<Insert appropriate security classification>

Australian Government
Department of Finance

Gateway Review Report (First Stage/Gate 0/Gate 1) Review <amend as applicable>

For: <Insert program/project name>

To: <Insert Senior Responsible Official name

This report is the property of the <insert entity name> and may only be distributed or reproduced with the permission of the Senior Responsible Official with the exception of projects or programs that include an ICT component, where the report will be shared with the Digital Transformation Agency (DTA).

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Entity name:		
Program/Project name:		
Review type:		
Senior Responsible Official (SRO):		
Planning Meeting date:		
Onsite Review dates:		
Date report provided to SRO:		
Date report provided to Assurance Reviews Unit:		
Review Team Leader:	**Name**	**Signature**
Review Team Member:	**Name**	**Signature**
Review Team Member:	**Name**	**Signature**
Review Team Member:	**Name**	**Signature**
Template version control:	Draft November 2021	

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Australian Government's Gateway Review Process (Gateway) methodology as set out in *Resource Management Guide 106: Australian Government Assurance Reviews.*

The report summarises the findings and recommendations of the review team, which are based on information provided to the review team during the review process.

A copy of the report is provided to the Assurance Reviews Unit (ARU), Department of Finance at the conclusion of the review to identify lessons learned and evidence of best practice. Where a project or program includes an ICT component the report is shared with the Digital Transformation Agency (DTA). The report is not shared more broadly without agreement from the SRO. A copy may be provided to subsequent review teams as pre-reading material for future reviews.

Enquiries regarding the Gateway methodology should be directed to:

Assurance Reviews Unit
Department of Finance
One Canberra Avenue
FORREST ACT 2603
Email: assurancereviews@finance.gov.au

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Version 223/20 T

Gateway Assurance Dashboard

Delivery Confidence Assessment

Rating

The review team finds that the overall delivery confidence assessment for the program at this point in time is <Guidance: insert **Green, Green/Amber, Amber, Amber/Red, Red**>

<Guidance: Insert definition of the rating.>

Factors Affecting Rating

<Guidance: insert a brief summary of the factors leading to the DCA rating.>

Summary of Key Focus Area Ratings

<Guidance: Insert appropriate rating, delete any Key Focus Areas not required>

Key Focus Area	Rating
Policy Context and Strategic Fit	
Business Case and Benefits	
Stakeholders and End Users	
Governance and Planning	
Risk Management	
Review of Current Phase	
Readiness for Next Stage	

Summary of Findings

<Guidance: Insert a brief statement outlining the key findings for each Key Focus Area>

<Guidance: For programs, include a brief statement as to the status of the component projects.>

3

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Summary of Recommendations

The review team makes the following recommendations which are provided with an urgency category.

Rec No	Key Focus Area	Recommendation	Urgency Category
R1			
R2			
R3			
R4			
R5			
R6			
R7			
R8			
R9			
R10			

<Guidance: recommendations are to be listed by Key Focus Area in their order of appearance in the report>

<Guidance: delete the following statement if this is the first review.>

A summary of the previous recommendations and actions taken can be found at Appendix B.

Definitions for the ratings provided for the Delivery Confidence Assessment, Key Focus Areas and Urgency Category are provided at Appendix F.

Appendices:

Appendix A.   Gateway Assurance Plan.

Appendix B.   Previous Recommendations and Actions Taken.

Appendix C.   Review Checklist.

Appendix D.   List of Interviewees.

Appendix E.   List of Documents Reviewed.

Appendix F.   Assessment Rating Definitions.

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Introduction

Program Description and Background

The outcomes and benefits of the program:

<Guidance: insert two or three short paragraphs about the program outcomes to be delivered and benefits to be realised.>

The policy context or need for the program:

<Guidance: insert a statement that describes why the program came into existence and/or is necessary. Explain the need for the program, for example building a capability, change and reform to address an issue or political imperatives. If the program is a whole of government or a multi-agency initiative, describe the overall program, and the roles of the relevant agencies >

Significant sub-programs and projects:

<Guidance: List and describe the related sub-programs/projects and their outputs and inter-dependencies.   Identify those subject to other Assurance Reviews (including Gateway Reviews and Implementation Readiness Assessments).>

Scope of the Review

<Guidance: the review scope and approach will generally be established during the Planning Meeting, ensuring a common understanding between the entity, review team and the ARU.

<Guidance: insert a brief summary about the scope of the review (e.g. first/mid/end stage) and where a Blended Review was undertaken, consider how this approach aims to minimise the review burden on entities by simultaneously providing program strategic alignment and project milestone delivery assurances>

Acknowledgements

The review team would like to thank <name> as the Senior Responsible Official and all those interviewed for their participation in the review. The support and openness from all parties contributed to the broader understanding of the program and the successful completion of the review. Additionally, the review team would like to thank <name/s> for their excellent administrative support.

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Detailed Findings and Recommendations

Key Focus Areas Assessed

<mark><Guidance: insert brief paragraphs setting out the key findings under each Key Focus Area. Where appropriate, include recommendations relating to the individual findings.</mark>

<mark><Guidance: recommendations should be concise and standalone so that their intention is clear to the entity staff involved. Recommendations should be actionable, provide clarity on when the recommendation should be actioned, who should be responsible, and why the recommendation has been made.></mark>

<mark><Guidance: Provide a Key Focus Area rating to highlight those Key Focus Areas that have issues.></mark>

Policy Context and Strategic Fit

Assessment Rating:	<mark><Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating definition)></mark> (copy from Appendix F)

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Business Case and Benefits

Assessment Rating:	<Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Stakeholders and End Users

Assessment Rating:	<Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Governance and Planning

Assessment Rating:	<Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Risk Management

Assessment Rating:	<Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Review of Current Phase

Assessment Rating:	<mark>\<Insert Key Focus Area rating\> \<Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)\></mark>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Readiness for Next Stage (Guidance – this Key Focus Area is intended to cover the period leading up to the next significant milestone)

Assessment Rating:	<Insert Key Focus Area rating> <Insert rating description (copy from Appendix F)>

Findings:

Recommendations:

<Guidance: Insert a recommendation for the timing of the next Gateway Review. Assurance Reviews should be conducted at intervals of approximately 12 months. If a significant lag is expected to occur between assurance reviews (i.e. greater than 18 months), an Intermediate Assessment should be considered>.

<Guidance: Please discuss with the ARU before recommending that no further reviews are required or if there is a material change to the Assurance Plan (Appendix A).>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix A: Gateway Assurance Plan

Gateway reviews complement other external and internal assurance activities and form part of the entity's overall assurance framework.   Better practice indicates that developing an assurance plan for the program/project early in its life cycle is a key factor in delivering successful programs/projects.   Such a plan would indicate the need for both milestone-based and time-based assurance reviews and would help ensure the program/project received the appropriate level of independent assurance.

The Gateway Assurance Plan is tabled below:

Date	Type of Review	Comments

<Guidance: The Gateway Assurance Plan is to be updated at each Gateway Assurance Review.>

<Guidance: Insert the proposed dates (Month/Year) for future Gateway Assurance Reviews and the type of review.>

<Guidance: When considering a recommendation for the timing of the next Gateway Assurance Review (if any), note that Gateway Assurance Reviews should be conducted at intervals of approximately 12 months. If a significant lag is expected to occur between reviews (i.e. greater than 18 months), an Intermediate Assessment should be considered>.

<Guidance: Please consult with the ARU before recommending a material change to the Plan, including a recommendation that no further reviews are required.>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix B: Previous Recommendations

<Guidance: This Appendix is not relevant if this is the first review for the program/project.>

The following table outlines the recommendations made during the previous Gateway Review and the actions taken by the entity to address the recommendations.

Prior to the review, the entity should complete the 'Action Taken' column demonstrating the remedial actions taken to implement the recommendations.

The review team will review the actions taken and indicate whether the recommendations have been addressed as defined below, further comments should also be provided where recommendations have only been partially addressed or not addressed.

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.

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Guidance: complete the table below if a previous review has been undertaken>

Previous Recommendations and Actions Taken

Item #	Recommendation	Category	Action Taken	Review Team Comments
		<Critical, Essential, Recommended>	<Note: Entity to complete>	<Fully, Partially, Not Addressed> <Provide further comments>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix C: Review Checklist

Consistent with *Resource Management Guide 106: Australian Government Assurance Reviews*, this section contains the review team's assessment[1] of the program against each of the Key Focus Areas. Review teams apply their collective expertise to determine the relevance and appropriateness of each question below with regard to the program and review stage.

The review team provides an assessment against each of the questions to allow a level of granularity and assist entities to identify and address the key issues. The overall delivery confidence assessment for the review is provided in the Dashboard.

The review team considers the individual Key Focus Area assessment ratings below and exercises its own judgement and expertise to determine the most suitable overall assessment of delivery confidence.

<Guidance: provide an assessment against each of the Key Focus Areas. Provide sufficient information (or a link to the main body of the report) to enable entities to identify and address any key issues >

Policy Context and Strategic Fit:

Assessment Rating: <insert Key Focus Area rating>

	Key Focus Area Question	Comments
1.1	Is the program supporting a new policy measure or other government initiative? Are the implications of the measure/initiative well understood?	
1.2	Is legislation required? Have legislation requirements and timeframes been built into the program plan?	
1.3	Is there a clear understanding of the required outcomes to be achieved and benefits to be realised?	
1.4	Will the proposed program design deliver the government's intent? Is it aligned to the agency's strategic plans?	
1.5	Does the program/project understand the users' needs and their context for using the system?	
1.6	Does the program/project involve other entities? Have interdependencies been identified and management of them agreed?	
1.7	In the cases of whole-of-government or multi-entity proposals, have issues of access, custody, sharing and ownership of data been addressed?	

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Business Case and Benefits:

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

	Key Focus Area Question	Comments
2.1	Is the business case appropriate for this stage of the Program's development?	
2.2	If applicable, do the business case and associated templates meet the requirements for the ICT Investment Approval Process or the Capital Works Two Pass approval process?	
2.3	Does the business case demonstrate strategic alignment with government policy, whole-of-government direction and entity business strategies and objectives?	
2.4	Have key assumptions been identified and documented? Are they still valid?	
2.5	How will are the major constraints be managed?	
2.6	Have the outcomes and outputs been identified and documented in the business case?	
2.7	Are the benefits clearly documented and are they measurable?	
2.8	Is there a strategy for realising benefits and is it fit for purpose?	
2.9	If benefits are dependent on future organisational change, is there a plan for this to occur and is it achievable?	
2.10	Is the scope of the project clearly documented and understood?	
2.11	Does the business case identify and evaluate the options available to deliver the capability/solution based on cost, benefit and risk?	
2.12	Does the business case identify a preferred option based on cost, benefit and risk?	
2.13	Has a proof of concept been conducted and have the results been used to progress design and sourcing decisions?	
2.14	Is there a clear understanding of what constitutes success?	
2.15	Is the proposed project affordable?	
2.16	Does the business case address the capability and capacity of industry to provide support as required?	
2.17	Does the business case address the capability and capacity of the entity to manage the program/project, deliver outcomes and realise benefits?	

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Stakeholders and End-users:

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

	Key Focus Area Question	Comments
3.1	Have the stakeholders and their areas of interest been identified, and do they support the program/project?	
3.2	Is this a whole of government initiative or are other agencies involved in design, development or delivery?	
3.3	Have stakeholder and end-user needs been taken into account in the program design?	
3.4	Do stakeholders support the business case and the selection of the preferred option? (This includes the potential or recommended delivery approach and mechanisms.)	
3.5	Are the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and supporting governance arrangements fit for purpose and do they recognise the need to engage with external whole-of-government and multi-entity stakeholders?	
3.6	Are stakeholders confident outcomes will be achieved when expected?	
3.7	Do stakeholders feel sufficiently engaged?	

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Governance and Planning:

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

	Key Focus Area Question	Comments
4.1	Are the proposed governance arrangements fit for purpose?	
4.2	If other agencies are involved in design and delivery , how will they be included in the governance framework?	
4.3	Have the program management, design and delivery methodologies been chosen and are they appropriate?	
4.4	Has a steering committee, or equivalent, been established to oversee the project?	
4.5	Is there a process to manage scope change? Is it effective?	
4.6	Is there executive level commitment to the project? Are responsibilities clear? Have key positions been staffed or are there plans to do so?	

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Risk:

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

	Key Focus Area Question	Comments
5.1	Has the agency managed programs of this size and complexity before?	
5.2	Is there an organisational framework for managing risks and issues associated with this program?	
5.3	Are there processes and systems in place to manage Risks, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies (RAID) and are they fit for purpose?	
5.4	Have the major risks been identified and risk owners appointed?	
5.5	Are RAID Registers reviewed and updated regularly and briefed to governance committees and management as appropriate?	
5.6	Are there contingency plans that address risks as necessary?	
5.7	Have assurance arrangements for the program been put in place and is there an Assurance Plan?	

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Review of Current Phase:

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

Key Focus Area Question	Comments
6.1 Is there an integrated master schedule showing the program/project milestones along with the milestones and interdependencies of projects? Is the level of detail appropriate for the stage of the program/project?	
6.2 Are the program/project key milestones compliant with broader government or entity timing requirements?	
6.4 Does the program/project schedule appear to be realistic and achievable, and does it include an appropriate allowance for contingency?	
6.5 Are the initial stages of the program progressing in accordance with the schedule?	
6.7 Have issues emerged and have they been resolved?	

21

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Readiness for Next Stage (Guidance – this Key Focus Area is intended to cover the period leading up to the next significant milestone)

Assessment Rating: <mark><insert Key Focus Area rating></mark>

Key Focus Area Question	Comments
7.1 Is the program on track to receive government or other approval to move to the next stage?	
7.2 Are the funds available to undertake the next phase?	
7.3 Has the entity assessed its readiness to proceed to the next stage?	
7.4 Does the program/project have the capability and capacity (right skills in the right quantity including specialist advice) ready to deliver the next stage?	
7.5 Are the plans for the next phase, including the integrated master schedule, fit for purpose and achievable?	
7.6 Are the governance arrangements for the next stage in place and fit for purpose?	

22

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix D: List of Interviewees

Name	Role/Position/Entity	Date Interviewed

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix E: List of Documents Reviewed

Document Title	Version no. and/or Publication date

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Appendix F: Assessment Ratings and Definitions

Delivery Confidence Assessment Rating Definitions

The review team will provide an overall delivery confidence assessment (DCA) based on the definitions below. The review team should consider the individual Key Focus Area assessment ratings (defined below) and exercise their own judgement/expertise to determine the most suitable overall assessment of delivery confidence rating.

DCA Assessment Ratings

Assessment	Definition
Green	Successful delivery of the program 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.
Green/Amber	Successful delivery of the program 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.
Amber	Successful delivery of the program to time, cost, quality standards and benefits realisation appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These need to be addressed promptly.
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the program 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.
Red	Successful delivery of the program appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on program definition, schedule, budget, quality or benefits delivery. The program may need to be re-baselined and/or overall viability re-assessed.

Key Focus Area Assessment Rating Definitions

The review team will provide an assessment against each of the Key Focus Areas probed. This will provide a level of granularity to assist entities to identify and address the key issues.

Key Focus Area Assessment Ratings

Assessment	Definition
Green	There are no major outstanding issues in this Key Focus Area that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly.
Amber	There are issues in this Key Focus Area that require timely management attention.
Red	There are significant issues in this Key Focus Area that may jeopardise the successful delivery of the program.

<Insert appropriate security classification>

<Insert appropriate security classification>

Report Recommendation Category Definitions

The review team will rate individual recommendations with a sense of urgency as defined below:

Critical (Do Now): To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the program should take action immediately.

Essential (Do By): To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the program should take action in the near future. Whenever possible essential recommendations should be linked to program 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 program milestones (e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe i.e. within the next three months).

<Insert appropriate security classification>