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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 2

|  |
| --- |
| The primary purpose of a Gateway Review 2 is to confirm that the business case is robust – that is, in principle it meets business need is affordable, achievable with appropriate options explored and likely to achieve value for money.Appendix A outlines the purpose statement of a Gateway Review 2. |

* + - 1. Conduct of the Gateway Review

|  |
| --- |
| This Gateway Review 2 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/%24File/RAP%20Template.DOC).

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

* + - 1. Overall delivery confidence assessment

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

* + - 1. Recommendations from the previous Gateway review (Gate 1) and the Recommendation Action Plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes/No/NA |
| The previous Gateway review report (Gate 1) was provided to the review team. |  |
| The Review Team considered the previous report during the conduct of the review. |  |
| The Recommendations from the last review were appropriately actioned. |  |
| A Recommendation Action Plan (RAP) was prepared as a result of the previous review. |  |
| The RAP was provided to the review team for consideration. |  |
| The RAP has been implemented (where applicable). |  |

The Review Team finds that [Insert a brief statement commenting on the adequacy of the actions taken in regard to all of the individual recommendations (Red and Amber) from the previous review, and specifically the mitigation responses to and implementation of any Red recommendations as identified within a RAP].

* + 1. Findings and recommendations

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

* + - 1. Policy context and strategic fit

[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. Business case and stakeholders

[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. Risk management

[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. Readiness for next phase (Readiness for market)

[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 3 Readiness for Market* should occur [Insert appropriate month and year and rationale].

The Department should confirm the requirement and timing for the next review approximately 8‑10 weeks prior to the above date.

Should there be any significant changes to the project schedule that would alter the date above, please notify the Gateway Unit.

# Appendix A – Purpose of Gateway Review 2: Business Case

* confirm that the business case is robust – that is, in principle it meets business need, is affordable, achievable, with appropriate options explored and likely to achieve value for money;
* confirm that potential options have been identified and analysed and appropriate expert advice has been obtained as necessary;
* confirm that the underlying investment logic has been reflected in the business case and that the project is still aligned with the objectives and deliverables of the program and organisation;
* establish that the feasibility study has been completed satisfactorily and a preferred way forward has been determined, developed in dialogue with the market where appropriate;
* confirm that the market’s likely interest has been investigated and that appropriate high-level procurement strategies have been considered;
* ensure that there is internal and external authority, if required, and support for the project;
* ensure that the major risks (investment and project level) have been identified and outline risk management plans have been developed;
* establish that the project is likely to deliver its business goals and that it supports wider business change, where applicable;
* confirm that the scope and requirements specifications are realistic, clear and unambiguous;
* ensure that the full scale, intended outcomes, timescales and impact of relevant external issues have been considered;
* establish the level of Project Development and Due Diligence (PDDD) analysis that has been undertaken and evaluate its appropriateness;
* ensure that there are plans for the next stage. confirm planning assumptions and that the project team can deliver the next stage;
* confirm that overarching and internal business and technical strategies have been taken into account; and
* establish that quality and benefit management plans including key performance targets for the project and its outcomes are in place.

# 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

## E.4 Assessment of Project Development and Due Diligence (in transition)

***The concept of a PDDD assessment rating is being progressively introduced into the Gateway Review Process. The Office of Projects Victoria (OPV) will advise which reviews it is applicable for in advance of the planning session.***

One important element to consider when assessing a business case is whether an appropriate level of Project Development and Due Diligence (PDDD) has occurred. The successful execution and performance of a project depends on the quality of its PDDD, which refers to the specific technical and planning analysis that may be conducted for a project at each stage of its lifecycle.

Gateway Review teams are expected to assess the extent and adequacy of due diligence conducted by project teams by evaluating documents and evidence that describe what PDDD activities have been completed and to what degree their findings have been translated into identifiable or quantifiable project risks. This should also consider why PDDD was not conducted for any PDDD elements. For this assessment, the review team should not be concerned with the PDDD findings as much as whether it has been conducted and quantified into risks.

Gateway Review teams will form an overall view of the PDDD assessment on how well PDDD findings have been incorporated into the risk assessment and the development of the project. The level of PDDD analysis may be scaled according to the risk profile and value of the proposal in accordance with the PDDD Guidelines available on the DTF website.

The review team will rate the extent to which PDDD has appropriately been considered as below:

|  |
| --- |
| **PDDD Rating** |
| There is evidence of effective PDDD for this stage of the project. Relevant issues have been incorporated into the project risk profile and mitigation/management strategies developed. There is little more that could reasonably be done at this stage of the project to provided certainty of project scope definition, risk allocation and benefits realisation. | There is some evidence of PDDD for this stage of the project; however, some gaps in the analysis are evident or analysis has not been fully translated into the project risk profile. Mitigation/management strategies have not been fully developed, leaving some questions over certainty of project scope definition, risk allocation and benefits realisation. | There is little to no evidence of PDDD for this stage of the project. The project risk profile does not reflect potential PDDD risks or issues. |

***Please contact OPV (Robert Abboud, Executive Director*** ***Robert.Abboud@opv.vic.gov.au******) for PDDD related enquiries.***

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