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# Introduction

## The Gateway Review Process

The Gateway Review Process (GRP) was endorsed by the Victorian Government in March 2003 and aims to assist agencies across the Victorian budget sector achieve better capital investment outcomes and to enhance their procurement processes.

The objective of a Gateway Review is for a team of experienced people, independent of the project team, to review a major asset investment project at a key decision point.

The report of a Gateway Review contains opinion, advice and recommendations about the project it has examined. It will contain information about how a specific agency undertakes and conducts major projects in a competitive environment. It may also refer to the business information of third parties. As such the report is confidential and independent of a project’s approval process.

Because a review is conducted in the course of a project, it will commonly contain sensitive commercial information relevant to that project as it proceeds. Equally, the report will form part of the continuing development and refinement of the Gateway Process and of asset investment across the Victorian public sector. Both the particular project to which the report relates, and the Gateway Process as a whole relate to the functions, and commercial interests of the relevant agency and the Government of Victoria.

A Gateway report will be prepared in consultation with an agency’s project team and stakeholders and will accordingly form part of the ongoing deliberative process of Government in order to assist in the continuing formulation of Government investment and procurement policy.

The report of a Gateway Review Team is not intended for release, other than to the relevant agency, except where the report is sought by Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee. Wider circulation could jeopardise the agency’s competitive position in a tender process and hence participation of it and other agencies in the Gateway Review Process, thereby imperilling the quality and frankness of the information provided and therefore the core objective of the process.

**Secretary**

Department of Treasury and Finance

* + 1. Report Information
       1. Review details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Version number: | [Insert Draft 0.1,0.2,0.3 or Final 1.0] |
| SRO name: | [Insert SRO name] |
| Date of issue to SRO: | [Insert date] |
| Department: | [Insert name] |
| Agency or PNFC: | [Insert name] |
| Gateway Review dates: | [Insert dates dd/mm/yyyy to dd/mm/yyyy] |

* + - 1. Review team

|  |
| --- |
| Gateway Review team members |
| [Insert name of team leader] |
| [Insert name of team member] |
| [Insert name of team member] |
| [Insert name of team member] |
| [Insert name of team member] |

* + - 1. The purpose of Gateway Review 1

|  |
| --- |
| The primary purposes of Gateway Review 1 are to review the outcomes and objectives of the proposed investment (and the way they fit together) and confirm that they make the necessary contribution to Ministers’ or the departments’ overall strategy.  Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Gateway Review 1. |

* + - 1. Conduct of the Gateway Review

|  |
| --- |
| This Gateway Review 1 was carried out from [Insert: Date 1] to [Insert: Date 2] at [Insert: location of review].  The stakeholders interviewed are listed in Appendix C.  Delete where not applicable: Appendix D shows a list of documents received and reviewed by the review team.  [Insert a note of thanks to the SRO and the client team. e.g. The Review Team would like to thank the Client X Project Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team’s understanding of the Project and the outcome of this review] |

* + 1. Assurance assessment summary as at [insert date]
       1. Project background

[Insert brief paragraph on the project background]

* + - 1. Review team findings

The Review Team finds that [Insert a brief statement outlining the Review Team’s view of the status of the project].

* + - 1. Observations of good practice

[Insert instances of significant good practice found, especially those that may be transferable to other programs and projects]

|  |
| --- |
| Good practice examples |
|  |
|  |
|  |

* + - 1. Red rated individual recommendations

All individual recommendations in a Gateway report with a red rating arising from Gateway reviews 1-4 (‘red’ defined as being critical i.e. action by the SRO is required), are to be reported to the Treasurer outlining the risk mitigation/s. The report will be submitted to the Treasurer utilising a Recommendation Action Plan (RAP). Click on the hyperlink to download a [Recommendation Action Plan](http://www.gatewayreview.dtf.vic.gov.au/CA256EF40083ACBF/WebObj/RAPTemplate/$File/RAP%20Template.DOC).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

* + - 1. Overall delivery confidence assessment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| R | A | G |

* + 1. Findings and recommendations – part 1 (documentation)

One of the roles of Gateway Review 1 is to confirm that the Strategic Assessment or Preliminary Business Case presents a compelling case with:

* + - strong policy merit (has a well-defined problem and clear benefits);
    - adequate exploration of strategic options that could address the problem and realise the benefits;
    - an identified way forward (indicative program or project solution).

**A summary of all the individual recommendations can be found in Appendix B.**

* + - 1. Problem

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. Where appropriate, include recommendations **(in bold text)** relating to individual findings including the Recommended action (RA) assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Benefits

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. Where appropriate, include recommendations **(in bold text)** relating to individual findings including the RA assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Strategic response

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. Where appropriate, include recommendations **(in bold text)** relating to individual findings including the RA assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Indicative solution

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. Where appropriate, include recommendations **(in bold text)** relating to individual findings including the RA assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + 1. Findings and recommendations – part 2 (organisation)

In this part, the focus is not on the deliverability of the indicative project solution as identified in the strategic assessment or preliminary business case, but rather, to look at the capacity and capability of the organisation to deliver a robust preliminary business case, or strategic assessment, and move successfully to the development of a full business case. Specifically, to the following questions need to be considered:

* + - Does the organisation have the capacity and capability to deliver a robust Preliminary Business Case or Strategic Assessment? Are the arrangements at the strategic concept and feasibility stage sound enough to ensure the organisation has the ability and processes to deliver a high-quality Preliminary Business Case or Strategic Assessment (e.g. proper governance arrangements, financing, feasibility studies, issues management, and quality assurance of feasibility studies at this stage)?
    - Does the organisation have the capacity and capability to move to full business case stage? Are the organisation’s arrangements to move the project to the next stage adequate to ensure the project’s health may be maintained through to full business case?

**A summary of all the individual recommendations can be found in Appendix B.**

* + - 1. Organisation

[Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings. Where appropriate, include recommendations **(in bold text)** relating to individual findings including the RA assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + 1. Planning for the next Review

According to the project’s current schedule, the next Gateway review, *Gate 2 Business Case* should occur [Insert appropriate month and year and rationale].

The Department should approach the Department of Treasury and Finance approximately 8‑10 weeks prior to the above date in order to coordinate the Gate 2 review.

Should there be any significant changes to the project schedule that would alter the date above, please notify the Department of Treasury and Finance.

# Appendix A – Purpose of Gateway Review 1: Concept and feasibility

At a high level, Gate 1 is aimed at assisting the SRO by advising them:

* whether the project team has done sufficient work on the Preliminary Business Case/Strategic Assessment submissions to allow the agency or Government to make a well-informed judgement as to whether the project should proceed with the preparation of a Full Business Case; and
* whether the agency has the capacity and capability to deliver a robust submission in the transition to the Full Business Case stage.

To achieve this, Gate 1:

* Examines the outcomes and objectives for the project and policy/program (if applicable) to confirm that it makes the necessary contribution to the overall strategy of the organisation, its senior management and interfaces effectively with broader high‑level government policy objectives and initiatives;
* Ensures that the policy, program and/or project is supported by users and key stakeholders;
* Confirms that the project’s potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of the organisation’s delivery plans and change programs, and any interdependencies with other programs or projects in the organisation’s portfolio and, where relevant, those of other organisations;
* Reviews the arrangements for leading and managing the policy, project or program (and its individual projects);
* Reviews the arrangements for identifying and managing the main program or project risks (and in the case of a program, the individual project risks), including external risks such as changing business priorities;
* Checks that provision for financial and other resources has been made for the project (initially identified at program/project initiation and committed later) and that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised; and
* Checks that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcome.

# Appendix B – Summary of individual recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RA status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Appendix C – Interviewees

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Role |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix D – Documents reviewed

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

# Appendix E

## E.1 Red Amber Green definition

There are two levels of Red Amber Green (RAG) status for a project that must be given, using the colour-coded indicators Red, Amber or Green[[1]](#footnote-1) described below. These include:

* + - Red (Critical) and Amber (Non-critical) for individual recommendations;
    - Red, Amber or Green Delivery Confidence assessment for the overall project.

## E.2 Individual recommendations (criticality)

The introduction of the RAP has resulted in a change to how individual recommendations are assessed. In the past individual RAG assessments have taken criticality and urgency into consideration. For example, if a project had very little time to address a critical recommendation, the recommendation was classed as red. If there was time to address the critical recommendation, then the recommendation was classed as Amber. This was even though the issue and its criticality was still identical to the red rating.

Individual recommendations are now classified as either **Critical (Red)** or **Non-critical (Amber)** as per the diagram below. **Green** is no longer used for individual recommendations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Non-critical recommendation | Critical recommendation |
| The project would benefit from the uptake of the recommendation | Action required |

Criticality – Individual recommendations\*

## E.3 Overall assessment (delivery confidence)

An Overall Assessment (Delivery Confidence) is also required for each review based on the definitions below. When determining the Overall Assessment, the Review Team should refer to their own judgement/expertise to determine the most suitable Delivery Confidence rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Overall report | Overall report | Overall report |
| Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely | Successful delivery appear feasible but significant issues already exist, requiring timely management attention. | Successful delivery of the project to cost, time and/or quality does not appear achievable. |
| There are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to significantly threaten delivery. | These issues appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not impact on cost, time or quality. | The project may need re‑baselining and/or the overall viability reassessed. |

Delivery confidence

1. Green is no longer used for individual recommendations [↑](#footnote-ref-1)