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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] |

The purpose of Gateway Review 6

|  |
| --- |
| The primary purposes of a Gateway Review 6 are to assess whether the anticipated benefits are being delivered and that the ongoing contractual arrangements meet the business need.  Appendix A gives the full purposes statement for a Gateway Review 6. |

* + - 1. Conduct of the Gateway Review

|  |
| --- |
| This Gateway Review 6 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]  [Insert a note confirming that no departures from the recommended scope of the review as prescribed within the Gateway Review Process Guidance has occurred, or where it has, detail the departure and the reasoning behind the action, e.g. the modified review scope was at the request of DTF’s Infrastructure Division]. |

* + 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. Recommendations from the previous Gateway review (Gate 5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes/No/NA |
| The previous Gateway review report (Gate 5) was provided to the review team. |  |
| The Review Team considered the previous report during the conduct of the review. |  |

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 Red and Amber recommendations can be found in Appendix B. A summary of all the individual** **Green recommendations can be found in Appendix C.**

* + - 1. Review of operating phase and future risks

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

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

* + - 1. Business case and benefits management

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

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

* + - 1. Plans for ongoing improvements in value for money

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

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

* + - 1. Plans for ongoing improvements in performance and innovation

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

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

* + - 1. Review of organisation learning and maturity targets

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

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

* + - 1. Readiness for the future: Plans for future service provision

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

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

# Appendix A – Purpose of Gateway Review 6: Benefits evaluation

At a high level, Gate 6 is aimed at assisting the SRO by:

* assessing whether the business case for the project at Gate 4: Tender Decision was realistic
* confirming that there is still a business need for the investment
* assessing whether the benefits (including social, environmental and economic) anticipated at this stage are actually being delivered
* assessing the effectiveness of the ongoing contract/facility and service delivery management processes
* confirming that the ‑client side continues to have the necessary resources to manage the facility and any contract successfully
* if relevant, confirming continuity of key personnel in facility and/or contract management roles
* assessing the ongoing requirements to meet business need. ensure that if circumstances have changed, the service delivery and any contracts are adapting to the new situation. Changing circumstances could affect partner management, relationship management, service management, change management, contract management, benefits management and performance management
* where changes have been agreed, checking they do not compromise the original delivery strategy
* checking there are ongoing continuous improvement mechanisms to improve value for money
* confirming there are plans to manage the facility and any operational contracts to its conclusion. where applicable, confirm the validity of exit strategy and arrangements for re-competition
* assessing ‘lessons learned’ and methodology for sharing information within government.

# 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**

**Delivery confidence**

## F.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.

## F.5 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 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.