

GATE 2

GATEWAY WORKBOOK

Business Case

How well has the project proven the preferred option best meets the service need and maximises benefits at optimal cost?

INTRODUCTION TO GATEWAY REVIEWS


The **NSW Gateway Policy (TPP17-01)** sets out guidance and minimum requirements for the delivery and monitoring of Gateway Reviews in NSW. Gateway Reviews are independent Reviews conducted at key points, or Gates, along the lifecycle of a project and are important for providing confidence to the NSW Government (through Cabinet) that projects are being delivered on time, to cost and in line with government objectives.

Infrastructure NSW is the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) for the government's capital infrastructure projects and programs. As the GCA, Infrastructure NSW developed, implemented and administers the Infrastructure Investor Assurance Framework (IIAF). The roles and responsibilities of Infrastructure NSW as well as delivery agencies, in relation to assurance processes are set out in the IIAF. It is the responsibility of all delivery agencies to meet the requirements of the IIAF.

Gateway Reviews are one of the four elements of the Infrastructure NSW risk-based assurance approach for all capital infrastructure projects valued at or more than \$10 million. The risk-based approach relies on an understanding of an agency's capability and capacity to develop and deliver capital projects and programs.

The outcome of each Gateway Review is a Review Report that includes commentary to inform the NSW Government of a project's progress against objectives. The Review Report also includes a series of recommendations aimed at assisting the delivery agency to develop and deliver their projects and programs successfully.


Gateway Reviews can consider an individual project or a program consisting of a number of projects. For the purposes of this workbook, the use of the term 'project' also covers the grouping of projects into a program.



The document has been developed by Infrastructure NSW, as the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) for capital infrastructure projects and programs. Copyright in this material and assurance methodology outlined resides with the New South Wales Government. Enquiries around reproduction of the material outside of the NSW Government should be directed to assurance@infrastructure.nsw.gov.au.

PROJECT LIFECYCLE AND GATEWAY REVIEWS

The diagram below outlines the typical Gates, along a project lifecycle where Gateway Reviews can be conducted:



HOW TO USE THIS WORKBOOK

At Gate 2, delivery agencies are expected to demonstrate that a preferred solution has been developed in accordance with government policy/strategy and that it achieves the established service need, while also demonstrating value for money over the whole-of-project life. The Review Report is used by the NSW Government to inform the investment decision.

Gateway Review workbooks support a consistent, structured approach to Reviews. The workbooks define roles and responsibilities during Reviews and assist delivery agencies and the Review Team to prepare.

PART A	FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES AND REVIEW TEAMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background information on the Gateway Review process Information on how the Gateway Review process applies to projects 	PAGE: 8
PART B	FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance on how to initiate a Gateway Review Mandatory information 	PAGE: 15
PART C	FOR REVIEW TEAMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance on how to conduct a Gateway Review 	PAGE: 21
PART D	FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES AND REVIEW TEAMS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas for investigation across the seven Key Focus Areas 	PAGE: 26

GATEWAY REVIEWS AND DELIVERY AGENCY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

The assurance process, including Gateway Review outcomes, informs the NSW Government (through Cabinet) on the development and delivery progress of capital projects. Recommendations and commentary emerging from Gateway Reviews also assist delivery agencies to improve projects, with a focus on adding value through the expertise and experience of the Review Team.

A Gateway Review provides an independent forward-looking snapshot of progress at a point in time. Gateway Reviews are **not a replacement for a delivery agency's internal governance**.

Every NSW Government agency should have its own governance structures and resources in place to undertake internal reviews and regularly report on its portfolio of projects.

WHY DO GATEWAY REVIEWS

The NSW Government requires visibility across the government's capital program and assurance that expected services and benefits will be delivered on time, to budget and in line with government policy. The Government also expects project issues and risks to be transparent, with delivery agencies acting on and mitigating problems before there is an impact on community and stakeholder outcomes.

Gateway Reviews provide the NSW Government with an appropriate level of project visibility based on each project's risk profile.

GATEWAY REVIEW PROCESS PRINCIPLES

- The Review Team members are selected for their skillset and as far as practicable match to the project's type, needs, stage, scale and complexity.
- The workbook structure is followed by the Review Team in undertaking the Review.
- Reviews are collaborative and constructive with all parties focused on value-adding to the project.
- Review Report commentary and recommendations are focused on practical improvements.








CONDUCTING A GATEWAY REVIEW

Gateway Reviews for Gates 1 to 6 follow the same format; the indicative steps and timeframes are shown in the following table:

STEP	ACTIVITY	
1	Project approaches milestone, delivery agency checks readiness for Gateway Review and contacts the GCA.	Planning
2	GCA Review Manager and the delivery agency confirm the Review dates.	
3	GCA Review Manager confirms and appoints Reviewers.	
4	GCA Review Manager prepares the Terms of Reference in discussion with the delivery agency.	
5	Delivery agency completes the required templates (see Part B) and provides them to the GCA Review Manager.	
6	Delivery agency uploads Review documents to GCA data room.	
7	Review documents are released to the Review Team.	Week 1
8	Project briefing (Review planning day) including site visit hosted by the delivery agency.	Week 2
9	Review days (hosted by the delivery agency – up to 3 days if required) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day 1 – Interviews • Day 2 & 3 – Interviews / report preparation The time required should be agreed in discussion between the GCA Review Manager, delivery agency and the Review Team Leader.	Week 3
10	Reviewer Team finalises the Review report for the GCA.	Week 4
11	Delivery agency debrief (usually attended by the GCA) to the SRO.	
12	Report and recommendations table goes to the delivery agency for fact check and responses to the recommendations.	Week 5
13	Fact checked report and responses to the recommendations sent to the GCA by the delivery agency.	
14	Report incorporating response to recommendations finalised by the GCA.	Post Review
15	Post Review survey sent out to delivery agency, Review Team members and GCA Review Manager.	
16	Close-out Plan issued to delivery agency by the GCA.	

KEY FOCUS AREAS

At the conclusion of the Review, the Review Team will rate the project against each of the seven Key Focus Areas:

KEY FOCUS AREA		DESCRIPTION APPLICABLE TO GATEWAY
	SERVICE NEED	Identification of the problem or opportunity and the service need, along with the drivers for change. Demonstrated alignment to government policy or strategy and evidence of demand for the potential new services or enhancements.
	VALUE FOR MONEY AND AFFORDABILITY	Ensure value is delivered by maximising benefits at optimal cost. Evidenced by a clearly defined scope, a cost benefit analysis and a robust cost plan to an appropriate level of detail for the lifecycle stage of the project. An assessment of potential or confirmed sources of funds. The whole-of-life, capital and operational cost impacts have been considered.
	SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY	Understanding the long-term impacts, opportunities and obligations created by the project. These can be social, environmental and economic. Ensuring the project delivers a positive legacy for the community. Areas explored include: socio-economic equity; resilience to climate change; effective place making; integration with broader asset networks; asset adaptability (including technological change); interface with heritage; and the robustness of the project's planning approvals processes.
	GOVERNANCE	The project governance is robust. Clear accountabilities, responsibilities and reporting lines are identified and decision-making and approvals are appropriate and understood. The Senior Responsible Officer and project team have the culture, capability and capacity required.
	RISK MANAGEMENT	Ongoing identification and active management of risks and opportunities using a structured and formal methodology.
	STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT	Ongoing identification and proactive management of stakeholders, both internal and external to government, using a structured and robust framework appropriate to the stage in the project lifecycle.
	ASSET OWNER'S NEEDS AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT	Demonstration of how change will be managed in the areas of people, organisation, network and systems as the asset enters operations. Proactive management of the handover impacts through the lifecycle of the project. Demonstrated consideration of issues and risks pertaining to the asset manager, operator and end users.

REVIEW RATINGS

The Review Team will rate each of the Key Focus Areas:

KEY FOCUS AREAS RATING HOW THE KEY FOCUS AREA HAS BEEN ADDRESSED AND WHAT RISK DOES IT POSE TO PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY CONFIDENCE	
STRONG	There are no major outstanding issues that appear to threaten benefit realisation, risk management and project scope definition.
SATISFACTORY	There are issues that require timely management attention.
WEAK	There are significant issues that may jeopardise the successful delivery of the project.

The Review Team will also assign the project an overall confidence rating:

OVERALL RATING CONFIDENCE LEVEL THAT THE PROJECT IS BEING EFFECTIVELY DEVELOPED AND DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT'S OBJECTIVES	
HIGH	Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten successful delivery.
MEDIUM	Successful delivery is feasible but significant issues exist which require timely management and attention.
LOW	Successful delivery of the project is in doubt, with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent additional action is needed.

Each of the recommendations made by the Review Team will also receive a rating, indicating level of urgency for the project:

RECOMMENDATION RATING EACH RECOMMENDATION OF THE REVIEW TEAM IS RATED ACCORDING TO ITS URGENCY AND CRITICALITY	
SUGGESTED	The recommendation is not considered critical or urgent but the development of the project may benefit.
ESSENTIAL (DO BY)	The recommendation is important but not urgent. The SRO should take action before further key decisions are taken.
CRITICAL (DO NOW)	<p>This item is critical and urgent. The SRO should take action immediately. It means "fix the key problems fast, not stop the project."</p> <p>'Clearance of Gateway' will not be provided by the GCA until this recommendation has been closed.</p>

GATE 2

GATEWAY WORKBOOK

Part A

FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES AND REVIEW TEAMS
**Background on NSW Gateway and risk based
approach to project assurance**

PART A

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE IN NSW

The NSW Government has adopted a formal Assurance Framework for capital infrastructure projects valued at or over \$10 million. The Framework is detailed in the Infrastructure Investor Assurance Framework (IIAF), as endorsed by NSW Cabinet in June 2016.

The Assurance Framework takes a risk-based approach to investor assurance. Each project is assigned one of four risk-based Project Tiers (considering risk criteria as well as the value and profile of the project), and this determines the potential assurance pathway for the project. For projects assessed to have higher risk/profile/value, the assurance pathway prescribes progressively greater levels of scrutiny.

There are three components of the assurance pathway for every project or program. These components are complemented by a fourth 'Improving Outcomes' initiative that seeks to enhance overall delivery of capital infrastructure programs and projects across government by sharing good practice and lessons learnt.



GATEWAY REVIEWS, HEALTH CHECKS AND DEEP DIVE REVIEWS

Gateway Reviews are short, focused and independent expert Reviews held at key points in a project's lifecycle. They are appraisals of infrastructure projects that highlight risks and issues which if not addressed, may threaten successful delivery. Gateway Reviews are supported by periodic Health Checks which assist in identifying issues which may emerge between decision points. Health Checks will be carried out, when required, by an independent team of experienced practitioners.

All Gateway Reviews and Health Checks follow a dedicated workbook that provides structure and guidance for the Review.

The results of each Gateway Review and Health Check are presented in a report that provides a snapshot of the project's or program's progress for the purposes of reporting to Cabinet and with recommendations to strengthen program and project outcomes.

REGULAR PROJECT REPORTING

Regular project reports are submitted through the NSW Assurance Portal on either a monthly or quarterly basis, depending on the Project Tier.

These project reports focus on the progress of the project against time, cost, quality, risks and impediments to project development/delivery confidence.

PROJECT AND PROGRAM MONITORING

The GCA monitors projects and programs through regular reporting (including mitigation plans for projects at risk), close-out of the Gateway Review Report Recommendations, development and review of project issue mitigation plans and general day-to-day interactions with delivery agencies.

IMPROVING OUTCOMES

Infrastructure NSW seeks to share lessons learnt and good practice across delivery agencies. A number of forums have been established to bring together practitioners to share their insight of the development, procurement and delivery of capital infrastructure projects and programs.

CAPITAL PORTFOLIO

In August 2020, Infrastructure NSW initiated, and NSW Cabinet endorsed the addition of Capital Portfolio Health Check Reviews. This is one of the initiatives in response to the Infrastructure NSW Root Cause Analysis conducted in 2019, which investigated improvement opportunities across government in the delivery of the capital infrastructure portfolio. Nominated delivery agencies will be required to undertake Capital Portfolio Health Check Reviews.

PART A

RISK BASED APPROACH TO INVESTOR ASSURANCE

The IIAF, in taking a risk based approach, means that Gateway Reviews are not applied as a ‘one-size fits all’ requirement to all projects.


Registration is mandatory for all capital infrastructure projects including programs, with an Estimated Total Cost (capital cost) of \$10 million or greater. It is the delivery agency’s responsibility to register projects.

Minimum mandatory requirements on projects to undertake Gateway Reviews are primarily based on the Project Tier determined when the project is registered through the GCA Reporting and Assurance Portal.

Projects are assigned one of four Project Tiers; 1 to 4, with Tier 1 being the highest profile and risk. Greater intensity/scrutiny is placed on those projects that need it most (i.e. Tier 1) through a greater frequency of Gateway Reviews, Health Checks, regular reporting and project monitoring.

The assurance pathway is outlined in a Project Assurance Plan for endorsement when registering. The Project Assurance Plan must meet the minimum requirement for Gateway Reviews outlined in the IIAF, unless specific authorisation is received through the GCA.

The overarching objective of applying Gateway Reviews in this way is to ensure that the appropriate level of attention is given to projects as they are developed and delivered so that government can optimise the community benefits.



APPLICABLE NSW POLICY

The Gateway Review process aligns with current NSW Government policy and strategies. Projects should ensure they meet latest NSW Government policy and guidelines. Examples of these policies and guidelines include the current versions of:


- NSW Gateway Policy (TPP17-01)
- Infrastructure Investor Assurance Framework (IIAF) (March 2021)
- Infrastructure NSW Framework for establishing effective Project Oversight (2021)
- NSW Government Sector Finance Act 2018
- NSW Government’s Capability Framework
- NSW Government Timely Information on Infrastructure Projects (C-2020-22)
- NSW Government Business Case Guidelines (TPP18-06)
- NSW Government Program Evaluation Guidelines (January 2016)
- NSW Government Benefits Realisation Management Framework (2018)
- NSW Government Guide to Cost Benefit Analysis (TPP 17-03)
- NSW Public Private Partnerships Guidelines (TPP17-07)
- NSW Government Procurement Policy Framework (October 2020)
- Public Works and Procurement Amendment (Enforcement) Act 1918
- NSW Procurement Board Directions Enforceable Procurement Divisions
- Australian Government Assurance Reviews and Risk Assessment (Department of Finance)

PART A

OVERVIEW OF GATEWAY REVIEW

Gateway Reviews are short, focused and independent expert Reviews into the progress and direction of a project at key points in its lifecycle.


The Gateway Review process identifies the project phases within each lifecycle stage, and these project phases guide the timing of Gateway Reviews. The project phases and the relationship to the lifecycle stages can be represented as:



Each of the seven Gates in the IIAF occur at a point within a project phase, timed to inform government decision-making and project progression.

GATE	NAME OF GATE	LIFECYCLE STAGE	PROJECT PHASE	INFORMS
GATE 0	GO/NO GO	INITIATION	NEEDS CONFIRMATION	Proceeding to develop the options analysis
GATE 1	STRATEGIC OPTIONS	PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	NEEDS ANALYSIS	Proceeding to develop the final business case
GATE 2	BUSINESS CASE	PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	INVESTMENT DECISION	The investment decision
GATE 3	READINESS FOR MARKET	PROCUREMENT	PROCURE	Readiness to release procurement documentation
GATE 4	TENDER EVALUATION	PROCUREMENT	PROCURE	Robustness of the evaluation process and readiness to mobilise
GATE 5	READINESS FOR SERVICE	DELIVERY	DELIVERY & INITIAL OPERATIONS	Readiness of the asset to enter service/operations
GATE 6	BENEFITS REALISATION	OPERATION	BENEFITS REALISATION	Benefits promised have been delivered

Bringing it all together, the relationship of the Gates to the project lifecycle stages and phases can be represented as:



PART A

GATEWAY REVIEW PROCESS

The Gateway Review process also includes 'Health Checks' and 'Deep Dives', which are Reviews conducted at any point through the project lifecycle. Health Checks follow the same format as Gate 1 to Gate 6 Reviews. Health Checks are general reviews on the progress of the project relevant to its stage of development or delivery but may have an increased focus on a particular set of issues. Deep Dives are specialist technical Reviews on a specific issue or issues.

The Gateway Review process integrates project development and delivery processes with informed decision-making. Each Gate has a clear purpose reflecting the increasing requirement for certainty as a project moves through its lifecycle.

GATE 0 – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

As project development is at an early stage in the project lifecycle, Gate 0 Gateway Reviews follow a different process to that for Gates 1 to 6, Health Checks and Deep Dive Reviews.

Gate 0 Go/No Go Gateway Reviews are guided by the Gate 0 Go/No Go Gateway Review Workbook and have a relatively narrow focus compared to later Gateway Reviews and Health Checks. The Gate 0 Review is not structured around the seven Key Focus Areas but rather focuses on the definition of the problem to be solved, the proposed project's alignment to government policy/strategy and the delivery agency's plan to take the project forward.

Delivery agencies are informed of the Gate 0 Gateway Review outcome and recommendations by the GCA Review Manager.

GATES 1 TO 6 – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY

Gateway Reviews (Gates 1 to 6) are independent expert Reviews conducted over a short period. The structure of each of these Reviews is similar and focused on project development and delivery, and high value areas that have greatest impact on successful outcomes.


The seven Key Focus Areas support a consistent structure in undertaking Gateway Reviews and preparing Review Reports. Review Report commentary and recommendations are intended to be constructive and raise issues essential to the project's success.

HEALTH CHECKS AND DEEP DIVE REVIEWS

Health Check Reviews are similar to the Gateway Reviews (Gates 1 to 6) and follow the same format to address and rate overall delivery confidence as well as each of the seven Key Focus Areas. They may also cover additional areas of concern. The customisation of the Health Check is achieved using the appropriate Health Check Workbook and Terms of Reference.

For some projects, Health Checks are conducted at regular intervals (every six to nine months) during the Delivery stage of the project lifecycle. Health Checks during other lifecycle stages are less common and generally only conducted upon request by Government, the GCA, NSW Treasury or the delivery agency.

Deep Dive Reviews have a limited Terms of Reference and do not cover the seven Key Focus Areas, instead they examine and report on a specific or detailed technical issue/s.



PART A

GATEWAY REVIEW REPORTS

The primary output of each Review is a high quality written report which follows the appropriate Gateway Review Report template and incorporates an Executive Summary, commentary on each of the seven Key Focus Areas, Gateway Review Ratings, the Recommendations Table, and observations of good practice or areas for opportunity. The Review Report may also cover other matters identified in the Terms of Reference. Review Recommendations are grouped by Key Focus Area.

The Review Team provides a rating of how well the project team has addressed each Key Focus Area and an overall rating of the level of confidence in the project's development and delivery. The primary purpose of the Review Report is to inform the NSW Government of project progress and key issues impacting decision-making. The Review Report, once finalised by the GCA, is provided to the NSW Cabinet. The delivery agency is expected to act on the recommendations documented in the Review Report.

The Review Report templates are specific to the Gate or Health Check and reflect the focus of the appropriate workbook. Deep Dive Review Reports are shorter given the more limited focus.

CLEARANCE OF GATE

Following the conclusion of the Gateway Review and the finalisation of the Review Report, the delivery agency can request a 'Clearance of Gate' Certificate from the GCA. 'Clearance of Gate' will be determined by the GCA.

The Certificate confirms the Gateway Review has been completed for a particular stage and that an appropriate Close-out Plan is in place to assist with project development or delivery. To achieve a 'Clearance of Gate' the delivery agency must:



- Respond appropriately to the Review Recommendations (to the satisfaction of the GCA)
- Address all CRITICAL Review Recommendations (to the satisfaction of the GCA)

Delivery agencies do not have to request a 'Clearance of Gate' Certificate but its absence does not negate the mandatory requirement on a delivery agency to respond to and act upon the Review recommendations.

The Certificate is not a Gateway Review approval or an endorsement of the project.

WHAT GATEWAY REVIEWS DO NOT DO

A Gateway Review is not an audit.

The Reviews are intended to be confidential and constructive, providing an expert assessment of a project's development and delivery confidence at a point in time.

Delivery agencies should note that Gateway Reviews will not:



- Represent a government decision in relation to funding, planning, approvals or policy
- Make an enforceable recommendation to halt a project
- Quality check or provide direct detailed assessment of management plans and project team deliverables
- Provide a forum for stakeholders or other parties to inappropriately disrupt the direction or nature of a project.

Review Teams require evidence that work has been completed, but documentation should not be created solely for a Gateway Review. If a project has genuinely reached the milestone that triggers a Gateway Review, little additional work should be needed other than collating and bringing together evidence to meet the Review requirements.

The Review Team should also note Gateway Reviews are not adversarial or a detailed assessment of management plans and project team deliverables.

PART A

ROLES WITHIN A GATEWAY REVIEW

The typical roles within a Gateway Review are outlined below:

ROLE	DESCRIPTION
GATEWAY COORDINATION AGENCY (GCA)	The Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) administers the Gateway Review process for the nominated asset type (capital infrastructure, ICT or recurrent). The Head of Investor Assurance within the GCA ensures systems, processes and resources are in place to facilitate successful Gateway Review processes and outcomes. The GCA is responsible for providing reports, briefings and commentary to the NSW Cabinet on the outcomes of Gateway Reviews.
GCA REVIEW MANAGER	The GCA representative responsible for guiding the implementation of the Gateway Review. The GCA Review Manager has Cabinet level reporting responsibilities for project assurance. The GCA Review Manager directs and manages the process of the Review, but does not participate in the Review itself.
DELIVERY AGENCY HEAD	The Secretary or CEO of the delivery agency responsible for the project.
SENIOR RESPONSIBLE OFFICER (SRO)	The delivery agency's nominated senior executive with strategic responsibility and the single point of overall accountability for a project. The SRO receives the Review Report from GCA for action, is debriefed by the Review Team Leader and the GCA Review Manager following the Review. The SRO may also be referred to as the Project Sponsor.
DELIVERY AGENCY'S PROJECT DIRECTOR	The delivery agency's nominated Project Director arranges access to the relevant project documentation and drafts the interview schedule for the Review Team. The Project Director takes an active part in the Gateway Review interviews and assists in responding to the GCA Review Manager and Review Team requests.
REVIEW TEAM LEADER (RTL)	<p>The RTL is appointed by the GCA Review Manager and leads the independent Review Team for the Review. The RTL acts as Chair for the Project Briefing and interview days and has primary responsibility for delivering a high quality, consolidated Review Report using the appropriate template.</p> <p>The RTL acts as the point of contact between the Review Team and the GCA Review Manager. If agreed by the GCA Review Manager, the RTL may act as the liaison between the Review Team and the delivery agency's SRO and/or Project Director. The RTL provides the Review debrief to the GCA and the delivery agency's SRO on behalf of the Review Team.</p>
REVIEW TEAM MEMBER	Provides the benefit of their independent and specialist expertise and advice in the Review of the project, focusing on issues appropriate to the project's lifecycle stage and the level of development and delivery confidence. Each Review Team member participates in the project briefing and interviews, and contributes to the Review Report and recommendations.
STAKEHOLDER	Organisations, groups or individuals, either internal or external to government, that are impacted by the project.

GATE 2

GATEWAY WORKBOOK

Part B

FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES


Initiating and preparing for a Gateway Review

PART B

HOW TO USE PART B

PART B assists delivery agencies prepare for the Gateway Review, including collating documentation and preparing for the project briefing and interviews.

GATE 2 – INFORMING THE INVESTMENT DECISION




The Gate 2 Review will confirm that the Final Business Case has:

- Clearly defined the scope to respond to an evidence based service need
- A cost plan, schedule and risk register
- A robust procurement strategy
- A delivery strategy
- Clearly articulated the benefits to be delivered
- Confirmed resources to manage:
 - Governance
 - Procurement activity
 - Stakeholder engagement.

The Final Business Case should have internal delivery agency approval prior to initiating the Gate 2 Gateway Review.

GUIDANCE FOR BUSINESS CASES

NSW Treasury Guidelines for Capital Business Cases (TPP18-06) can be found on the NSW Treasury website. Infrastructure NSW provides templates and practitioner notes to support the development of capital infrastructure cases. These can be found on the INSW website.



PART B

GATE 2 GATEWAY REVIEW AND DOCUMENTS

The delivery agency is responsible for initiating a Gateway Review at the appropriate time. Delivery agencies should seek authorisation from the delivery agency's governance structure and the Gateway Review should be led by the delivery agency's SRO.

It is intended that delivery agencies **use existing project documentation** and not create or customise documents for the Review.

MANDATORY DOCUMENTS



- Project presentation providing an executive overview of the project
- Final Business Case
- Cost-Benefit Analysis with Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) and Net Present Value (NPV)
- Benefits Realisation Management Plan or Evaluation Plan
- Detailed risk register or matrix
- Detailed cost plan
- Cost Data Collection Template (supplied by Infrastructure NSW)

REQUIRED INFORMATION

At Gate 2, documents should exist that include information relating to the development of the Final Business Case. The table below highlights the information required to assess the project against the seven Key Focus Areas. In collating documents, it may also be useful to refer to Part D of this workbook.

The delivery agency must complete a document register for the Review Team and for inclusion in the Review Report. The Document Register template is included in the Gate 2 suite of documents. Typically, no more than 30 documents that are most relevant to the project, should be loaded into the data room.

REQUIRED INFORMATION DOCUMENTED TO SUPPORT GATE 2

Final Business Case consistent with NSW Treasury guidance and including a Cost-Benefit Analysis with Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) and Net Present Value (NPV).

Comprehensive assessment and analysis of all reasonable and/or feasible alternative options of meeting the service need.

Documentation confirming the project budget and funding sources for ongoing project development and project delivery.

Documentation confirming how the project will achieve all social, environmental and economic sustainability requirements, legislative considerations and planning approvals.

Evidence of project design development demonstrating consideration of community outcomes, integration within the built environment (place making), and potential for future adaptations.

Evidence of a well developed and robust project schedule with all milestones identified.

Preferred procurement, packaging and contracting approach with demonstrated input from market engagement and previous project experience.

Documentation of project benefits and impacts including evaluation of social, economic and environmental impacts and recurrent and whole-of-life costs.

Structure of the current and proposed project team including roles and responsibilities and a description of the outline sourcing strategy to meet future needs (governance structure).

Description of identification and engagement of stakeholders demonstrating management of issues, impacts and concerns.

Evidence risks are being identified, considered and actively managed (live risk register or matrix).

PART B

TEMPLATES TO BE COMPLETED

Prior to the commencement of the Review the delivery agency will need to complete the following templates and supply them to the GCA Review Manager.

Each of these templates is available with other Review documentation on the Infrastructure NSW website.

- Project briefing agenda
- Interview schedule
- Cost data collection template
- Interviewee list
- Document register
- Oversight Framework self-assessment checklist

GATEWAY REVIEW
Gate 2 Business Case

we are insw Infrastructure New South Wales

[project]
[date and location]

PROJECT BRIEFING AGENDA

Review Team Members (names of Review Team members)
Review Manager (name of GCA Review Manager)

TIME	FOCUS	REPRESENTATIVE
9:00 – 9:15	Introduction	GCA Review Manager
9:15 – 9:30	Introduction of the Project or Program Problem Identification Fit with NSW Government Policy or Program	Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)
9:30 – 10:30	Overview of the location and asset form	Project Director
10:30 – 11:15	Site visit (if requested by GCA)	ALL
11:15 – 11:30	BREAK	ALL
11:30 – 13:00	Summary overview of how each of the 7 Key Focus Areas have been addressed: • Service need • Value for money and affordability • Social, environmental and economic sustainability • Governance • Risk management • Stakeholder management • Asset owner needs and change management	Project Team
13:00 – 13:30	WORKING LUNCH - Discussion of interview schedule	Project Director
13:30 – 14:00	Review Team Discussion	Review Team Only

CONTACT DETAILS:
[name of delivery agency contact for day]
[mobile number of delivery agency contact]

NSW INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT Version 2, December 2018

GATEWAY REVIEW
Gate 2 Business Case

we are insw Infrastructure New South Wales

[project]
INTERVIEWEE LIST

PERSON	ORGANISATION	ROLE	EMAIL / PHONE

NSW INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT Version 2, December 2018

GATEWAY REVIEW
Gate 2 Business Case

we are insw Infrastructure New South Wales

[project]
[date and location]

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TIME	NAME AND POSITION OF PRESENTER	DETAILS	KEY FOCUS AREA
9:00 – 10:00	Project Director Accountant Design Manager	• Asset design and scope overview • How the asset fits in with its network / place making • Identified need and problem being solved	ALL
10:00 – 10:45	Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) Deputy Secretary / GM Planning Deputy Secretary / GM Operations	• Assessment of alternative means of meeting the need • Delivery agency endorsement • Benefits of the project for the delivery agency and stakeholders	Service Need
10:45 – 12:45	Project Director Commercial Manager BCR Analyst Quantity Surveyor (Cost Planner) Treasury Representative	• Economic appraisal • Financial analysis of options • Cost benefit Analysis: quantitative and qualitative • Source of funds	Value for Money and Affordability
12:45 – 13:15	LUNCH BREAK		
13:15 – 15:00	Master Planner Network manager Planning Approvals Operations / Asset Management	• Whole-of-life costs sustainability • Planning approval process • Environmental impacts • Place making and system/network integration	Social, Economic and Environmental Sustainability
15:00 – 17:00	Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) Chair of Steering Committee Program Manager Project Director	• Project oversight structure • Delivery agency capability and capacity • Project team structure and capability • Responsibilities and authorities • Delivery agency governance policies	Governance

NSW INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT Version 2, December 2018

GATEWAY REVIEW
Gate 2 Business Case

we are insw Infrastructure New South Wales

[project]
DOCUMENT REGISTER

DOCUMENT NAME	DATE	CONTEXT / PURPOSE

NSW INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT Version 2, December 2018

PART B

INITIATING THE GATEWAY REVIEW

The delivery agency contacts the relevant GCA Review Manager to initiate the Review.

On initiation of the Review, the GCA will draft the Terms of Reference and appoint the Review Team. The delivery agency uses this time to collate project documentation and coordinate interviewees. The Review commences with the release of the project documents to the Review Team. This is followed by the project briefing and site visit, and interviews.


The delivery agency and GCA Review Manager will discuss and agree:

- Dates for the project briefing and interview day(s)
- Any urgency in the completion of the Gateway Review Report
- Any issues to be covered in the Terms of Reference
- Any nominations for Review Team Members (which may or may not be agreed by the GCA).

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE REVIEW

The GCA will determine the Terms of Reference for the Gateway Review in consultation with the delivery agency and provide them to the Review Team prior to the commencement of the Review. The Terms of Reference provide the Review Team with important project-specific information and identify aspects of the project that the GCA and/or delivery agency see as issues. The Terms of Reference should be used in conjunction with the appropriate Gateway Review Workbook.

Delivery agencies should collate sufficient evidence and schedule appropriate interviewees to address the Terms of Reference.



GATEWAY REVIEW
Gate 2 Business Case

GATEWAY REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROJECT: [Name in portal]
GATE: Gate 2 Business Case **PHASE:** Investment Decision
DELIVERY AGENCY: [Delivery agency responsible for project]
CLUSTER: [Cluster delivery agency belongs to]
SRC: [SRC name] **EMAIL:** [SRC email]

The Review will be conducted in line with Infrastructure NSW's mandate to provide investor assurance for infrastructure projects valued at or over \$10M and in accordance with Gate 2 Gateway Review Workbook. The Review Report produced following this Review is primarily for the consideration of and noting by, the NSW Cabinet. This Terms of Reference forms part of the Review Report.

PROJECT BACKGROUND
 [Project name]
 [Objectives and intended outcomes]

GATEWAY TIMING
 The timing of the Gateway Review is as follows:


ACTIVITY	DATE
Documents to Reviewers	[Enter date dd/mm/yyyy]
Project Briefing (half day)	[Enter date dd/mm/yyyy]
Interview Days (all day)	[Enter date dd/mm/yyyy]
Report and Recommendations Table from Reviewers	[Enter date dd/mm/yyyy]
Final Report with delivery agency responses	[Enter date dd/mm/yyyy]

NSW INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR ASSURANCE SENSITIVE: NSW GOVERNMENT Version 2, December 2018

COST DATA COLLECTION TEMPLATE

The delivery agency is required to complete the cost data collection template and return it to the GCA Manager prior to the commencement of the Review.

The data template will continue to be used over the life of the project/program. The primary purpose of the data collection is to provide a history of cost movements between Final Business Case, Investment Decision, Pre-tender estimates, Tender Price and final out turn costs to inform gateway reviews.



we are insw
Infrastructure New South Wales

Cost Data Collection Template

Project Name [Please identify the project name]
Contact Person [Please provide contact for any enquiries? Please also provide phone number and email address]

1. Cost Data and Reasons for Cost Changes

Please populate the template as much as possible to reflect the current stage of your project, noting that this data template will continue to be used over the life of the project/program. If available and applicable, please provide cost information and reason for changes by work package, and include each work package as a new row.

For cost information, please capture PBR costs if available, and provide nominal/outturn costs in \$ millions (if overall project cost is not available, Government portion of costs only).


	Contracting Method	Date of Data in the Final Business Case (to Date)	Government Approved cost at Investment Decision (to Date)	PBR costs used for Investment Decision?	PBR costs used for Investment Decision?	Date of Pre-tender Estimate (to Date)	Date of Tender Return Price (to Date, to the end of the project)	Contract Award Price (to Date)	Current (to Date)
Project/Program Total									
Information by Work Package (if applicable)									
1. Information by work package									
2. Each work package									
3. Section 1									
4. Section 2									
5. Section 3									
6. Section 4									
7. Section 5									
8. Section 6									
9. Section 7									
10. Section 8									
11. Section 9									
12. Section 10									
13. Section 11									
14. Section 12									
15. Section 13									
16. Section 14									
17. Section 15									
18. Section 16									
19. Section 17									
20. Section 18									
21. Section 19									
22. Section 20									
23. Section 21									
24. Section 22									
25. Section 23									
26. Section 24									
27. Section 25									
28. Section 26									
29. Section 27									
30. Section 28									
31. Section 29									
32. Section 30									
33. Section 31									
34. Section 32									
35. Section 33									
36. Section 34									
37. Section 35									
38. Section 36									
39. Section 37									
40. Section 38									
41. Section 39									
42. Section 40									
43. Section 41									
44. Section 42									
45. Section 43									
46. Section 44									
47. Section 45									
48. Section 46									
49. Section 47									
50. Section 48									
51. Section 49									
52. Section 50									
53. Section 51									
54. Section 52									
55. Section 53									
56. Section 54									
57. Section 55									
58. Section 56									
59. Section 57									
60. Section 58									
61. Section 59									
62. Section 60									
63. Section 61									
64. Section 62									
65. Section 63									
66. Section 64									
67. Section 65									
68. Section 66									
69. Section 67									
70. Section 68									
71. Section 69									
72. Section 70									
73. Section 71									
74. Section 72									
75. Section 73									
76. Section 74									
77. Section 75									
78. Section 76									
79. Section 77									
80. Section 78									
81. Section 79									
82. Section 80									
83. Section 81									
84. Section 82									
85. Section 83									
86. Section 84									
87. Section 85									
88. Section 86									
89. Section 87									
90. Section 88									
91. Section 89									
92. Section 90									
93. Section 91									
94. Section 92									
95. Section 93									
96. Section 94									
97. Section 95									
98. Section 96									
99. Section 97									
100. Section 98									
101. Section 99									
102. Section 100									
103. Section 101									
104. Section 102									
105. Section 103									
106. Section 104									
107. Section 105									
108. Section 106									
109. Section 107									
110. Section 108									
111. Section 109									
112. Section 110									
113. Section 111									
114. Section 112									
115. Section 113									
116. Section 114									
117. Section 115									
118. Section 116									
119. Section 117									
120. Section 118									
121. Section 119									
122. Section 120									
123. Section 121									
124. Section 122									
125. Section 123									
126. Section 124									
127. Section 125									
128. Section 126									
129. Section 127									
130. Section 128									
131. Section 129									
132. Section 130									
133. Section 131									
134. Section 132									
135. Section 133									
136. Section 134									
137. Section 135									
138. Section 136									
139. Section 137									
140. Section 138									
141. Section 139									
142. Section 140									
143. Section 141									
144. Section 142									
145. Section 143									
146. Section 144									
147. Section 145									
148. Section 146									
149. Section 147									
150. Section 148									
151. Section 149									
152. Section 150									
153. Section 151									
154. Section 152									
155. Section 153									
156. Section 154									

PART B

OVERSIGHT FRAMEWORK REQUIREMENTS

Delivery agencies are expected to demonstrate that the minimum requirements detailed in the Oversight Framework are met through the Gateway assurance processes. Prior to the commencement of the Review for Gates 1 to 5 the delivery agency will complete the Oversight Framework Self-Assessment Checklist.

The Checklist should be used in conjunction with the Oversight Framework Guide. The Checklist is applicable for all HPHR projects and selected non-HPHR projects at request of the GCA Manager. The Review Team will review the completed checklist for inclusion in the Review Report.



The form is titled 'GATEWAY REVIEW Gate 2 Business Case' and 'OVERSIGHT FRAMEWORK SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST'. It contains two main sections: 'MINIMUM REQUIREMENT GATEWAY REVIEW' and 'GATE 2 BUSINESS CASE GATEWAY REVIEW'. Each section contains a list of questions with checkboxes for 'Yes', 'No', and 'Not Applicable'. The questions cover various aspects of project governance, financial management, and performance evaluation. At the bottom, there is a section for 'GATEWAY REVIEW REPORT' with checkboxes for 'Yes', 'No', and 'Not Applicable'.

PROJECT BRIEFING AGENDA

The project briefing is held approximately one week after the release of the Review documentation and one week prior to the interviews.

The delivery agency prepares the Project Briefing Agenda and provides it to the GCA. The delivery agency organises the venue and the GCA Review Manager issues diary invitations. The project briefing should include a site visit.

A Project Briefing Agenda template is included in the Gate 2 suite of documents. This template is only provided as guidance and the delivery agency may change the agenda as appropriate.


PARTICIPATION AND INTERVIEWS

The delivery agency prepares an interview schedule and provides it to the GCA Review Manager and the Review Team for comment. The Review Team has discretion over the final list of interviewees and, if they deem necessary, can request additional interviewees, which the delivery agency must then arrange. The interviewees nominated should be appropriate to cover each of the seven Key Focus Areas and the Terms of Reference.

The delivery agency must complete an interviewee list for the Review Team and for inclusion in the Review Report. The interviewee list and schedule templates are included in the Gate 2 suite of documents. Typically, interviewees for Gate 2 will include:

- Senior Responsible Officer
- Senior delivery agency representatives responsible for capital planning and prioritisation
- Project Manager/Director
- Manager responsible for risk
- Cost Planning / Estimating team members
- Project team members including those responsible for design, scheduling, planning approvals and communication)
- Network planning team and/or a representative of the intended operator
- NSW Treasury representative familiar with the project
- Stakeholders from other agencies or user groups.

An interviewee information sheet is available with the Gate 2 suite of documents and it may be useful for the delivery agency to provide this to interviewees unfamiliar with the Gateway Review process.



The form is titled 'INVESTOR ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK Gateway Review, Health Checks and Deep Dive' and 'WHAT THE INTERVIEWEE SHOULD KNOW'. It contains two main sections: 'OVERVIEW' and 'INTERVIEWS'. The 'OVERVIEW' section provides information about the Gateway Review process, including the purpose, scope, and the role of the Review Team. The 'INTERVIEWS' section provides information about the interview process, including the format, duration, and the role of the Review Team. At the bottom, there is a section for 'WHO'S WHO IN A GATEWAY REVIEW' with checkboxes for 'Yes', 'No', and 'Not Applicable'.

GATE 2

GATEWAY WORKBOOK

Part C

FOR REVIEW TEAMS Conducting a Gate 2 Review

PART C

GATE 2 APPROACH

The Gate 2 Review is conducted prior to the investment decision and a formal approach to market by the delivery agency.

The Review Team should use this workbook to guide the **assessment of the Final Business Case** and check the project scope and investment is an appropriate and deliverable response that will maximise benefits at optimal cost, to the well-defined service need and that a procurement strategy is in place.

The outcome of the Gate 2 Review will inform the investment decision by government and the progression of the project to procurement and delivery by the delivery agency.

GATEWAY REVIEW

The Gateway Review is conducted through an examination of the project documentation provided and interviews with project team members and stakeholders. The Gateway Review is structured around the seven Key Focus Areas and is informed by the Terms of Reference.

Typically, a Gateway Review includes:

- Project documentation released to the Review Team
- A project briefing and site visit hosted by the delivery agency and attended by the SRO and the GCA Review Manager
- Interview day(s) hosted by the delivery agency
- Review Report drafted by the Review Team for the GCA
- Review debrief with the SRO organised by the delivery agency and attended by the Review Team Leader and the GCA Review Manager
- Finalisation of the Review Report by the GCA and issue to the delivery agency.

GATEWAY REVIEW TEAM

For each Gateway Review the GCA Review Manager selects the Gateway Review Team members (typically three members but can be more or less depending on the Review requirements), from the GCA's established Expert Review Panel. One of the Review Team members will be assigned by the GCA as the Review Team Leader.



Each member of a Review Team must be independent of the project. Reviewers must immediately inform the GCA of any potential or current conflict of interest that arises prior to or during Review. The Reviewer's participation in the Review may preclude them, and their organisation, from participating in the project in any other capacity. For all Tier 1 projects, members must be high profile industry experts and independent of the NSW Government (i.e. not currently employed by the NSW Government).

The GCA seeks to appoint a Review Team with the mix of skills and expertise to allow the Team to expertly address each of the seven Key Focus Areas, as relevant to the project stage and the nature of the project. Each member is expected to contribute within their area of expertise, work collaboratively with their Review Team colleagues and take responsibility for producing a high quality, well written Review Report using the appropriate template.

REVIEW TEAM PRINCIPLES AND BEHAVIOURS

Throughout the Review, the Review Team is expected to add real value to the development and delivery of the project by:



- Being helpful and constructive in conducting the Review and developing the Review Report
- Being independent, with the Review Report's recommendations not directed or influenced from outside the Review Team
- Adhering to the Terms of Reference provided by the GCA
- Providing a Review Report that clearly highlights substantive issues, their causes and consequences
- Providing specific and actionable recommendations.

Delivery agencies and Review Team members should immediately inform the GCA if they believe any member of the Review Team is in breach of these principles or displays any inappropriate or disrespectful behaviour at any time.

PART C

REVIEW COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS

TOPIC	DETAILS
REPORT CONFIDENTIALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Reports are primarily for the consideration and noting of the NSW Cabinet to assist them in making key decisions about the project or to take action as required. All Review Reports are marked “SENSITIVE - NSW CABINET” and are submitted to Cabinet. All participants must keep all information, including documentation, confidential at all times. Review Team members must not directly contact the delivery agency without the permission of the CGA Review Manager.
REPORT DISTRIBUTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Team Members must not distribute copies of any versions of Review Reports directly to delivery agencies, project teams or any other party. The Review Team Leader sends the draft Review Report to the GCA for distribution. There is no ‘<i>informal</i>’ element to a Gateway Review or the Review Report, and action will be taken if a Review Report is distributed without permission of the GCA. The Review Report must not be distributed outside of the responsible delivery agency until the report is finalised, including a delivery agency response to the Review Recommendations. Copies of final Review Reports (including delivery agency responses) are only distributed by the GCA in accordance with the protocols outlined in the IIAF. The final Review Report must not be distributed to any other parties unless directed by the Delivery Agency Head or delegate of the GCA. The Delivery Agency Head or delegate may distribute the final Review Report at their discretion, having regard to the confidential nature of the Report.
REVIEW DEBRIEF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GCA Review Manager and the Review Team Leader will agree on the process and timing to conduct a Review debrief with the delivery agency following the development of the Review Report. The GCA Review Manager will approve the delivery agency representative at the debrief and may attend the debrief at their discretion. There is no ‘<i>informal</i>’ element to Gateway Reviews. A debrief to SROs or a delivery agency’s executive must not occur without the approval of the GCA representative.
REPORT FORMAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Review Reports must include a document control table. All Review Reports must include a list of people interviewed by the Review Team. All versions of reports issued by the Review Team to the GCA are to be in MS WORD format. The final Review Report issued to the delivery agency SRO is to be watermarked as ‘FINAL’ and issued in PDF.
REPORT TRANSMITTAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GCA is required to keep a record of all parties, noting the Review Report version, to whom reports are issued. All participants should minimise the use of hard copies of delivery agency documents and must not keep documents in any form following the Review.

PART C

GATEWAY REVIEW REPORT

The primary output of a Gateway Review is a high quality written report that is candid and clear, absent of errors and without contradiction and inconsistencies.

The primary purpose of the Review Report is to inform the NSW Cabinet of project progress and issues with recommendations so appropriate action can be taken.

The Review Team should utilise the appropriate Review Report template incorporating the Gateway Review Ratings and the Review Recommendations Table. The Terms of Reference form part of the Review Report.

Review Reports must include:

- Executive Summary that addresses the Review Team's key findings and includes the recommendations rated as critical and the overall Review Rating with a succinct justification
- Commentary, including a Rating, on the project's response to each of the seven Key Focus Areas
- Relevant recommendations under each Key Focus Area, listed, justified and rated (consistent with the Ratings Guide)
- Commentary under 'Other Matters' for issues that do not fit within the seven Key Focus Areas (including issues identified in the Terms of Reference)
- Recommendations Table in the format provided by the GCA and including each recommendation with its rating and categorisation by theme (see below).

KEY THEME ASSESSMENT

Infrastructure NSW is required to prepare a report each year on key themes emerging across all reviews. This relies on an analysis of the Review recommendations categorised according to 18 key themes.

Review Teams are requested to assign one of the 18 key themes to each recommendation made.

THEME	DEFINITION
QUALITY OF THE BUSINESS CASE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for change is not clearly articulated or sufficiently succinct and the justification for the investment is not substantiated. • Analysis, assumptions and/or documentation lack rigour, clear articulation and/or is inadequate.
GOVERNANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance frameworks are not fit for purpose or understood by team members and/or there is a lack of definition around roles, understanding of responsibilities, decision-making frameworks and single-point accountability. • There is a lack of active senior level support.
DISCIPLINE IN RISK MANAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key project risks overlooked, missed or not adequately considered, risk management strategy / plan requires strengthening, mitigation measures and contingency management has not been developed or is not up to date.
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder strategy / management plan is missing or is not up to date. • Lack of adequate stakeholder consultation and/or stakeholder views / concerns have not been considered and addressed appropriately.
BENEFITS REALISATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a benefits realisation framework strategy/plan, or does not adequately identify, quantify or assign responsibility for benefits.
PROJECT RESOURCING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The resource plan, including for the next stage in the project lifecycle, has not been developed or resources identified are not adequate, key roles lack appropriate capability and expertise.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of, or inadequate, project management, scheduling discipline or project controls. • The schedule (program) has not been appropriately developed and is not reflective of the project risks and timing.
PROCUREMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate procurement strategy, inadequate procurement planning, documentation does not ensure transparency in the decision-making process. • Delivery strategy not appropriately detailed and project staging not addressed.

PART C

THEME	DEFINITION
OPTIONS ANALYSIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and/or assessment of options to meet service need is inadequate / incomplete. • Alternative options, including a realistic base case, are poorly explained / justified. • Lack of a clear justification for the preferred option.
COMMERCIAL CAPABILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient rigour, process and accuracy around cost estimates and contingency estimating, planning and management. • Funding for the next phase not confirmed or allocated, gaps in project funding, lack of suitable funding strategy.
APPROACH TO PLANNING AND APPROVALS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning pathway to achieve planning consent in a timely manner not identified or articulated.
CHANGE MANAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of an effective mechanism to identify the changes necessary to achieve project outcomes. • Lack of a change management plan / inadequate change management plan.
OPERATIONAL READINESS PLANNING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of, or inadequate mechanisms to ensure effective readiness planning, prioritisation, management and operation. • Operational governance and management structures not determined and/or established.
SHARING KNOWLEDGE ACROSS GOVERNMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of, or inadequate processes to capture and share lessons learnt (errors and successes).
INTEGRATION WITH PRECINCT AND ACROSS SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate consideration of interfacing networks, precincts, projects and services.
UNDERSTANDING GOVERNMENT PROCESSES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant NSW Government guidelines, frameworks and processes not considered, employed and/or complied with during project development and delivery.
CLEAR PROJECT OBJECTIVES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project objectives do not align to Government priorities, are not clear and/or do not articulate the service need. • The scope, scale and requirements of the project have not been appropriately articulated. • The project scope does not align with the project objectives and KPIs have not been developed.
SUSTAINABILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of or inadequate consideration, documentation and assessment of the social, economic and environmental impacts of the project.

GATE 2

GATEWAY WORKBOOK

Part D

FOR DELIVERY AGENCIES AND REVIEW TEAMS
Areas for investigation in a Gate 2 Review

PART D

WHAT TO LOOK FOR AT GATE 2

The Gate 2 seeks to answer the question: **How well has the project proven the preferred option best meets the service need and maximises benefits at optimal cost?**


KEY FOCUS AREA	GENERAL DESCRIPTION APPLICABLE TO GATEWAY	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2
SERVICE NEED 	Identification of the problem or opportunity and the service need, along with the drivers for change. Demonstrated alignment to government policy or strategy and evidence of demand for the potential new services or enhancements.	Service need refined to inform the project scope, key risks to service need addressed and opportunities for broader benefits examined and maximised.
VALUE FOR MONEY AND AFFORDABILITY 	Ensure value is delivered by maximising benefits at optimal cost. Evidenced by a clearly defined scope, a cost benefit analysis and a robust cost plan to an appropriate level of detail for the lifecycle stage of the project. An assessment of potential or confirmed sources of funds. The whole-of-life, capital and operational cost impacts have been considered.	Preferred option(s) refined and developed through the production of a Final Business Case to demonstrate maximum benefits at optimal cost. Clear pathway to access funding required for delivery and ongoing operations.
SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY 	Understanding the long-term impacts, opportunities and obligations created by the project. These can be social, environmental and economic. Ensuring the project delivers a positive legacy for the community. Areas explored include: socio-economic equity; resilience to climate change; effective place making; integration with broader asset networks; asset adaptability (including technological change); interface with heritage; and the robustness of the project's planning approvals processes.	Assessment of how the project fits within its context and location and its compatibility within the broader service network. Robust planning pathway and approach identified.
GOVERNANCE 	The project governance is robust. Clear accountabilities, responsibilities and reporting lines are identified and decision-making and approvals are appropriate and understood. The Senior Responsible Officer and project team have the culture, capability and capacity required.	Robust project development governance structure with clearly articulated responsibilities and reporting lines and appropriate delegations in place with an emphasis on project procurement and delivery.
RISK MANAGEMENT 	Ongoing identification and active management of risks and opportunities using a structured and formal methodology.	Risks and opportunities identified, considered and controlled within a structured methodology to enable the procurement and delivery of the project.
STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT 	Ongoing identification and proactive management of stakeholders, both internal and external to government, using a structured and robust framework appropriate to the stage in the project lifecycle.	Identification and engagement of stakeholders, both internal and external to government. Stakeholders formally engaged and evidence that this has influenced the project development. Stakeholder management plan in place for procurement and a clear approach to take the project through delivery.
ASSET OWNER'S NEEDS AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT 	Demonstration of how change will be managed in the areas of people, organisation, network and systems as the asset enters operations. Proactive management of the handover impacts through the lifecycle of the project. Demonstrated consideration of issues and risks pertaining to the asset manager, operator and end users.	Involvement of the asset owner/operator and consideration and documentation of operational issues for the project. Proactive identification of handover points and required change management processes to move effectively through to procurement.

PART D

DEFINITION OF SCOPE

As projects progress through their lifecycle stages, there should be a strong convergence in the definition of scope, cost and time to deliver the desired outcome and objectives. Gateway Reviews support a project through this process, using the Key Focus Areas to ensure that economic and social impacts have been considered and stakeholder groups have been engaged in developing the optimum solution to address the service need or problem.


This can be illustrated as a funnel representing increasing development and delivery certainty in the project:



PROJECT DECISIONS

Gateway Reviews also recognise that scope changes have a greater impact on cost as the project progresses through its lifecycle. Robust decision-making and clarity of direction early in project development is important to successful project delivery. A lack of clarity and late decision-making will result in higher costs and greater uncertainty of outcomes.

PROJECT AND SCOPE DECISIONS






PART D

APPLICATION OF REVIEW SUCCESS FACTORS

In examining each of the Key Focus Areas the Review Team should be guided by project development and delivery fundamentals. These fundamentals are the Success Factors for projects underpinning delivery confidence.

The Success Factors provide an overarching context for each Key Focus Area and should assist in developing lines of enquiry. The Success Factors provide context to the commentary in the Review Report and are incorporated into the Review Report.

As a project progresses through its lifecycle there is an expectation that the detail and evidence will increase, providing confidence that the requirements of the seven Key Focus Areas are being met. This can be seen through the lens of three success factors within each Key Focus Area:

	INCREASING SCOPE CONFIDENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well defined service need Value-for-money approach in developing an evidence-based solution Increasing clarity and detail in defining the solution Increasing understanding and clarity within the delivery agency of how to deliver the solution
	MANAGING RISK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasingly granular and effective identification of risk Assessment, prioritisation and planned mitigation of uncertain events that could adversely affect the achievement of the project objectives
	REALISING BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing definition of the project objectives and benefits Linking of those benefits to the service need Embedding an end-to-end process to ensure that the benefits and objectives of the investment are realised





OPTIMISM BIAS

Optimism bias refers to the tendency to overestimate the likelihood of good events occurring and underestimating the likelihood of experiencing adverse events. Optimistic errors are considered to be an integral part of human nature, requiring conscious effort to manage and promote accuracy in project estimates and analysis. Practical steps for project teams to avoid optimism bias in project analysis include:

- Use independent peer reviewers to verify that cost, demand and benefit estimates are realistic
- Undertake risk workshops, with key stakeholders, and people with knowledge of the project and/or the potential risks, the operator and asset owner involved to review the assumptions made and the risks identified – including the likelihood of the risk occurring, and impact if the risk were to occur.

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 1 – SERVICE NEED

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2		
 SERVICE NEED	Service need refined to inform the project scope, key risks to service need addressed and opportunities for broader benefits examined and maximised.		
	 Project scope clearly articulated in the context of the problem definition and evaluated against service need and project objectives.	 Detailed assessment of risks of meeting and not meeting service need. Procurement strategy will meet the service need.	 Project outcomes clearly identified and maximised for community and non-monetary benefits across agency portfolios.

1. Has a compelling case for change been presented?
2. How has the project presented a robust and evidence based evaluation against problem definition, service need, project objectives and government policies?
3. How has the project comprehensively assessed and analysed all reasonable and/or feasible alternative means of meeting the need?
4. How unambiguous and detailed is the project scope in terms of outcomes, scale and requirements?
5. Have the demand forecasts been developed through an appropriate modelling approach with valid data and a robust modelling process, incorporating validated assumptions?
6. How has the delivery of the service need, scope, benefits influenced the procurement strategy?
7. How does the project identify and incorporate broader community outcomes, which may accrue to deliver whole of government benefits?
8. How well has the approach to benefits realisation been documented?





OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
How are the program's service need and benefits articulated and are there clear business rules for qualifying projects?
How has the program delivery been prioritised, including appropriate tranches and dependencies between projects and any minimum service level requirements?
How have the program procurement options been optimised to deliver maximum benefit?
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
How have the service needs of the network and potential intersecting networks been considered within the development of the project?
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
How does the site masterplan, that the project sits within, demonstrate alignment to the current and future uses and requirements on the site?

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 2 – VALUE FOR MONEY AND AFFORDABILITY

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2
 VALUE FOR MONEY AND AFFORDABILITY	<p>Preferred option(s) refined and developed through the production of a Final Business Case to demonstrate maximum benefits at optimal cost. Clear pathway to access funding required for delivery and ongoing operations.</p> <div>  Cost-Benefit Analysis of the project is consistent with Treasury guidance.  Demonstrated linkage between the risk analysis and the cost plan and clear approach to contingency.  Demonstration that the benefits identified are achievable. </div>

1. What is the evidence that the project will maximise benefits at optimal cost and the intended funding pathway is supported?
2. To what extent does the project's funding include other funding sources outside of Consolidated Revenue?
3. What is the evidence that the expected benefits are realistic and achievable and have been identified and quantified?
4. What is the evidence that a high quality and comprehensive Cost-Benefit Analysis (in line with NSW Treasury guidance) has been completed and presented, including assumptions, discount factors and sensitivity analysis?
5. How does the Cost-Benefit Analysis support the preferred option being presented (the option with the highest Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) as calculated in-line with NSW Treasury guidance), or is there a significant risk or opportunity that justifies an alternative?
6. What is the evidence to support a clear link between the scope, schedule, cost plan, risk matrix, and Cost-Benefit Analysis?
7. How has the project accounted for non-monetary benefits, costs and impacts to the community?
8. Are the resourcing, funding plans and broader agency support to procure the project in place and are they appropriate to the project's scale?
9. How will the procurement, packaging and contracting strategy drive maximum value from the market?
10. What is the approach to managing the impact of the works on utilities? Has liaison taken place with the Utility Companies to assess cost and time impact?
11. What is the approach to managing site conditions, including details of available data, investigations completed and any contamination issues?





OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
Nil
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
What is the approach to value engineering and innovation within the design development to maximise benefits while minimising cost?
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
How does the masterplan drive maximum benefits while minimising costs and how has this impacted the analysis of the project?
Is the approach to architecture driving cost and what is the approach to value engineering for the design development?

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 3 – SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2			
 SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY	Assessment of how the project fits within its context and location and its compatibility within the broader service network. Robust planning pathway and approach identified.			
	 Scope of the project considers social and economic equity, environmental impacts, technological change and climate resilience in the context of its location and integration with its wider asset network.	 Planning pathway assessed. Risks around network and place integration are understood.	 Scope maximises access to services, and addresses economic and social inequality and environmental enhancements.	

1. How has the planning pathway for the project been assessed and is it realistic to achieve the project schedule and cost outcomes required?
2. What progress has been made in the development of approvals documentation in-line with the overall delivery expectations on the project and is it appropriate?
3. How have heritage impacts been incorporated or dealt with through design or robust approach?
4. How will the project integrate with the built environment and precinct, and ensure value through place making?
5. How has the long-term integration with broader asset networks and services been articulated and appropriately captured?
6. How does the project maximise access to services for the community, and address socio-economic inequality?
7. How has the project considered long term social and economic needs and impacts and then balanced these against the relatively short term project benefits and impacts?
8. How does the project design address sustainability impacts and criteria (e.g. emissions)?
9. How does the project capture future adaptability needs, including climate resilience and asset reconfiguration, and future potential technological change?

OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
Nil
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
What consideration has been given to the enhancement of green space and the creation of recreational opportunities?
How will the project manage the competing demands for places, people, transport modes and changing end-user priorities?
What consideration has been given to the achievement of relevant sustainability/environmental rating (e.g. IS Rating) and is this appropriate for the project?
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
What consideration has been given to the achievement of relevant sustainability/environmental rating (e.g. GREENSTAR) and is this appropriate for the project?
How have community use sharing arrangements been considered?
How has the project considered the integration with other community services that may be required to support the end-users of the project?

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 4 – GOVERNANCE

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2		
 GOVERNANCE	Robust project development governance structure with clearly articulated responsibilities and reporting lines and appropriate delegations in place with an emphasis on project procurement and delivery.		
	 Clear governance framework is in place. Project team structure, capability and capacity is appropriate to take the project through procurement and plan for delivery.	 Strong Senior Responsible Officer. Governance structure supports the assessment and control of risk.	 Clear approach to benefits measurement and realisation.

1. What has been the formal project and delivery agency governance structure to support the Final Business Case and how will this change for the procurement stage of the project?
2. What is the evidence of endorsement from the Delivery Agency Head or equivalent?
3. What is the capability and experience of the delivery agency nominated to procure and deliver the project and are any necessary inter-agency governance agreements in place?
4. What evidence demonstrates the SRO has sufficient engagement, expertise, capacity and financial delegation at a level appropriate to the scale of the project?
5. What are the plans to establish the necessary skilled resourcing, project controls (program, milestones, change control, contingency), monitoring of key risks and reporting to support the procurement stage of the project?
6. How is appropriate visibility and transparency through the project team and governance demonstrated and maintained?
7. How has the governance framework across the Final Business Case ensured a balance between the technical and engineering outcomes, and end-user needs?
8. Has the project considered the governance requirements for the delivery stage?
9. How has the adopted procurement, packaging and contracting strategy been agreed within the established governance framework?
10. How does the project demonstrate the governance and project team for the procurement stage of the project have clear responsibilities, accountabilities and decision-making delegations?
11. How will the governance for the project and delivery agency ensure the right culture is developed and maintained within the project team through the procurement stage of the project?
12. How does the governance structure demonstrate a clear understanding of how the benefits will be managed, controlled and assessed through the procurement and delivery stage of the project?





OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
How has an assurance framework been developed that is consistent with the desired outcomes of the program?
How does the governance plan to ensure that each of the component projects within the program will combine to deliver the required outcomes and benefits?
How has a clear governance hierarchy been established to ensure project reporting can be rolled up to the program level?
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
Nil
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
Nil

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 5 – RISK MANAGEMENT

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2		
 RISK MANAGEMENT	Risks and opportunities identified, appropriately considered and controlled within a structured methodology to enable the procurement and delivery of the project.		
	 Full assessment of risks against a clearly defined scope, documented and captured.	 Development of robust risk management plan to take the project through procurement and delivery. Clear understanding of procurement risks.	 Risk assessment extends to future benefit realisation.

1. What has been the formal risk management approach and does it remain appropriate for the procurement stage of the project?
2. Is there an active risk matrix that is comprehensive and robust, and how is this kept current?
3. How has the development of the risk matrix involved all relevant stakeholders, including the asset owner/operator?
4. How do the major risks to project procurement and delivery affect the Final Business Case?
5. How have the risks to the on-time completion of the project been addressed through a sufficiently documented and robust delivery program?
6. How are regulatory or legislative risks identified and addressed in the procurement and delivery of the project?
7. What is the commercial risk allocation for the project and is it realistic for the scale and complexity of the project?
8. How are the key risks to the realisation of benefits identified and how are they to be mitigated?
9. How has the procurement and delivery strategy considered the risks that emerge from contractors where the government has a high commercial exposure?





OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
What is the risk escalation process established to allow project risks to be considered at the program level and is it appropriate?
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
Nil
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
Nil

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 6 – STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2
 STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT	<p>Identification and engagement of stakeholders, both internal and external to government. Stakeholders formally engaged and evidence that this has influenced the project development. Stakeholder management plan in place for procurement and a clear approach to take the project through delivery.</p> <div>  Stakeholder input to the project scope.  Assessment of risks resulting from the acceptability of the project to key stakeholders.  Identified benefits are clearly linked to key stakeholders. </div>

1. What level of engagement has been undertaken with stakeholders (including end users and the community) in the development of the preferred option and how have issues been addressed?
2. What is the stakeholder management and engagement strategy for the procurement stage of the project and is it comprehensive?
3. How has intra- and inter-agency consultation resulted in the identification of opportunities to enhance the outcomes of the preferred option?
4. How have the views and concerns of stakeholders been incorporated into the development of the preferred option and procurement strategy?
5. How has the project benefited from early market engagement in the development of the preferred option or procurement strategy?
6. What is the market engagement and tenderer engagement approach for the procurement stage, is it robust and how will it enhance benefits and deliver innovation?
7. How has the market engagement and community stakeholder activity been coordinated with other relevant projects to mitigate communications/stakeholder fatigue as the project progresses?
8. How is the stakeholder engagement plan for the procurement and delivery resourced, coordinated across the delivery agency and reflected in the project's current or future governance structure?

OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
How does the planned stakeholder engagement approach, especially with stakeholders external to government, demonstrate a level of sophistication appropriate to the scale of the program?
Can the program demonstrate established program and project level stakeholder engagement approaches?
How is stakeholder influence being mapped and managed at both program and project level?
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
How granular is the stakeholder management plan and is this sufficient to address issues across communities impacted by the length/scale of the project?
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
Nil

PART D

KEY FOCUS AREA 7 – ASSET OWNER'S NEEDS AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT

KEY FOCUS AREA	HOW APPLIED AT GATE 2		
 ASSET OWNER'S NEEDS AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT	Involvement of the asset owner/operator and consideration and documentation of operational issues for the project. Proactive identification of handover points and required change management processes to move effectively through to procurement.		
	 Operational impacts /changes understood.	 Understanding of affected organisations and likely response to change documented.	 Benefit owners identified and a clear methodology to capture benefits is documented.

1. How have the consequences of workforce or human resources impacts caused in the delivery of the project been considered?
2. How have the consequences of the broader network changes resulting from the project been considered and addressed?
3. How have systems changes/transformation (technology, processes or procedures) driven by the project been explored and addressed?
4. How has the asset owner/operator been involved in the development of the project and do they agree they can realise the intended benefits?
5. What are the consequences of the operational impacts across affected organisations and are they transparent?
6. How well are the end-user needs and impacts considered and addressed?
7. What is the plan in place to facilitate the handover of the project to the team responsible for procurement and who will be accountable for leading this change?
8. What is the plan to efficiently recruit and induct new staff into the project team for the procurement stage of the project?
9. How has any potential network disruption, during delivery or in operations, been considered in the development and procurement of the project?

OPTIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE

The Review Team may choose to explore the following questions based on the type of project being undertaken.

FOR PROGRAMS
Nil
FOR CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ASSETS
Nil
FOR BUILDINGS AND PLACES
Nil

COST REVIEW QUESTIONS

All Gate 2 Gateway Reviews are required to address the following additional cost review questions:

1. Is the methodology applied to determine the capital cost estimate appropriate?
2. Have the costs been independently verified?
3. What is the confidence level of the capital cost estimate?
4. Has the cost plan been developed in line with the delivery agency or NSW Treasury guidance?
5. Is the cost plan appropriately detailed and benchmarked?
6. Have the risks to on-budget completion of the project been incorporated into the cost plan at a level sufficient for the scale and complexity of the project?
7. How was the project contingency estimated?
8. Is the level of detail in the design to determine the cost estimate appropriate?
9. Is the methodology applied to determine the whole-of-life cost estimate appropriate?
10. Is the level of escalation applied an appropriate reflection of anticipated market risk?
11. What is the escalation rate applied?
12. Have all costs to deliver the project and its key objectives been included? (e.g. cost of associated and peripheral works)

The Review Team must complete the appropriate section within the Gate 2 Review Report to respond to these questions.

GLOSSARY

TERM	DEFINITION
BENEFIT OWNER	The person responsible for the realisation of the benefit.
CAPITAL PROJECT	A project primarily comprised of one or more of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • Equipment • Property developments • Operational technology that forms a component of a capital project.
CEO	Chief Executive Officer.
CLOSE-OUT PLAN	Document outlining actions, responsibilities, accountabilities and timeframes that respond to recommendations identified in Gateway Review and Health Check Final Review Reports.
COMPLEX PROJECT	A project delivered in multiple stages and potentially across varying time periods. This could also be across a large (but connected) geography. Individual project stages may be identified during the development phase or during the procurement and delivery phases. This occurs when individual project stages are being procured and delivered under different contracts and potentially over different time periods. In some cases these individual project stages may have a different Project Tier to the overall complex project.
DECISION-MAKING	The Gateway, Health Check and Deep Dive Reviews inform decision-making by government. Government in this context refers to all parts of government including delivery agencies.
DEEP DIVE REVIEWS	Deep Dives Reviews are similar to a Health Check but focus on a particular technical issue informed by the Terms of Reference rather than the seven Key Focus Areas considered at a Health Check. These Reviews are generally undertaken in response to issues being raised by key stakeholders to the project or at the direction of the relevant Government Minister.
DELIVERY AGENCY	The Government agency tasked with developing and / or delivering a project applicable under this Framework and the NSW Gateway Policy.
EQUIPMENT	The necessary assets used on or to support an infrastructure system and can include fleet and rolling stock.
ECI	Early Contractor Involvement.
ETC	Estimated Total Cost.
EXPERT REVIEWER PANEL	Panel comprising independent highly qualified Expert Reviewers established to cover all aspects of Gateway Review needs.
FBC	Final Business Case.
GATE	Particular decision point(s) in a project/program's lifecycle when a Gateway Review may be undertaken.
GATEWAY COORDINATION AGENCY (GCA)	The agency responsible for the design and administration of an approved, risk-based model for the assessment of projects/programs, the coordination of the Gateway Reviews and the reporting of performance of the Gateway Review Process.
GCA REPORTING AND ASSURANCE PORTAL	Online portal administered by the GCA for the management of IIAF functions.
GATEWAY POLICY	The NSW Gateway Policy sets out the key points along the project lifecycle important for providing confidence to the NSW Government that projects are being delivered to time, cost and in-line with government objectives.

TERM	DEFINITION
GATEWAY REVIEW	<p>A Review of a project/program by an independent team of experienced practitioners at a specific key decision point (Gate) in the project's lifecycle.</p> <p>A Gateway Review is a short, focused, independent expert appraisal of the project that highlights risks and issues, which if not addressed may threaten successful delivery. It provides a view of the current progress of a project and assurance that it can proceed successfully to the next stage if any critical recommendations are addressed.</p>
HEALTH CHECK	Independent Reviews carried out by a team of experienced practitioners seeking to identify issues in a project which may arise between Gateway Reviews.
INFRASTRUCTURE	The basic services, facilities and installations to support society and can include water, wastewater, transport, sport and culture, power, policy, justice, health education and family and community services.
INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTOR	The NSW Government, representing the State of NSW.
IIAF	Infrastructure Investor Assurance Framework.
KEY FOCUS AREA	A specific area of investigation that factors in Gateway Review deliberations.
PROGRAM	<p>A temporary, flexible organisation created to coordinate, direct and oversee the implementation of a set of related projects and activities in order to deliver outcomes and benefits related to the organisation's strategic objectives. A program is likely to be longer term and have a life that spans several years. Programs typically deal with outcomes; whereas projects deal with outputs.</p> <p>Projects that form part of a program may be grouped together for a variety of reasons including spatial co-location (e.g. Western Sydney Infrastructure Program), the similar nature of the projects (e.g. Bridges for the Bush) or projects collectively achieving an outcome (e.g. 2018 Rail Timetable). Programs provide an umbrella under which these projects can be coordinated.</p> <p>The component parts of a program are usually individual projects or smaller groups of projects (sub-programs). In some cases, these individual projects or sub-programs may have a different Project Tier to the overall program.</p>
PROJECT	<p>A temporary organisation, usually existing for a much shorter duration than a program, which will deliver one or more outputs in accordance with an agreed business case. Under the IIAF a capital project is defined as infrastructure, equipment, property developments or operational technology that forms a component of a capital project.</p> <p>Projects are typically delivered in a defined time period on a defined site. Projects have a clear start and finish. Projects may be restricted to one geographic site or cover a large geographical area, however, will be linked and not be geographically diverse.</p> <p>A particular project may or may not be part of a program.</p> <p>Where a project is delivered in multiple stages and potentially across varying time periods it is considered a 'complex project'. Refer to the definition for 'complex project'.</p>
PROJECT TEAM	The delivery agency assigned group with responsibility for managing the project through the Gateway Review
PROJECT TIER	Tier-based classification of project profile and risk potential based on the project's estimated total cost and qualitative risk profile criteria (level of government priority, interface complexity, procurement complexity, agency capability and whether it is deemed as an essential service). The Project Tier classification is comprised of four Project Tiers, where Tier 1 encompasses projects deemed as being the highest risk and profile (Tier 1 – High Profile/High Risk projects), and Tier 4 with the lowest risk profile.
REVIEW TEAM	A team of expert independent practitioners, sourced from the Expert Reviewer Panel engaged by the GCA to undertake a Gateway Review, Health Check or Deep Dive Review.
SENIOR RESPONSIBLE OFFICER (SRO)	The delivery agency executive with strategic responsibility and the single point of overall accountability for a project.