intended outcome.  
• A business case with, a rationale and objectives statement, appraisal of options and evaluation plan for the option being pursued, and the key performance indicators - e.g. as stated in the Portfolio Budget Statement. |
| **2.2** Is the scope of the programme clear? Does it overlap or interface with other internal or external policies or programmes? | • A description of the programme scope to date.  
• Details of any overlap or link with existing internal or external programmes or policies. |
| **2.3** Have the stakeholders been identified and do they support the programme? | • A list of key stakeholders and statements of their needs and support for the programme.  
• A plan for communicating with and involving stakeholders and securing common understanding and agreement. |
| **2.4** Does the programme:  
• rely on complex dependency relationships with other projects or entities, or have  
• complex cross-entity funding arrangements? | • For cross-entity programmes, clear lines of accountability to resolve any conflict with stakeholder requirements.  
• Recognition of the need to involve external delivery partners e.g. the not-for-profit sector, industry and suppliers. |
| **2.5** Are key stakeholders confident outcomes will be achieved when expected? | • A confirmation that planned outcomes have been achieved to date.  
• Mechanisms for collecting performance data are in place and a plan for evaluating the impact of the programme is in operation.  
• The entity’s accountable authority, SRO or a steering... |
| 2.6 | Have the programme sub-components been appropriately identified and structured? | • A description of programme strands and/or sub-programmes and main projects with an explanation of how each will contribute to the required outcomes.  
• Key deliverables and identification of key interdependencies.  
• Implementation will be broken up into manageable steps and phased delivery where appropriate and will avoid ‘big bang’ approaches. |
| 2.7 | Have programme controls been determined, especially where constituent projects will join other entities? | • A definition of overall programme controls such as progress tracking, risk management, issue identification and resolution and impact assessment.  
• Interdependencies between other programmes and projects defined, with high-level plans for managing them.  
• For collaborative programmes, accountabilities and governance arrangements for different entities defined and agreed.  
• Processes to manage and record key programme information and decision making. |
| 2.8 | Has a delivery strategy been developed? | • An analysis of delivery options.  
• The parties in the delivery chain are identified and an approach for working together established. |
| 2.9 | Is there a clear understanding of what constitutes success? | • A definition of key critical success factors and how the required quality of performance will be measured.  
• A description of main outcomes and an analysis of the leading and lagging indicators.  
• The relationship between programme outcomes and government objectives.  
• Projected performance over the life of the programme with key performance targets and measures agreed with stakeholders.  
• The programme can be evaluated in a practical and affordable way. |
| 2.10 | What are the additional factors that could affect success? Are there risks associated with: multiple suppliers or complex/volatile supply or logistical chains; economic conditions likely to affect options of availability; or environmental issues such as volatility and/or significant external change factors? | • The main risks identified at the outset with nominated risk owners’ options for mitigating these risks considered, and the need for contingency and business continuity plans recognised.  
• A description of dependencies and/or other factors and/or programmes already under way that could affect the outcomes of the programme.  
• Engagement with delivery chains, the not-for-profit sector and/or the market to determine capability to meet the need and to identify suitable options for delivery.  
• Where suppliers and/or partners are already in place, confirmation that their ability to deliver has been considered.  
• The legal framework for the programme and its projects exists, is comprehensive and sound. |
3. Risk Management

Review the risk management arrangements for identifying and managing programme and project level risks, including external risks such as changing business priorities and competing Government priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to use this section for:</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>If the first review is very early, the major risks may have just been identified at a high level with an indication of how they will be managed and initial consideration of the requirements for contingency plans. At programme initiation all aspects of risk management must be probed thoroughly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>The focus is checking that risk management remains effective and appropriate. Implementation risks inherent in working with other agencies, jurisdictions and contracted service providers should be adequately identified, assessed and treated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>The status of the risk register at programme closure will be the principal area to investigate and will consider which risks have now been closed/removed and which will be transferred to the risk register for a new initiative or corporate risk log.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Areas to probe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.1</strong> Is there a framework for managing issues and risk to this programme?</th>
<th><strong>Evidence expected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Defined roles, responsibilities and processes for managing issues and risk across the programme, with clearly defined routes for bringing issues and risks to the attention of senior management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.2</strong> Have the major risks been identified?</th>
<th><strong>Evidence expected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current list of major strategic, political and/or reputation and legislative risks to the overall programme analysed by likelihood and impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identified early warning indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The risks of success (e.g. take-up or greater than expected usage, and impact and capability of market) have been considered and contingencies identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation that regular reviews of risks, mitigation options and contingency plans are carried out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.3</strong> Have assurance measures for the programme been put in place?</th>
<th><strong>Evidence expected</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation that the programme is subject to the agency’s assurance framework for its portfolio of programmes and projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme governance arrangements include individuals who can challenge assumptions, decisions and risks and, where necessary, advice should be acted upon, such as representatives from internal audit, procurement specialists, the central entities, the policy and service delivery entities and peer reviewers, as required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gateway reviews, health checks and/or policy reviews are incorporated into the plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review recommendations are turned into action plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An audit, arranging for complementary assurance about control and processes from audit functions through the delivery chain, is undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market and/or supply considerations are understood and acted upon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4  Is there a contingency plan and business continuity plans?  • Decisions about contingency and business continuity arrangements made with appropriate plans.
• The programme’s effects are analysed and decisions taken about those for which contingency arrangements will be needed.
• Milestones relating to contingency measures are in the plans and the milestones are being achieved as expected.

3.5  Have lessons from similar programmes been considered?  • Details of applicable issues identified from previous similar programmes are considered in the current programme.

4. Review of current phase
Review current status of the programme in terms of budget, schedule and progress with outcomes, against the performance measures set out in the relevant Portfolio Budget Statements, the approved business case and benefits management plans.

**How to use this section for:**

| First Stage Programme Review | This section would not normally apply but some of the topics may need to be considered. |
| Mid Stage Programme Review | All areas need to be investigated thoroughly to confirm the programme remains on track and issues are being managed effectively. |
| Final Stage Programme Review | Confirm the expected outcomes have been achieved against the performance indicators and targets, as set out in the relevant Portfolio Budget Statements, and the Business Plan and that no outstanding issues remain. |

**Areas to probe**

| Evidence expected |
|---|---|
| Evidence expected |
| **4.1** Are the programme’s key milestones compliant with broader government or entity timing requirements? | • Timelines for processes are identified and lead times are factored into the programme schedule. |
| **4.2** Is the programme on track in relation to planning and/or delivery? | • The programme report and plan are updated.
• Milestones are achieved as planned.
• The plan for benefits measurement and achievement is on track.
• The risk register is current.
• There are highlight reports for constituent work streams.
• The resources and funding used to date.
• Issues being resolved.
• Documented confidence from delivery partners that future milestones and plans are realistic.
• Confirmation that interdependencies with other programmes are being managed satisfactorily. |
| **4.3** Have problems occurred and if so how have they been resolved? | • Issues and details of action taken are documented.
• Governance framework with escalation routes to senior management, ministers and responsible interdepartmental committees and central entities.
• The programme plan is updated to reflect changing issues and risks.
• Recommendations from previous Gateway reviews are addressed. |
| **4.4** Have options for potential ways forward been identified? | • Documentation of various solutions including policy, asset and non-asset options.
• A comparison of retention maintenance and replacement |
indictive costs.
• Options analysis or feasibility studies.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Have lessons learned been shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmation of lessons learned and shared across the entity and across programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Assessment of intended outcomes and benefits

Review the management of intended outcomes and benefits by analysing governance arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the programme, including roles and responsibilities for managing risk, interdependencies between other programmes/projects, including those of other agencies.

### How to use this section for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Stage Programme Review</th>
<th>If the first review is very early, the key aspects to investigate thoroughly are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the main outcomes and benefits identified, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the relationships between the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans for achieving the outcomes are likely to be unclear at an early stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There should be evidence of high-level plans for the way forward or a set}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of options for consideration, with a preferred option identified. There</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                            | should also be a reasonably clear indication of how success will be measured,|}
|                            | e.g. a trajectory for take-up of a service.                               |
|                            | At programme initiation, all areas must be investigated thoroughly to     |
|                            | confirm expectations for delivery are realistic and performance can be    |
|                            | measured with reasonable accuracy.                                        |

### Mid Stage Programme Review

The Mid-Stage review checks plans to deliver outcomes and ensure benefits remain achievable. It focuses on ensuring that everything is in place to deliver the required outcomes and that information obtained will be acted on to improve the quality of the implementation.

At this stage, a benefits realisation strategy and plan should clearly show what will happen, where and when the benefits will occur and who will be responsible for their delivery. It is important to be clear about handover and responsibilities for ongoing operations in the changed state (for instance when the benefits will actually be harvested). Integrating this strategy with the overall Programme Master Schedule will help to ensure ownership and ongoing management of benefits is maintained after the programme has been closed and/or handed over to its business owner.

### Final Stage Programme Review

The topics in this section would primarily be on benefits realised and lessons learned at programme closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to probe</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Have the policy/programme outcomes been identified?</td>
<td>• A current list of the main outcomes and desired benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information on links to strategic outcomes and to deliverables from specific projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Are the planned outcomes achievable, or have any changes in scope, relationship or value been properly agreed?</td>
<td>• The outcomes and their relationship to each other have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Credible plans for the achievement of the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documentation of an ongoing commitment from stakeholders to the outcomes and their achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confirmation that the business case has been reviewed and approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.3 | Is the programme on track to deliver? | - Confirmation that planned outcomes have been achieved to date.  
- Mechanisms for collecting performance data are in place and a plan for evaluating the impact of the programme is in operation.  
- Confirmation that senior management is confident that planned milestones will result in good quality deliverables and the desired outcomes (e.g. senior officials such as the entity's accountable authority, the SRO, a steering committee, a programme coordination committee or an interdepartmental committee.  
- Documented commitment from key stakeholders that programme deliverables will achieve the desired outcomes. |
| 5.4 | Is there a plan for monitoring and achieving the required outcomes? | - A benefits management strategy and a plan to ensure that outcomes are delivered in terms of performance measures and/or key performance indicators.  
- Appropriate baseline measures identified to assess future performance.  
- Actual performance is to be assessed against the defined measures and indicators.  
- Processes are established for identifying and resolving issues and problems which may result in non-achievement of planned outcomes.  
- Clear documentation outlining how the objectives from the sub-programmes and/or projects link to the outcomes of the programme. |
| 5.5 | How will change be managed? | - Programme management controls and reporting mechanisms are defined and operational (e.g. to entity accountable authority, responsible minister, and interdepartmental committees). |
| 5.6 | Is a benefits management plan active and are benefits being monitored and reported? | - Benefits management plans are in place and linked to intended outcomes, where applicable.  
- Methods of measuring benefits are agreed with service providers and stakeholders.  
- Reporting lines are clear, with clear roles and responsibilities assigned. |
| 5.7 | Is granting activity part of the programme? Do the grants management processes align with the seven key principles prescribed in the Commonwealth Grants Rules and Guidelines? | - Granting activity should operate under clearly defined and documented operational objectives,  
- These objectives should be concise, unambiguous, realistic, and outcomes orientated. |
| 5.8 | Where procurement is part of the programme, how is capability and capacity for acquisition to be managed? | - A procurement strategy is in place and its application to the programme and its projects is adequately documented.  
- A market management plan is in place, demonstrating a good understanding of supply side capability and capacity. |

### 6. Readiness for next review stage

Assess the entity's readiness and transition to the next review stage phase by considering how the entity plans to achieve the required outcome, including detailed measures for the management of other agencies, jurisdictions or other parties contributing to the outcome.

---

4 Commonwealth Grant Guidelines 2009, Part II, pp 13-26
This section will provide a stocktake of what has been achieved to date and what will be required to move to the next stage. It will assess resources, capabilities and inter-dependencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to use this section for:</th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>If the first review is very early, plans may be in too early a stage of development to provide reliable evidence. Where this is the case, this review would examine planned steps to programme initiation; all areas would apply to strategic thinking and scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>All areas should be probed thoroughly with the focus on ensuring everything is in place to start delivering the required outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Stage Programme Review</strong></td>
<td>This section would not normally apply at programme closure stage but some of these areas may need to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas to probe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evidence expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6.1** Are the funds available to undertake the next phase? | • The budget provision for the programme is appropriately documented.  
• Information is provided, setting out adequate approaches for estimating, monitoring and controlling the expenditure on the programme. |
| **6.2** Are the programme’s resources, including inter/intra departmental resources, suitably skilled, available and committed to carrying out the work? | • Information showing who needs to be involved, what they must deliver and when it must be delivered.  
• Identification of the key specialist and management skills required for the next phase of the programme.  
• Confirmation of the key roles in place with skills matched to the nature of the work.  
• Information on the resources that will be made available in the next phase. |
| **6.3** Are the plans for the next phase realistic and achievable? | Plans for the next phase would vary depending on the programme/project but would generally include the items in the following list.  
• Information on streams of work such as sub-programmes and projects.  
• Deliverables and/or milestones and the route map to achieve them.  
• Timescales.  
• Organisational and governance structure,  
• Communication and stakeholder engagement strategy.  
• Information on costs and resources.  
• Risk management strategy.  
• Benefits management strategy.  
• Confirmation that the plans have been tested and found to be robust. |
| **6.4** Are appropriate governance controls and approvals in place? Has the entity assessed its readiness to proceed to the next stage? | • Identification of accountabilities allocated to the SRO.  
• Programme management controls and reporting mechanisms are defined and operational (e.g. to entity accountable authority, responsible minister, and interdepartmental committees).  
• Plans for ongoing management of the delivery chain are in place. |
| **6.5** Is the governance framework fit for purpose for the next stage; and is there commitment to support key roles and responsibilities for | • A commitment from the owner and governance group, a willingness to take ownership, and a clear understanding of their roles in achieving successful outcomes.  
• Key roles and individuals have been identified and |
this programme within current corporate priorities?

assigned, with responsibility for the transition to new ways of working (e.g. responsible minister, SRO, programme director, programme manager, business change manager and sub-programme and/or project managers).

6.6 Are the required skills and capabilities for this programme available, taking account of the entity’s current corporate commitments?

- The entity has brought together, or plans to bring together, the skills and capabilities it needs to plan and achieve the desired outcomes and has access to external sources of expertise.
- The programme/project team is realistic about the complexity of the changes and how they can be managed and can demonstrate learning from previous and/or other programmes.
- Key roles within the programme are identified with named individuals.
- Key individuals have an appropriate track record of successful delivery.
- The programme has access to expertise which can benefit those fulfilling the requisite roles.
- There is an appropriate allocation of key programme or project roles between internal staff and consultants or contractors.
Implementation Readiness Assessment

**Purpose of the IRA Review**

IRA Reviews are designed to:

- assess the programme implementation strategy against its specified objectives
- provide early identification of any areas that may require corrective action, and
- increase confidence that a programme implementation strategy is effective and conclusive, draws on experience and better practices, has effectively identified risks to implementation and has plans to manage these.

The IRA provides assurance to Government and entity accountable authority that necessary implementation planning activities have taken place and that significant issues are identified early in the development phase. An IRA typically occurs at the final stages of the development process prior to consideration by decision makers. If an IRA is commissioned, any requirement for a Gateway review will be superseded.

In some circumstances, it is not always logistically possible to conduct an IRA in time to inform government deliberations of the proposal. Where this occurs, an IRA may still be applied with the review findings to be included in a letter from the Minister of Finance to the Prime Minister copied to the responsible portfolio minister and the Treasurer.

IRAs focus on six high level topic areas which assist in determining entity preparedness for the implementation of a policy initiative. An IRA is designed to assess the programme implementation strategy against its specified objectives, provide early identification of any areas that may require corrective action, and increase confidence that a programme implementation strategy is effective and conclusive.

By identifying key factors that may affect policy performance and identifying scenarios for how these factors might evolve in the future, policies can be made more robust to a range of anticipated conditions, and strategies developed to help make important policy adjustments when needed.

The IRA report summarises the findings and recommendations of the IRA review team, informed by but not limited to, an assessment against the criteria documented in the:

- "Chapter 9: Lessons Learned, Identifying the challenges to implementation during policy development", of Performance Audit No.12 2010-11, Home Insulation Programme (Australian National Audit Office, October 2010); ⁵ and
- other relevant better practice guidance, depending on the nature of the programme. For example Implementing Better Practice Grants Administration (Australian National Audit Office, June 2010). ⁶ Refer also to the PGPA Act and Rules.

**Applied ratings for the key area table**

The key area table provides an indicator of potential challenges to successful implementation of a proposal. The analysis is not an exhaustive model for the identification of challenges to programme preparedness for implementation. However, it can be the starting point for a more exhaustive assessment of a programme and implementation readiness.

---


The table is made up of a series of assessments, with the result indicated by marking X in the appropriate box between Very Low (VL) and Very High (VH). Those assessments are made using the knowledge and judgement of the SRO, programme team and relevant stakeholders and should be considered in the light of a programme implementation plan and strategic context.

The table has been designed to be applied to a range of proposals, and not every item in the table will apply to each policy initiative. The review team will focus on those items most relevant to the specific policy initiative and will flag items which are not relevant as ‘not applicable’.

Please note: when assigning a measure for each Key Area that it should reflect the overall consequence of the considerations to the overall objective for readiness planning for policy implementation. For example, if in one area a number of issues are raised during the considerations, you must assess the overall impact/consequence of these issues against the objective (preparedness for implementation).

Example application of weightings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Low - Low</strong></td>
<td>The challenge would have some impact on the objective (implementation readiness) but it is not considered to be significant and can be managed within the entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>The challenge would have some impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will escalate further if not addressed and managed appropriately – entity strategies to mitigate should include senior management governance control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>The challenge has a significant impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will need a strategy to manage – will require senior management governance controls and may benefit from independent oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High</strong></td>
<td>The challenge has a critical impact on the objective (implementation readiness) and will need a strategy to manage – will require senior management governance controls and independent oversight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key areas for assessment in the IRA review**

The ‘areas of enquiry’ focus on the issues most pertinent at the earlier stages of policy development, these areas are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th><strong>Policy Design (includes key assumptions)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Has there been a systematic focus on implementation at the policy development stage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Is there a clear and concise description of the programme objectives and how it will work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Is this commonly understood between relevant entities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Have all delivery challenges been identified and documented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Have the critical implementation assumptions been identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Are the assumptions supported by data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Have the assumptions been tested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Is there a process for monitoring and retesting the assumptions during the design and implementation phases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Has a sensitivity analysis been applied to the assumptions and how has this been reflected in programme design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Are arrangements in place to adequately resource implementation planning for the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>To what extent does the entity consider this is the best way to achieve the policy objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Has consideration been given to alternative/other options for programme delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Have all the options under consideration been adequately tested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Is this a demand driven programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>What are the key factors that may influence demand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>How will funding be impacted by changes in demand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>How will this emerging cost be managed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Is this policy initiative outside the entity’s traditional area of expertise or experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18.1</td>
<td>If so how will additional expertise and experience be sourced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Has the financial impact of the policy been formally costed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19.1</td>
<td>If so has the costing been agreed with Finance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Is the financial profile appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Is there a need for additional capital as well as recurrent costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>How have these capital costs been assessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Does the entity have in place a property management plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Are there any gaps in critical information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Implementation Planning (includes resources, managing interdependent relationships and procurement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Is there sufficient time to safely implement the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Is there an implementation plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Is there a detailed programme timeline including critical paths, dependencies and milestones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Is implementation of the programme appropriately phased over the forward years and does it reflect manageable stages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>How have lessons from similar programmes been drawn upon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Is there a Programme Management Office?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Does the programme require a corporate Programme Management Office function?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Are there structured change management strategies in place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Do financial reporting arrangements provide effective monitoring and forecasting of expenditure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Is there an overall ICT plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Has the ICT plan been subject to external scrutiny (e.g. AGIMO)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1</td>
<td>If so what feedback has been provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>How will the appropriate ICT expertise/resources be marshalled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Are the ICT requirements clearly within the agencies existing competencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1</td>
<td>If not are they novel or leading edge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to leverage existing or developing ICT capability within the Commonwealth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Do implementation plans provide for structured testing of IT systems, and formal acceptance sign-off, prior to system implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Does the entity have the necessary skills available or can they be sourced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Does the entity have the capacity to implement the policy without impacting negatively on existing programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Are there appropriately skilled and experienced financial management personnel available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Is delivery of the programme dependent on another government entity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.1</td>
<td>If so how mature are the arrangements for accessing this support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Does the service delivery entity have demonstrated capability to deliver?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Has consideration been given to cross-organisational functions and funding arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Is delivery of the programme reliant on third party suppliers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Is the external to government supplier market limited and/or very specialised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Has a high-level procurement strategy been developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>How does the procurement strategy support value for money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Does implementation depend on complex or innovative procurement processes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance Arrangements

| 3.1 | Is there a formal governance structure in place, established and documented? |
| 3.2 | Is the Governance Plan appropriate for this policy initiative? |
| 3.3 | Do governance arrangements for the programme require a change in corporate governance arrangements? |
| 3.4 | Does the size and complexity of the initiative require a formal or separate governance structure? (e.g. Steering committee or task force to assist in implementation). |
| 3.5 | Do members of the taskforce or steering committee have the required skills and are they at the right level? |
| 3.6 | How will the entity’s senior management officials monitor the development and implementation of the initiative? |
| 3.7 | Is there a senior official responsible for the delivery of this policy initiative? |
| 3.8 | How has senior management commitment for this policy initiative been demonstrated? |
| 3.9 | Is there independent input to the governance process? |
| 3.10 | Will the governance arrangements be effective in providing leadership and direction for the delivery of the policy initiative? |
| 3.11 | Have roles and responsibilities been defined? |
| 3.12 | Are financial delegations well understood and appropriate? |
| 3.13 | Are records made of key programme design decisions and the basis for those decisions? |
| 3.14 | Are appropriate monitoring and reviewing processes in place? |
| 3.15 | Are monitoring arrangements linked to the critical implementation risks? |
| 3.16 | Is the policy initiative likely to involve probity issues? |
| 3.17 | Has a probity plan been prepared? |
| 3.18 | How will key probity concerns be managed? |

### Risk Management

| 4.1 | Is there a risk management policy within the entity, including processes for the monitoring, escalation and ownership of risk factors on a day-to-day basis? |
| 4.2 | Is there a specific risk management plan for the programme? |
| 4.3 | Is there a common understanding of the risks and who carries the specific risks between the delivery entity, central entities and partner entities? |
| 4.4 | Have all the risks been identified? |
| 4.5 | Have treatments for these risks been identified? |
| 4.6 | Is the risk management plan based on current and appropriate guidelines? |
| 4.7 | Are there contingency plans, including an exit strategy, for extreme risk implementation scenarios? |
| 4.8 | Is there an effective escalation strategy in place and how will this work in practice? |
| 4.9 | Has the accountable authority been briefed on the risks to implementation? |
| 4.9.1 | How has this been documented? |
| 4.10 | Has the responsible minister and Government been briefed on the risks to implementation? |
| 4.10.1 | How has this been documented? |
| 4.11 | Are there planned measures in place to deal with fraud and abuse? |

### Stakeholder Management and Communications

<p>| 5.1 | Have all the key stakeholders been identified? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Is there clear responsibility for stakeholder management, and the outcomes required from stakeholder engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Have stakeholders already been engaged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>What is the strategy for stakeholder engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Have senior management provided input into the analysis of key stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>How has stakeholder feedback been reflected in programme design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>If stakeholder resistance is likely, how will it be managed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>How will stakeholder expectations be managed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>How do the key stakeholders interact with governance arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Is there a communication plan encompassing both internal and external stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10.1</td>
<td>Is there an alignment between the communication strategy and stakeholder analysis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Are resources targeted to maximise the necessary messages to all stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Is whole-of-government consultation required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Are arrangements in place to ensure shared implementation activities are aligned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Will the policy initiative be formally evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Is there an evaluation strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Do arrangements for data collection support effective evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>How will results of evaluation be used to inform future implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Have key performance indicators been developed for the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>How will the key performance indicators be applied in on-going programme management?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>