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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 beyond circulation to the members of the project steering committee (or equivalent) and the relevant portfolio Minister, members of the Department of Treasury and Finance High Value High Risk (HVHR) team, the relevant Victorian State Government department or agency, and to Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee (where sought). 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 the Program Review

|  |
| --- |
| The primary purposes of a Program Review are to review the outcomes and objectives for the policy/program (and the way they fit together) 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.  Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Program Review. |

* + - 1. Conduct of the Program Review

|  |
| --- |
| This Program Review 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. 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. Overall delivery confidence assessment

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

* + - 1. Red and amber rated individual recommendations

DTF considers risk management to be an inherent feature of projects, and risks identified through gateway review processes do not substitute the need for strong risk management processes within a project.

All individual recommendations in a Gateway report with either a red or amber rating arising from Gateway reviews 1 to 4, (‘red’ being defined as being critical i.e. action required) are to be reported to the Treasurer outlining the risk mitigation/s.

The Department or Agency are responsible for completing a Recommendation Action Plan (RAP) and submitting it to DTF. The RAP will be used by DTF in its reporting to the Treasurer, in support of the Treasurer’s role in approval processes under the HVHR framework.

The Department or Agency is also required to provide the Gateway review report and any associated RAP to the project Steering Committee (or equivalent governance forum) to provide oversight of all ‘critical’ actionable items. It is also recommended that the Gateway report and any associated RAP be issued to the relevant portfolio Minister.

**For a consolidated table of red and amber recommendations, please refer to Appendix B – Summary of individual Red and Amber recommendations.**

Download a Recommendation Action Plan on our website.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes/No/NA |
| The previous Gateway review report 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 agency provided a copy of the previous Gateway review report and any associated RAP to the Steering Committee (or equivalent) and the relevant portfolio Minister. |  |

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].

* + 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 (RAG) assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG 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 recommended action (RAG) assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Management of intended outcomes

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG 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 recommended action (RAG) assessment]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Review of current outcomes

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + - 1. Readiness for next phase

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* + 1. Planning for the next Review

As part of participation on project governance arrangements, DTF requires agencies’ Project Assurance Plans capture the key Gateway review milestones, including organising reviews in a timely way. This should take into account the readiness of the agency for the review.

According to the project’s current schedule, the next Gateway Program review should occur [Insert appropriate month and year and rationale].

The Department should confirm the requirement and timing for the next Review approximately eight to 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 Program

At a high level, a Program Review 3 is aimed at assisting the SRO by:

* reviewing the outcomes and objectives for the policy/program (and the way they fit together) 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
* ensuring that the policy or program is supported by users and key stakeholders
* confirming that the program’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
* reviewing the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the program as a whole and the links to individual parts of it (e.g. to any existing projects in the program’s portfolio)
* reviewing the arrangements for identifying and managing the main program risks (and the individual project risks), including external risks such as changing business priorities
* checking that provision for financial and other resources has been made for the program (initially identified at program 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. this includes individual projects within a program
* after the initial program review, checking progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes (e.g. investment concept brief and investment logic map, business case, benefits management plans)
* checking that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcome
* where relevant, checking that the program takes account of integration with other programs, both internal and external.

# Appendix B – Summary of individual Red and Amber recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation | RAG status |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Appendix C – Summary of individual Green recommendations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation # | Recommendation (Suggestion / Lessons Learnt) | RAG status | Potential Benefit (e.g. Time, Cost, Quality, Other including Social and Environmental) |
| 1 | Example 1: Refer to project x team who recently installed a hundred prefabricated accommodation modules. | Green | Site Impact reduction on a sensitive environmental site. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Appendix D – Interviewees

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

# Appendix E – Documents reviewed

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

# Appendix F – Definitions and report use

## F.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, as described below. These include:

* + - Red (Critical and Urgent) and Amber (Critical, non-urgent) and Green (Project would benefit from uptake) for individual recommendations;
    - Red, Amber or Green Delivery Confidence assessment for the overall project.

## F.2 Individual recommendations (criticality)

Recommendations should be made in relation to all risks identified during the review that have the potential to materially impact on the successful delivery of the project.

It should be noted that risk management is an inherent feature of projects, and risks identified through gateway review processes do not substitute the need for strong risk management processes within a project.

Individual recommendations are classified as either, Red Amber or Green as detailed below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Red | Critical and urgent, to achieve success the project or program should take action on recommendations immediately. |
| **Amber** | **Critical but not urgent, the project or program should proceed, with action on recommendations to be addressed before further key decisions are taken.** |
| **Green** | **The project or program is on target to succeed but may benefit from the uptake of recommendations.** |

Green recommendations are effectively ‘suggestions’ for the consideration of the project or program team. They may be based on observations from the review or ‘Identified Lessons Learnt’ from relevant projects for consideration.

## F.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**

## F.4 Intended use of the Gateway Review Report

From July 2021, SROs are required to distribute Gateway review reports and associated RAPs to project steering committees or the equivalent project governance forum. It is also recommended that the SRO issue the Gateway report and any associated RAP to the relevant portfolio Minister.

The tracking of red and amber-rated recommendation actions, including the status of relevant Ministerial briefings, is to be undertaken both as part of project governance arrangements for the project, and also as performed by the Department of Treasury and Finance in accordance with its responsibilities under the High Value High Risk Framework.

The Department of Treasury and Finance will continue to report to the Treasurer on red and amber rated actions and Recommendation Action Plans in support of the Treasurer’s role in approval processes under the HVHR framework.