

Gate 3 Review: Guideline and Workbook

Pre-execution

April 2026



Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Overview of the gateway review process.....	2
1.2	Project lifecycle and gateway reviews.....	3
1.3	About this Guideline / Workbook.....	4
1.4	How to use this workbook.....	5
1.5	Gateway reviews and agency assurance processes.....	6
1.6	Why do gateway reviews?.....	7
1.7	Gateway review process principles.....	7
1.7.1	Digital Assurance.....	7
1.7.2	Gateway Review Process Principles.....	8
1.8	Conducting a Gate 3 Gateway Review.....	9
1.9	Review ratings.....	11
1.10	Delivery confidence level definitions.....	12
2	Part A: For Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies and Reviewer Team Background on NSW Gateway and the risk-based approach to project assurance.....	13
2.1	Overview of gateway review.....	14
2.2	Gateway review process.....	18
2.3	Gate 0 – Project initiation.....	18
2.4	Gates 1 to 5 – Project development and delivery.....	18
2.5	Health checks and deep dive reviews.....	18
2.6	Gate 6 – Closure Review.....	19
2.7	Gateway review reports.....	19
2.8	Report distribution.....	20
2.9	Clearance of Gate.....	20
2.10	What Gateway reviews do not do.....	21
2.11	Roles within a gateway review applicable to Gate 3.....	22
2.12	Assessing risk in Digital Assurance.....	23
2.13	Developing the report.....	24
2.14	Applicable NSW Policy.....	25
2.15	Gateway Review Framework.....	26
3	Part B: For Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies Initiating and preparing for a Gate 3 Review.....	33
3.1	Key Gateways: Gate 0 – 2.....	34
3.2	Initiating a Gate 3 Review.....	36
3.3	Gate 3 Gateway Review and documents.....	38
3.3.1	Mandatory documents.....	38

3.3.2	Information documented to support Gate 3.....	38
3.3.3	Preplanning Planning Session Step 8.....	38
3.3.4	Review Activities Steps 9 & 10.....	39
3.3.5	Draft and final review report Steps 11 &12.....	39
4	Part C: For the Reviewer	
	Conducting the Review	40
4.1	Gate 3 Approach.....	41
4.2	Gate 3 Review.....	41
4.3	Gateway Review reviewer team.....	42
4.4	Review principles and behaviours.....	42
4.5	Part C: Review communication protocols.....	43
4.6	Gateway review report.....	44
4.7	Coverage of Gate 3 review objectives.....	44
5	Part D: Gate 3 Purpose and Report Process	47
5.1	Gate 3 Review Purpose and Process.....	48
6	Glossary	49
7	Additional guidelines material for Review Teams	54
7.1	Focus Areas.....	55
7.2	Assessment of delivery approach.....	56
7.2.1	Do all relevant options for delivery consider delivery agency business needs and relevant government priorities?	56
7.2.2	Are the delivery approach and mechanisms appropriate and agreed to by stakeholders? Have Agile methodologies (if appropriate) been considered?	56
7.2.3	Are business needs understood by the delivery agency and understood by those involved in delivery?.....	57
7.2.4	Are project outputs/outcomes reflected in the requirement specification?	57
7.2.5	Where appropriate, have options for procurement been evaluated, including sources of supply?.....	57
7.2.6	Will the project be attractive to the market?	58
7.2.7	Has the proposed procurement procedure been evaluated?	58
7.2.8	Is the selected outline delivery strategy defined?	59
7.2.9	Have factors that influence the delivery strategy been addressed?.....	59
7.2.10	Will the outline delivery strategy facilitate communication and cooperation between all parties involved?	59
7.2.11	Is there knowledge of existing and potential suppliers that are most likely to succeed?.....	60
7.2.12	Is the contract management strategy robust?	60
7.2.13	Do the contracts comply with NSW procurement rules?	60
7.2.14	Is the evaluation strategy (including how to demonstrate value for money) accepted by stakeholders and compliant with NSW procurement rules?	61

7.2.15	Does the project and proposed solution meets the whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities?.....	61
7.2.16	Is the culture of the delivery agency ready to deliver the project?	61
7.2.17	Do all the stakeholders fully understand the delivery methodology including resource commitments, delegations and governance arrangements?.....	62
7.2.18	Have time, cost and resource implications been considered?	62
7.2.19	Is it clear that some development may be discarded or approaches change as the development progresses?	62
7.2.20	Does the delivery agency have the capability and capacity to manage simultaneous developments?	62
7.3	Business Case and stakeholders	63
7.3.1	Does the Business Case demonstrate business need and contribute to delivery agency's business strategy?.....	63
7.3.2	Does the project align with the wider change portfolio?	63
7.3.3	Is the preferred option still appropriate?.....	63
7.3.4	Are ICT security requirements identified?	63
7.3.5	Is the proposed arrangement likely to achieve whole-life value for money?.....	64
7.3.6	Are costs within budget? Is whole-life funding affordable and supported by stakeholders?	64
7.3.7	Are costs for appropriate cyber security protection identified?.....	64
7.3.8	Is the delivery agency realistic about its ability to achieve success?	64
7.3.9	Is there a clear definition of the total project scope?	65
7.3.10	Are the risks and issues relating to business change understood? Is there an initial plan to address these issues?.....	65
7.3.11	Do stakeholders support the project? Is the delivery agency still fully committed? 65	
7.3.12	Are benefits understood and agreed with stakeholders? How will these be realised and evaluated?	65
7.3.13	Have affected business units been involved in the change management plan?	66
7.3.14	How will changes across affected business areas within and external to the delivery agency be identified, assessed, communicated and managed?	66
7.3.15	Are roles and responsibilities and authority delegations defined?.....	66
7.3.16	Has the training of. service delivery teams, case workers, administrative staff and front-line staff been considered and planned?	66
7.3.17	Have benefits changed in a way that could affect the value of the project?.....	67
7.3.18	Is there still a strategy to plan and manage benefits?	67
7.3.19	Are resources available to maintain momentum or address gaps in the multidisciplinary teams?.....	67
7.3.20	Can business as usual activities be maintained if staff required?.....	67
7.3.21	Is there a governance process to monitor and manage progress, and align with corporate strategy and ICT strategy, and intended benefits realisation?	68
7.3.22	Are appropriate business change management processes in place?	68

7.3.23	How will progress be tracked, reported and, if required, corrected?	68
7.4	Risk Management.....	69
7.4.1	Are major risks and issues identified, understood, financially evaluated and considered in the delivery strategy?	69
7.4.2	Are there Risk Management plans?	69
7.4.3	Have all issues identified been resolved?	69
7.4.4	Are external issues such as statutory process, communications and environmental issues being addressed?	70
7.4.5	Have cyber security risks been identified and evaluated?	70
7.4.6	Will staff be protected from burn out and what mitigation processes are proposed?	70
7.5	Review of current phase	71
7.5.1	Is the project under control?	71
7.5.2	What caused any deviations such as over or under-runs?	71
7.5.3	What actions will prevent deviations recurring in other phases?	71
7.5.4	Are any assumptions documented at Gate 3 not verified?	71
7.5.5	Has time been allowed to fix faults and are there arrangements for proactive monitoring and management of any slippage?	72
7.5.6	Is the incremental planning approach overloading staff or schedule?	72
7.5.7	Is the budget under control? Will a higher spend burn rate be required, e.g. for developers or coders to maintain pace?	72
	7.5.8 Has the Use of AI been considered?	73
	7.5.9 Have AI Risk Mitigation strategies been considered?	74
7.6	Readiness for next phase: Tender Evaluation.....	75
7.6.1	Is the project plan for remaining stages realistic?	75
7.6.2	Are the project's timescales reasonable?	75
7.6.3	Are arrangements for the next stage defined and resourced?	75
7.6.4	Does the team have resources with appropriate skills and experience?.....	76
7.6.5	Are end-users adequately prepared for the transition to the new/redesigned digital service?.....	76
7.6.6	If there are legacy systems, what are the plans to transfer data, integrate with them and exit them adequately?	76
7.7	Gate 3 Review: Typical project documentation	77

1

Introduction

1.1 Overview of the gateway review process

The *NSW Gateway Policy* (TPG22-12) 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.

Figure 1. NSW Gateway Framework




Figure 1 summarises the interaction between the NSW Gateway Policy, Gateway Coordination Agency (CGA Frameworks and delivery of Gateway reviews.

DCS NSW is the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) for the government’s ICT capital projects and programs. As the GCA, Digital NSW within DCS NSW developed, implemented, and administers the Digital Assurance Framework (DAF). (See Fig1.) The roles and responsibilities of DCS NSW as well as Delivery Agencies, in relation to assurance processes are set out in the DAF. It is the responsibility of all Delivery Agencies to meet the requirements of the DAF.

Gateway Reviews is a key tool DCS NSW uses to complete a risk-based assurance approach for all large ICT projects and programs valued at or more than \$5 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. The Review Report also includes a series of recommendations aimed at assisting the Delivery (or Accountable) 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 (incl. sector specific and place-based). For the purposes of this workbook, the use of the term ‘project’ also covers the grouping of projects into a program.

This document has been developed by DCS NSW, as the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) for capital IT 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 ICTAssurance@customerservice.nsw.gov.au

1.2 Project lifecycle and gateway reviews


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

Figure 2.



1.3 About this Guideline / Workbook

This guideline assists review teams and delivering agencies working on Gate 3: Pre-execution Review of the Digital Assurance Framework (DAF) Gateway review process. This is a new Gateway Workbook and follows the same overall structure of the new DSSA single workbook design revised for Digital projects. It should be read alongside the 'Gate 3 Review Report' template which is available from <https://www.digital.nsw.gov.au/policy/digital-assurance/resources-for-agencies-and-expert-reviewers>



The Gateway Review process examines projects at key decision points (gates) and looks ahead to provide assurance that projects can progress to the next stage (or gate). This can also include health checks between gates.

Gateway reviews are independent peer reviews of a project's viability and development. Independent practitioners from outside the project examine the progress and likelihood of successful delivery at a certain point in each project – this provides a valuable new perspective on the project's issues, while challenging the robustness of plans and processes. The recent Digital Assurance Trends and Analysis report developed by Digital NSW has highlighted many of the benefits of applying the gateway review process. Looking back over the past 5 years the report has identified that project teams that engage early and regularly with the Gateway Assurance team, have had improved results and higher success rates than those that have had limited or no access to Gateway Assurance. The new Gateway assurance workbooks and approach emphasise close collaboration between Assurance, Sponsor and project team to help ensure maximum value is gained for the process.

1.4 How to use this workbook

Gate 3: Pre-execution assesses the procurement and tendering approach, identifying any problems early and confirming delivery plans are in place. The review also confirms that relevant whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities have been considered.

This Gate 3: Pre-execution review is designed to:

- Confirm the Business Case now the project is fully defined;
- Confirm the project's objectives and desired outputs still align with the program to which it contributes;
- Ensure a robust and appropriate outline delivery strategy;
- Confirm the procurement strategy and final pricing aligns to the Business Case financial forecasts for capital and operating expenditure;
- Ensure the project's plan to completion is detailed, realistic and includes a contract management strategy;
- Ensure project controls and organisation are defined, financial controls in place and the resources available;
- Confirm funding availability for the whole project;
- Confirm the outline development and delivery approach and mechanisms are appropriate and manageable;
- If appropriate, check market capability and track record (or existing supplier's capability and performance) are understood and the competitive response from the market meets requirements;
- Confirm the project will facilitate good client/supplier relationships;
- For a procurement project, confirm the procurement plan will comply with NSW Government procurement and legal requirements;
- Confirm project performance measures and tools are appropriate;
- Confirm there are plans for risk and issues management (business and technical) that will be shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners;
- Confirm quality procedures have been applied consistently since the previous review;
- Confirm compliance with ICT and information security requirements, and IT standards;
- Confirm delivery agency resources and capabilities will be available for future phases;
- Confirm stakeholders support the project and are committed to its success;
- Evaluate actions to address recommendations from earlier reviews; and
- Confirm all relevant whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities have been considered.

This guideline details topics to be assessed and the evidence the review team should expect, in five key review scope areas:

- Assessment of delivery approach;
- Business Case and stakeholders;
- Risk Management;
- Review of current phase; and
- Readiness for next phase: Tender Evaluation.

These key review scope areas will help to structure the Gate 3 report.

The guideline provides examples of evidence the review team should seek. This should not be considered prescriptive; each review team should consider if broader topics should be addressed, or different evidence required – this will depend on the context of the project.

Gateway Review workbooks support a consistent, structured approach to Reviews. The workbooks define roles and responsibilities during reviews and assist Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies and the Reviewer Team to properly prepare. DAF have remodelled their guideline and workbook into a single document for simplicity as part of the revision of the gateway assurance framework for Digital project/programs.

Part A: For agencies and the lead reviewer	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information on the Gateway Review process • Information on how the Gateway Review process applies to projects 	Page: 13
Part B: For Delivery (or Accountable) agencies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on how to initiate a Gate 3 Review • Documentation required 	Page: 33
Part C: For the lead reviewer	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on how to conduct a Gateway Review 	Page: 40
Part D: Gate 3 report purpose and process	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary overview of the Gate 3 Report purpose and process • Where to find applicable templates • Additional material for Reviewers including focus areas 	Page: 47

1.5 Gateway reviews and agency assurance processes

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

A Gateway Review provides an independent snapshot of project status at a point in time. Gateway Reviews are **not an audit or replacement for a Delivery (or Accountable) Agency’s internal governance**.

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

1.6 Why do gateway reviews?

The NSW Government requires visibility across the government's capital IT 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 (or accountable) agencies acting on and mitigating problems before there is an impact on the community and stakeholder outcomes.

1.7 Gateway review process principles


1.7.1 Digital Assurance

The Digital Assurance Framework (DAF) is an independent risk-based assurance process for the State's capital and recurrent Digital projects. It identifies the level of confidence that can be provided to Cabinet and Cabinet sub-committees that the State's ICT and Digital projects are being effectively developed and delivered in accordance with the Government's objectives.

The framework's key features (Fig 3.) are categorised under the following headings:

- Accountability
- Transparency
- Agility
- Support

Figure 3. Key features of DAF. See [Digital Assurance Framework](#) for detailed description.









1.7.2 Gateway Review Process Principles

- The Review Team is selected for their skillset and as far as practicable to match to the project's type, needs, stage, scale and complexity.
- The workbook structure, Terms of Reference and report template are followed by the Review Team.
- All parties focus on value-adding to the project.
- Review Report commentary and recommendations are focused on practical issues and outcomes.

1.8 Conducting a Gate 3 Gateway Review

Follow the steps and timeframes shown in the table below:

Step	Activity	
1	<p>Entry Criteria</p> <p>Completion of Gate 1 and or 2 & the project must be registered in the ICT portal- DSSA, <i>this is a prerequisite for initiating a Gate 3 review.</i></p> <p>6 weeks prior to the Gateway commencement date, the Accountable Agency checks readiness of the project for the Gate 3 Review and contacts the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA).</p> <p><i>(Note the DCS Assurance team will also monitor the likely timeframe through the regular assurance catch ups each month.)</i></p>	<p>6 weeks + prior</p> 
2	<p>GCA Review Manager (Digital Assurance) and Delivery (or Accountable) Agency confirm the Review Dates.</p> <p>(Dates must consider key stakeholder availability including the Sponsor)</p>	
3	<p>GCA Review Manager appoints an independent Reviewer Team to the review. (As per the expert reviewer panel appointment process.)</p>	
4	<p>GCA Review Manager conducts a briefing with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to gain a common understanding of the project's status, identify any supporting documentation required and provide guidance on how to complete the Gate 3 readiness checklist template.</p>	<p>1 Month prior</p> <p>Preparation / Planning</p> <p>TOR</p> 
5	<p>The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to complete the Gate 3 <i>readiness checklist template</i> with input from key Agency stakeholders. (New document to assist the Agency and DCS Assurance team to prepare for the Gateway.)</p> <p>A draft Terms of Reference (ToR) is also completed at this time by the GCA Review Manager (Digital Assurance), this is shared with the Agency to refine.</p> <p><i>The project sponsor to agree/sign off.</i></p>	
6	<p>The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency provide the Reviewer Team with the readiness checklist and provide supporting documentation to the allocated secure shared drive location.</p>	<p>Finalise Plan and Conduct</p> 
7	<p>Pre-Planning</p> <p>GCA Review Manager meets with the Independent Review Team to jointly review the Terms of Reference for the Gate 3 and if additional documentation is considered then the request can be made for this as well the key interviewees.</p>	
8	<p>Planning formal Kick off</p> <p>This starts with the kick-off meeting where the sponsor and delegates outline the project to be assessed, and any key background needed to provide context.</p> <p>High level run through of the Gateway process, roles and responsibilities</p> <p>Documentation requirements are confirmed, and interview are scheduled and confirmed</p>	

Step	Activity	
9	<p>Review Week</p> <p>Entry criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOR Approved, • All documentation is loaded and available to the team, • All interviews are scheduled and confirmed, MS Teams Channel for Review teams set up and tested. <p>Interview week commences and the scheduled interviews are undertaken by the Gateways reviewers.</p> <p>Up to 18 interviews could be held over this time with the Independent Review team</p> <p>The Review team complete the interviews and maintain feedback to the sponsor daily or as deemed appropriate.</p>	<p>Review week</p> 
10	<p>The draft findings are prepared using the Gate 3 Reporting Template. <i>Noting the Scope items need to all be addressed including core areas of focus.</i></p> <p>The draft report is shared with Digital Assurance for initial QA</p> <p>Sponsors debrief is undertaken to outline the findings – this is a confidential meeting directly with sponsor.</p> <p>Report circulated to the Agency for fact check post Sponsor Debrief.</p> <p>Attention is to be given to Cyber, Privacy and now AI impact on the plan.</p>	<p>Reporting</p> 
11	<p>Post Review survey sent out to Delivery (or Accountable) Agency, Reviewer Team and GCA Review Manager.</p>	
12	<p>Close-out Plan issued and managed by DCS ICT Digital Investment and Assurance (IDIA) Unit</p>	
13	<p>Post Review Activities</p> <p>Record Critical and Essential issues for ongoing assurance follow up – note the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency will need to provide adequate evidence of item closure.</p> <p>Critical rated items need to be closed before the clearance letter can be issued.</p> <p><i>This clearance can impact approval of funding</i></p> <p>Charge back to be completed and reviewer invoice payment completed</p>	<p>Post Review</p> <p>Within 4 weeks of report issue</p> <p>Post Review Activities</p> 

1.9 Review ratings

Following a Gate 3 Review, a Review Report is produced using the Gate 3: Pre-execution Report template. Recommendations made by the Review Team will receive a rating, indicating level of urgency for the project:

Rating	Criteria description
Critical (Do Now)	This item is critical and urgent, and action must be taken immediately. DCS will not clear this Gateway until this recommendation is actioned.
Essential (Do By)	The recommendation is important but not urgent – it should be actioned before further key decisions are taken. DCS will only clear this Gateway once it has approved a plan to respond to this recommendation.
Recommended	The recommendation is not critical or urgent, but the project may benefit from addressing it.

1.10 Delivery confidence level definitions

The review teams will provide an assessment of confidence status using the definitions below.

Rating	Criteria description
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has delivered outcomes and benefits against its agreed objectives, to time, cost and quality. Lessons learned have been considered, and anticipated benefits are being delivered and/or on track to being delivered; and There are no outstanding issues that appear to threaten benefits realisation and/or plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance.
Medium-High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has delivered most outcomes against its agreed objectives, to time, cost and quality. Lessons learned have been considered, and anticipated benefits are being delivered and/or on track to being delivered; and There are no major outstanding issues that appear to threaten benefits realisation and/or plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has delivered outcomes against its agreed objectives, to time, cost and quality; Lessons learned have not been considered in their entirety, and/or there are risks that may threaten plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance; or The benefit realisation plan of the anticipated benefits is not completed, the outstanding issues appear to be resolvable at this stage, if addressed promptly.
Medium-Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has delivered most outcomes against its agreed objectives, to time, cost and quality; Lessons learned have not been considered in their entirety, and/or there are major risks/issues that may threaten plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance; or Major risks and/or issues exist that threaten the realisation of anticipated benefits which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has not delivered most of the outcomes against its agreed objectives, or had not delivered to time, cost and quality; Lessons learned have not been considered in their entirety, and there are major risks/issues that threaten plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance; or Major risks and/or issues exist that threaten the realisation of anticipated benefits which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable.

2

Part A: For Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies and Reviewer Team

Background on NSW Gateway and the risk-based approach to project assurance

2.1 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.

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

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


Stage	Purpose	Scope	Health Checks
Portfolio review	Initiatives assessed using a value-based priority rating system to determine which initiatives should be developed.		
Strategy and Business Plan	Cluster or agency plan from which initiatives are formed.		
Planning			
GATE 0 Go / No-Go	<p>Determine if the project aligns with Government and Agency priorities and whether the identified service need has merit and warrants further consideration.</p> <p>Assesses if there are sufficient governance processes and resources available to support the development of a preliminary business case.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability (ETC) • Government Priority • Criticality of service need / urgency • Strategic risk and compliance mitigation • Alternative solution • Whole of government impact / reuse /SDA 	NA
GATE 1 Strategic Alignment	<p>Ensures the business needs for the initiative are clearly defined and aligned with Strategic imperatives, Investment Principles and Enterprise Architecture.</p> <p>Cyber, Privacy and AI implications are understood</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and business context • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 	NA

Stage	Purpose	Scope	Health Checks
GATE 2 Business Case	<p>Ensures that the business case is robust and there are plans to realise benefits and align with Strategic imperatives, Investment Principles and Enterprise Architecture.</p> <p>Demonstrated Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture</p> <p>Funding model to operate is sustainable for whole of life</p> <p>Cyber, Privacy and AI implications are understood, and assurance addressed in the BC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of delivery approach • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 	<p>Potential for multiple or recurrent health checks and milestone reviews.</p>
You are here GATE 3 Pre-execution	<p>Assesses the procurement and tendering approach, identifies problems early in the initiative and ensures plans for the delivery of the initiative are in place.</p> <p>Clear understanding that Vendor is capable of meeting the NSW AI Assessment framework and cyber security requirements – 3rd party assurance is now important to consider closely in these areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of delivery approach • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Approach maintains compliance with Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 	<p>Potential for multiple or recurrent health checks and milestone reviews.</p> <p>Update status of risk profile for AI and Cyber may be needed.</p>
Delivery			
GATE 4 Tender Evaluation	<p>Evaluates the solution and preferred option prior to committing funds, ensuring that the initiative will be delivered effectively and checks requirements against milestones.</p> <p>Consider Vendor compliance requirements under new AI guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of the proposed solution • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Approach maintains compliance with Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 	<p>Potential for multiple or recurrent health checks and milestone reviews.</p> <p>Test leading indicators of problems to catch risks and issues early.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate measures and checks are in place for ongoing assurance.</p>

Stage	Purpose	Scope	Health Checks
GATE 5 Pre-commissioning	<p>Assesses whether the organisation is ready to adopt the solution to achieve the planned benefits stated in the business case and implement the change management required.</p> <p>Clearly defined sustainability of funding to deliver the system into the future in BAU including AI Monitoring, Cyber and Privacy checks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Cyber, privacy and AI compliance sign offs should be completed and the ongoing plan into operations clearly specified. 	<p>Potential for multiple or recurrent health checks and milestone reviews.</p> <p>Test leading indicators of problems to catch risks and issues early.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate measures and checks are in place for ongoing assurance.</p>
GATE 6 Closure Review	<p>Assesses whether the anticipated benefits are being delivered, lessons learned have been considered and plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance are in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Operating Phase including financial sustainability • Business Case and Benefits • Plans to improve Value for Money • Review of organisational • Review Organisational learning • Readiness for future • Risk Management over AI, Cyber, Privacy 	<p>Potential for multiple or recurrent health checks and milestone reviews.</p>

Gateway system applies Gates and related reviews, such as Health Checks, to projects and programs at key milestones throughout their lifecycle as shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4. - Gateway Reviews throughout the Project Lifecycle (TPG22-12)



2.2 Gateway review process

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.

The Gateway Review process also includes 'Health Checks' and 'Deep Dives', which are Reviews conducted at any point through the project lifecycle.

All Gates, Health Checks and Deep Dives include the involvement of an Independent Expert Reviewer, Review Team Lead and/or Review Team. These individuals are appointed by the GCA based on their independence from the project, experience and expertise.

2.3 Gate 0 – Project initiation

As project development is at an early stage in the project lifecycle, Gate 0 Go/No-Go Gateway Reviews have a relatively narrow focus compared to later Gateway Reviews and Health Checks. The Gate 0 Review is undertaken by the GCA's Gate 0 Committee shortly following the registration of the project. The Gate 0 Review focuses on how well the project fits with government priorities, the criticality of its service need and how well it is aligned to the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency's IT Asset Management Plan or framework.

2.4 Gates 1 to 5 – Project development and delivery

Gateway Reviews (Gates 1 to 5) are independent expert Reviews conducted over a short period. The structure of each of these Reviews is similar and focused on high value areas that have greatest impact on successful project development and delivery.

Seven Key Focus Areas support a consistent structure in undertaking Gateway Reviews and preparing Review Reports. Review Report commentary and recommendations are intended to address the Key Focus Areas, the Terms of Reference and be constructive in raising issues essential to the project's success.

2.5 Health checks and deep dive reviews

Health Check Reviews are similar to the Gateway Reviews (Gates 1 to 5) and follow the same format to address and rate overall delivery confidence as well as each of the seven Key Focus Areas. 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 generally only conducted upon request by Government, the GCA, NSW Treasury or the Delivery (or Accountable) 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).

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, and focus on progress against time, cost and other risks.

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 and general day-to-day interactions with Delivery Agencies.

IMPROVING OUTCOMES

Digital 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.

2.6 Gate 6 – Closure Review

The purpose of the Gate 6 Closure Review Report is to support the close-out of the delivery stage into operations and to assess the successful delivery of the purpose and benefits of the government's investment in the project. The Report is to be finalised four to eight months from the first operations commencement date.

Instead of the Review Team, the GCA appoints an independent expert Lead Reviewer to work with the responsible agencies to complete the Gate 6 Report. The Gate 6 Report follows a structured template. The most appropriate agency leads the preparation of the initial draft and then the review team finalises the draft content of the report, including the overall rating and recommendations. The Lead Reviewer then provides the Gate 6 Report to the GCA for review and finalisation.

2.7 Gateway review reports

The primary output of the Review is a high-quality written report which follows the appropriate GCA issued Report template. For Gate 3, the final draft of the Report template, the recommendations and recommended overall Review Rating are determined by the review team.

The primary purpose of the Review Report is to inform the NSW Government of initial operational status of the asset (following project completion) and key issues impacting functionality and benefits realisation. The Review Report, once finalised by the GCA, is provided to the NSW Cabinet. The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency is expected to act on the recommendations documented in the Review Report. Close out of recommendations is undertaken by the GCA's Asset Management Assurance team.

2.8 Report distribution

- Gate 3 Reports are Cabinet documents.
- The review team must not distribute copies of any versions of Review Reports directly to Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies, project teams or any other party.
- The review team sends the draft Review Report to the GCA for distribution.
- The Review Report must not be distributed outside of the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency until the report is finalised, including agency responses to the Review Recommendations.
- Copies of final Review Reports (including agency responses to the Review Recommendations) are only distributed by the GCA in accordance with the protocols outlined in the DAF.
- The final Review Report must not be distributed to any other parties unless directed by the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency Head or delegate of the GCA. No Report may be distributed outside the NSW Government by either the GCA or Delivery (or Accountable) Agency Head, unless permission is explicitly granted by the Government Chief Information and Digital Officer (GCIDO) or the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency Head.
- The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency Head or delegate, responsible for developing and delivering the project, may distribute the final Review Report at their discretion, having regard to the confidential nature of the Report – but this does not include outside the NSW Government.

2.9 Clearance of Gate

Following the conclusion of the Gateway Review and the finalisation of the Review Report, the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency can request a 'Clearance of Gate' Certificate from the GCA. 'Clearance of Gate' will be determined by the GCA and granted by the NSW Cabinet.

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. The Certificate is not a GCA endorsement of the project, only confirmation that development work on the project may continue.

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 (or Accountable) Agencies do not have to request a 'Clearance of Gate' Certificate, but its absence does not negate the mandatory requirement on a Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to respond to and act upon the Review recommendations.

At Gate 3 the clearance letter may be important to gain funding approval, it is therefore important to ensure the Critical items in the report are adequately addressed with supporting evidence to expedite the release of the clearance letter.

2.10 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 status.

Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies should note that Gateway Reviews will not:

- Represent a government decision in relation to funding, planning, approvals or policy
- 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
- Provide a detailed mark-up of management plans and specific project team deliverables.

2.11 Roles within a gateway review applicable to Gate 3

The typical roles within a Gate 1 - 5 Review are outlined below:

Role	Description
Assurance Governance Committee	The Assurance Governance Committee is a committee of NSW Government Secretaries chaired by the Chief Executive of Infrastructure NSW. This Committee reviews and endorses the GCA's regular assurance submissions. This includes the Go/No-Go recommendations to Cabinet by the GCA.
Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA)	<p>The agency identified in the NSW Gateway Policy as responsible for the Gateway Review processes, procedures, advice and reporting for either infrastructure, recurrent or ICT projects.</p> <p>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.</p>
GCA Review Manager	The senior 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 (or Accountable Agency)	The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency that is primarily responsible for the project or program at the various stages of the project's lifecycle. This agency is required to adhere to the Digital Assurance Framework (DAF). Can also be referred to as the Sponsor Agency.
Delivery (or Accountable) Agency Head	The Secretary or CEO of the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency responsible for the project.
Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)	The Delivery (or Accountable) 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 the GCA for action, is debriefed by the Lead Reviewer and the GCA Review Manager following the Review. The SRO may also be referred to as the Project Sponsor. SROs are not to contact the Lead Reviewer outside the protocols set by the GCA, including following the Review.
Delivery (or Accountable) Agency's Project Director	The Project Director takes an active part in the Gateway Review and assists in responding to the GCA Review Manager and Lead Reviewer's requests. The Project Director must ensure they and their team do not initiate contact with the Lead Reviewer outside the protocols of the Review. There is no 'informal' communication permitted.
Reviewer team	<p>The Reviewer team is appointed by the GCA Review Manager. The Reviewer Team are responsible for the execution the review and the delivery of the final gateway report. The review Team Leader takes primary carriage for the report delivery, but the report is prepared as a team.</p> <p>There is no 'informal' aspect to Reviews and specifics of the Review Report commentary or recommendations are not to be discussed outside the protocols set by the GCA, including with Agency Heads or SROs.</p> <p>The Lead Reviewer has primary responsibility for delivering a high quality, consolidated Gate 1 Review Report using the appropriate template.</p>

Role	Description
Stakeholder	Organisations, groups or individuals, either internal or external to government, that are impacted by the project and may be interviewed at the discretion of the Lead Reviewer.

2.12 Assessing risk in Digital Assurance

Each gate in the Gateway Review process requires the review team to assess a project’s level of risk. Before the Gateway Process starts, each project is allocated a risk tier to quantify the level of assurance required. The risk tier – a rating between 1 and 5, with 1 being the largest and most complex – is determined through a self-assessment of risks and complexities which is then compared against estimated costs. The risk tier ensures there will be sufficient assurance to larger projects and less regulation for smaller projects.

Tier classification and assessment

Risk score	ETC (\$m)					
	200+	>100-200	>50-100	>20-50	10-20	5-10<
4.0 – 5.0	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2
3.0 – 3.9	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 3
2.5 – 2.9	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4
2.3 – 2.4	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5
2.1 – 2.2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5
0.0 – 2.0	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5

The DAF Gateway Review process provides for a series of focused, independent expert reviews, held at key decision points in a project’s lifecycle (as depicted in Table below - Application of Gateway Reviews and Health Checks under the DAF). The Gateway Reviews are appraisals of ICT and Digital projects/program, that highlight risks and issues, which if not addressed may threaten successful delivery.

At Gate 3, the project should be at the final stages of procurement and ready to proceed to contract award and implementation. This stage involves confirming that the project is fully planned, with all key elements such as procurement processes, risk management, governance structures, and budget allocations thoroughly reviewed and approved. The project team should have a clear execution strategy, including a finalised business case, and all necessary resources and approvals should be in place to move forward with delivery.

Refer to Fig 5. for [Digital Assurance Framework 2024](#) – Section 3.3 for detail.

Figure 5.

Shaded boxes are mandatory. Blue boxes are Gateway requirements.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Tier 5	
	External review (by GCIDO), agency decision to proceed					
Planning Phases	Gate 0	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review	Project sponsor-commissioned review	
	Gate 1	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review	Project sponsor-commissioned review	Optional
	Gate 2	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review	Project sponsor-commissioned review	Project sponsor-commissioned review	Optional
Delivery Phases	Gate 3	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Gateway review + GCIDO endorsement	Project Sponsor-commissioned review	Optional	Optional
	Gate 4	Gateway review	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
	Gate 5 Tailored at Gate 2	Gateway review	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
	Gate 6	Gateway review	Gateway review	Project sponsor-commissioned review	Optional	Optional
Health Checks / Deep Dives / Rapid Assurance Review	External review	External review		Optional	Optional	

2.13 Developing the report

A review report is the key output of each gate. Each report must follow the report template and be written in a concise way that a third party could understand. Commentary should be included for each section, to support recommendations by the Review Team. Where possible, examples should be provided especially for items that require further work and action.

The review report lists recommendations, defined as either critical, essential or recommended. These should:

- Link to project milestones.
- Follow the SMART approach (S – specific; M – measurable; A – attainable; R – realistic; T – timely); and
- Align to the seven focus areas.

Reports will remain in Microsoft Word and named as per the following file naming protocol:

Project Name – Gateway Review Name – (DRAFT / FINAL) Report Ver 1-1



The review team leader emails all reports to the ICT Assurance Director.

2.14 Applicable NSW Policy

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



- NSW Gateway Policy (TPG22-12)
- NSW Government Sector Finance Act 2018
- NSW Government Capability Framework
- NSW Government Cost Control Framework (CCF)
- NSW Treasury Guidelines for Capital Business Cases (TPP08-5)
- NSW Government Business Case Guidelines (TPP18-06)
- Asset Management Policy for the NSW Public Sector (TPP19-07)
- NSW Government Guide to Cost Benefit Analysis (TPG23-08)
- NSW Government Program Evaluation Guidelines (January 2016)
- NSW Government Benefits Realisation Management Framework (2018)
- NSW Public Private Partnership Policy and Guidelines (TPG22-21)
- NSW Government Procurement Policy Framework (April 2022)
- NSW Procurement Board Directions Enforceable Procurement Divisions
- Australian Government Assurance Reviews and Risk Assessment (Department of Finance)
- Digital Assurance Framework (Department of Customer Service)
- NSW Government Financial Risk Management Policy (TPP21-14)

2.15 Gateway Review Framework




Gate 0 – Go / No Go				
Purpose	Determine if the project aligns with Government and Agency priorities and whether the identified service need has merit and warrants further consideration. Assesses if there are sufficient governance processes and resources available to support the development of a preliminary business case.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability (ETC) • Government Priority • Criticality of service need / urgency • Strategic risk and compliance mitigation • Alternative solution • Whole of government impact / reuse /SDA 			
7 Focus Areas Emphasis	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
	Risk Management   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early identification of key risks, including risk for potential solutions/options and strategic risk • Outline risk management plans. 	Change and End Users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder identification and end user input to service needs. 	Benefits Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level benefits identified and agreed • Benefits strategy, plan and register 	Scope Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with Government Policy and Priorities • Requirements and scope are clear • Alignment to business needs • Options analysis

Given the early stage of the project – assessment of the 7 focus areas will be limited and are considered for broader reference only by the review committee at this time.



Gateway Review Framework continued

Gate 1 – Strategic Alignment				
Purpose	Ensures the business needs for the initiative are clearly defined & aligned with strategic Imperatives, Investment Principles & Enterprise Architecture. Confirmation of Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and business context • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 			
7 Focus Areas Emphasis	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
 	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early identification of key risks, including risk for potential solutions/options and strategic risk • Outline risk management plans. • Early Assessment of IA impact per NSW Assessment Guidelines • Cyber Security risk Profile documented and included in project scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder identification and end user input to service needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level benefits identified and agreed • Benefits strategy, plan and register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements and scope are clear • Alignment to business needs • Options analysis




Gateway Review Framework continued

Gate 2 – Business Case				
Purpose	Ensures that the business case is robust & there are outline plans to realise benefits & align with Strategic Imperatives, Investment Principles & Enterprise Architecture. Confirmation of Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture Funding model to operate is sustainable for whole of life Cyber, Privacy and AI implications are understood, and assurance addressed in the BC.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of delivery approach • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 			
Health checks / Deep dives				
7 Focus Areas Emphasis   	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early identification of key risks, including risk for potential solutions/options and strategic risk • Updated risk management plans including Cyber, Privacy and AI • Early Assessment of IA impact per NSW Assessment Guidelines • Cyber Security risk Profile documented and included in project scope 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of the change impact to all stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits aligned to business case and agreed • Governance and plans for realising and delivering benefits • Updated Benefits management plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility and options analysis to meet organisations needs and address government strategy



Gateway Review Framework continued



Gate 3 – Pre-execution				
Purpose	Assesses the procurement and tendering approach, identifies problems early in the project and ensure plans for the delivery of the project are in place.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of delivery approach • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Approach maintains compliance with Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 			
Health checks / Deep dives				
7 Focus Areas Emphasis  	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of key risks • Key procurement and supplier risk • Stakeholder risks • Updated risk management plans • AI, Cyber and Privacy considerations have been costed into the delivery approach correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External (market) engagement and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits aligned to business case and agreed • Governance and plans for realising and delivering benefits • Deviations to agreed and planned benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated project scope including business change • Delivery plan defined and agreed

Gateway Review Framework continued

Gate 4 – Tender evaluation				
Purpose	Evaluates the solution & the preferred option prior to committing funds, ensuring that the project will be delivered effectively and checks requirements against milestones.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of the proposed solution • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture • Approach maintains compliance with Assessment of Cyber, Privacy and AI compliance requirements 			
Health checks / Deep dives				
7 Focus Areas Emphasis	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
  	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of key risks • Key procurement and supplier risk • Updated risk management plans • Stakeholder & change risks • AI, Cyber and Privacy considerations have been costed into the delivery approach correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change preparation and planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated benefits strategy, realisation plan and register • Deviations to agreed and planned benefits • Benefits aligned to business case and agreed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of options to ensure they are still within scope

Gateway Review Framework continued

Gate 5 – Pre-commissioning				
Purpose	Assesses whether the organisation is ready to adopt the solution to achieve the planned benefits stated in the business case and implement the change management required. Clearly defined sustainability of funding to deliver the system into the future in BAU including AI Monitoring, Cyber and Privacy checks			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case and stakeholders • Risk management • Review of current phase • Readiness for next phase • Cyber, privacy and AI compliance sign offs should be completed and the ongoing plan into operations clearly specified. 			
Health checks / Deep dives				
7 Focus Areas Emphasis  	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of key risks • Key delivery and implementation risks • Updated risk management plans • Stakeholder & change management risks • AI Cyber and Privacy Compliance Signoff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change, training and transition support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievability of planned benefits • Updated benefits strategy, realisation plan and register • Handover and measurement of benefits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation project scope still meets business needs and acceptance criteria

Gate 6 – Closure Review				
Purpose	Assesses whether the anticipated benefits are being delivered, lessons learned have been considered and plans for ongoing improvements in value, service enhancements and performance are in place.			
Review Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Operating Phase • Ongoing Sustainability and financial viability • Business Case and Benefits • Plans to improve Value for Money • Review Organisational learning. • Readiness for future • Risk Management over AI, Cyber, Privacy into BAU 			
Health checks / Deep dives				
7 Focus Areas Emphasis  	Reviews will assess the focus areas through various lenses including:			
	Risk Management	Change and End Users	Benefits Management	Scope Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing plans for risk management • Business continuity & operations risks • Ongoing cyber & information security risk • Updated risk management plans to include AI in BAU • Ongoing change management & stakeholder management risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous improvement • End user support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment and measurement of the realisation of planned benefits • Planned future benefits • Measurement of benefits against the business case 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope for improved value for money • Future needs and scope

3


Part B: For Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies

Initiating and preparing for a Gate 3 Review

3.1 Key Gateways: Gate 0 – 2

Gate 0 – 2 are key Gateways as they serve to ensure investor assurance through a structured evaluation of a project's feasibility and potential for success. These are critical checkpoints where investor concerns about feasibility (Gate 0), planning (Gate 1), and potential returns (Gate 2) are addressed, ensuring that only the most promising projects move forward. This systematic evaluation builds investor confidence and helps mitigate risks associated with new projects. Refer to Fig 6. Overall Digital Assurance Framework – Introducing Gate 0 and Pre-Gateway Review.

Figure 6.



1. Gate 0: Justification

Purpose: To consider the alignment of the project with Government and agency priorities, the merit of the identified service need, and the governance and resources available to develop a Strategic Business Case.

2. Gate 1: Strategic Assessment

Purpose: To assess whether the project is aligned with the Government's and the agency's strategic plans and demonstrates that the service need should be addressed, proposing the best value means of servicing that need.

3. Gate 2: Business Case

Purpose: To evaluate the evidence that the proposed project is ready for funding, aligned with relevant policy, or other types of approval associated with the funding of the project. [e.g. DRF funding rules vs NPP]

Gate 0: Go/No-Go, includes a pre-Gateway Self-assessment tool for project teams and Agencies to use to prequalify into Gate 0 Assessment, a Pre-Gateway Self-assessment tool, is self-administered and will be automated with ETC threshold >\$10 million. Once prequalified, project team completes 2-page Gate 0 justification report, and this will be reviewed by independent Gate 0 committee. The outcome of the Gate will be a clear direction of Go/No Go decision to proceed into Gate 1: Strategic Business Case stage / Gate 2: Business case stage from Government. Projects may also receive directions on funding pathways available and will be advised by the Gate 0 committee on how to improve the future business case focus. Clearance of Gate 0 with a 'Go' designation only provides approval to continue to business case – it does not provide approval for funding.

Gate 1 is the ideation phase, Strategic Business case Gate. Gate 1 ensures the business needs for the initiative are clearly defined & aligned with strategic Imperatives, Investment Principles & Enterprise Architecture. Confirmation of Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture. After a Gate 1 has been successfully completed and all material issues cleared. In most cases the Gate 2 is an important prerequisite for the approval and release of funding for the project. This is a strong investment control to help the Agency set up for success and ensure the government is well informed about the full cost and risk profile of the project as well as the key benefits that will be gained should the project go forward.


Gate 2 moves into the concept development phase, the Business Case Gate. The Gate 2 Gateway Review will assess whether the business case is robust and there are plans to realise benefits and align with Strategic imperatives, Investment Principles and Enterprise Architecture. Key areas of validation are:

- Demonstrated Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture
- Funding model to operate is sustainable for whole of life
- Cyber, Privacy and AI implications are understood, and assurance addressed in the BC.
- The Gate 2 Review focuses on the detailed business case and the readiness of the project team to move to the next stage. The review leverages Treasury TPP18-06 to considers whether the business case is robust and meets the key criteria of set out in the TPP18-06. See guides on the NSW Treasury web site for further guidance

Note: Gate 3- 5 Gateway Review maybe subject to revision of business case.

Figure 7. Business Case Guidelines Overview (NSW Government Treasury)

Business Case Guidelines Overview



*These steps are recommended as updates post procurement once the preferred supplier has been identified

3.2 Initiating a Gate 3 Review

Entry Criteria

Prior to Gate 3, the project must have an approved business case, a finalised procurement strategy, established governance structures, a comprehensive risk management plan, detailed financial planning, ready-to-execute contractual documents, and a clear implementation plan – these are prerequisites for initiating a Gate 3 review. (It should be undertaken at least 6 weeks before initiating a Gate 3).

Engagement set up – 6 Weeks Prior to Review week

- 6 weeks prior to the Gateway commencement date, the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency checks readiness of the project for the Gate 3 Review and contacts the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA).
- (Note the DCS Assurance team will also monitor the likely timeframe through the regular assurance catch ups each month.)
- GCA Review Manager (Digital Assurance) and Delivery (or Accountable) Agency confirm the Review Dates. (Dates must consider key stakeholder availability including the Sponsor) ☐
- GCA Review Manager appoints an independent Reviewer Team to the review. (As per the expert reviewer panel appointment process.)

Detailed Engagement Planning and TOR preparation

5. GCA Review Manager conducts a briefing with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to gain a common understanding of the project's status, identify any supporting documentation required and provide guidance on how to complete the Gate 3 readiness checklist template. ☐
6. The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency complete the Gate 3 readiness checklist template with input from key Agency stakeholders. A draft Terms of Reference (ToR) is also completed at this time by the GCA Review Manager (Digital Assurance), this is shared with the Agency to refine. (The project sponsor to agree/sign off)
7. The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency provide the Reviewer Team with the readiness checklist and provide supporting documentation to the allocated secure shared drive location.

Preplanning With Independent Review team members

8. GCA Review Manager meets with the Independent Review Team to jointly review the Terms of Reference for the Gate 3 and if additional documentation is considered then the request can be made for this as well the key interviewees.

Planning formal Kick off

9. This starts with the kick-off meeting where the sponsor and delegates outline the project to be assessed, and any key background needed to provide context.
 - High level run through of the Gateway process, roles and responsibilities
 - Documentation requirements are confirmed, and interview are scheduled and confirmed

Review Week

10. Interview week commences and the scheduled interviews are undertaken by the Gateways reviewers.

Entry criteria

- a. TOR Approved,
- b. All documentation is loaded and available to the team,
- c. All interviews are scheduled and confirmed, MS Teams Channel for Review teams set up and tested.

Up to 18 interviews could be held over this time with the Independent Review team

The Review team complete the interviews and maintain feedback to the sponsor daily or as deemed appropriate.

Reporting

11. The draft findings are prepared using the Gate 3 reporting Template. Noting the Scope items need to all be addressed including core areas of focus.
 - The draft report is shared with Digital Assurance for initial QA
 - Sponsors debrief is undertaken to outline the findings – this is a confidential meeting directly with sponsor.
 - Report circulated to the Agency for fact check post Sponsor Debrief.
 - Post Review survey sent out to Delivery (or Accountable) Agency, Reviewer Team and GCA Review Manager.
12. Close-out Plan issued and managed by DCS ICT Assurance

Post Review - Within 4 weeks of report issue

13. Post Review Activities

- Record Critical and Essential issues for ongoing assurance follow up – note the Agency will need to provide adequate evidence of item closure.
- Critical rated items need to be closed before the clearance letter can be issued.
- This clearance can impact approval of funding
- Charge back to be completed and reviewer invoice payment completed

3.3 Gate 3 Gateway Review and documents

The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency is responsible for initiating a Gateway Review at the appropriate time. Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies should seek authorisation from the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency's governance structure and the Gateway Review should be led by the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency's SRO.

It is intended that Delivery (or Accountable) Agencies **use existing project documentation, assistance from the delivery team and IT asset operator** and not create or customise documents for the Review.

3.3.1 Mandatory documents

- Main body of the original Final Business Case
- Summary presentation of the project, including scope, deliverables and purpose
- Benefits Realisation Plan (or similar)
- Target Operating model and financial sustainability to operate
- The delivery/acquisition approach (including the procurement strategy if appropriate) and documented justification for the approach;

3.3.2 Information documented to support Gate 3

Typical project documentation can be found in section 7 for reference.

3.3.3 Preplanning Planning Session Step 8

The preplanning session is set up by the GCA in coordination with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency and Reviewer Team, to gain an overview of the project and provide guidance on how to complete the Gate 3 preparation checklist

The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency organises the venue and the GCA Review Manager issues diary invitations. The alignment (project briefing) session may be on site or via MS Teams.

3.3.4 Review Activities Steps 9 & 10

The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency prepares the draft check list and shares this with the GCA Review Manager (Digital Assurance) this is discussed and reviewed, and any further information is then requested to be loaded into the secure SharePoint site. As part of pre planning the independent review team may ask for additional information if it exists.

Interview week commences and the scheduled interviews are undertaken by the Gateways reviewers.

Entry criteria

- a. TOR Approved,
- b. All documentation is loaded and available to the team,
- c. All interviews are scheduled and confirmed, MS Teams Channel for Review teams set up and tested.

Up to 18 interviews could be held over this time with the Independent Review team – it is essential the entry criteria are all ready and complete as there is no time during the review week to wait or go back for items not ready at the start of the review.

3.3.5 Draft and final review report Steps 11 &12

The Reviewer Team reviews the report and submits a Final Draft Report to the GCA for review. The GCA reviews the Final Draft Report and seeks responses to the recommendations from the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency, along with any clarifications from the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency or Lead Reviewer. The Report is then finalised in accordance with the Digital Assurance Framework (DAF).

The Gate 3 Report only becomes final once the GCA has reviewed and approved the Report. The GCA will send a copy of the final Report to the SRO and it will be included in Assurance Cabinet reporting as required.

Recommendations from the Review are transferred to the GCA's Asset Management Assurance team to be actioned or closed-out as appropriate.

4

Part C: For the Reviewer

Conducting the Review

4.1 Gate 3 Approach

The Gate 3 Review is conducted after the procurement strategy is finalised, contractual documents are ready, and the project has secured an approved business case and detailed implementation plan.

The Reviewer Team should use this workbook to guide an assessment of the project against the scope and objectives outlined in the Final Business Case and/or Benefits Realisation Plan and provide practical recommendations.

4.2 Gate 3 Review

The Reviewer Team conducts interviews with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency and stakeholders (as required) to complete the final draft of the Gate 1 Report, writes recommendations and determines the final overall rating for the Report.

The Gateway Review includes:

- Project documentation released by the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to the Reviewer Team as key evidence to support the review work – prior to the review fieldwork starting (2 weeks minimum.)
- A planning session, hosted by the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency, is attended by the Reviewer Team, agency SRO and the GCA Review Manager
- Review week and Interviews are undertaken with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency team and a daily update is provided to the Sponsor
- Final Draft Report completed by the Reviewer Team for the GCA Review Manager, including any updates to the content, recommendations and review rating
- GCA manages responses from the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to address the recommendations
- Finalisation of the Gate 3 Report by the GCA and issue of the Report to the SRO
- Close-out of the recommendations by the GCA's ICT Management Assurance team – part of the ICT Digital Investment and Assurance (IDIA) Unit.

4.3 Gateway Review reviewer team

For the Gate 3 Review, the GCA will appoint a Reviewer Team with a mix of skills and expertise. The Reviewer Team is expected to work collaboratively with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency and take responsibility for producing a high-quality, well written Gate 3 Report using the appropriate template.

The Lead Reviewer and any 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 the 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.

4.4 Review principles and behaviours

Throughout the Review, the Reviewer Team is expected to add real value to the project and IT asset 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 by external parties
- Adhering to any 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 that will guide and enhance project development.
- Gateway Reviews are not adversarial or a detailed assessment of management plans and project team deliverables. Poor or disrespectful behaviour will not be tolerated by the GCA.

4.5 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 “OFFICIAL: 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 agency or stakeholders without the permission of the GCA Review Manager.
Report Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Reviewer Team must not distribute copies of any versions of Review Reports directly to agencies, project teams or any other party. The Reviewer Team sends the final draft of the Review Report to the GCA for review and distribution. There is no ‘informal’ 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 Reviewer Team may not keep any copies of any version of the Review Report, or supporting documents, following submission to the GCA.
Review Debrief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GCA Review Manager and the Reviewer Team will agree on the process and timing to conduct a Review debrief with the Accountable Agency following the development of the Review Report. The GCA Review Manager will approve the agency representatives that attend the debrief and may attend the debrief. There is no ‘informal’ element to Gateway Reviews. A debrief to the SRO or any agency 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 Lead Reviewer. All versions of reports issued by the Reviewer Team to the GCA are to be in MS WORD format. The final Review Report issued to the Accountable 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, and to whom the reports are issued. Reviewers should minimise the use of hard copies of Accountable Agency documents and must not keep documents in any form following the Review.

4.6 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 status 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 Gate 3 Report should be succinct and between 10 and 15 pages.

4.7 Coverage of Gate 3 review objectives

Gate 3 review objectives	Applicable to this review		Review team confidence rating			Report reference
	Yes	No	Not met	Partially met	Met	
<i>Example: Objective 1. Confirm the Business Case now the project is fully defined.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>e.g. Review team detailed findings 1. Business Case</i>
1. Confirm the Business Case now the project is fully defined.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Confirm that the objectives and desired outputs of the project are still aligned with the program to which it contributes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Ensure that the outline delivery strategy is robust and appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Confirmation of the procurement strategy and final pricing aligns to the Business Case financial forecasts for both Capex and Opex ongoing costs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Ensure that the project's plan through to completion is appropriately detailed and realistic, including any contract management strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Ensure that the project controls and organisation are defined, financial controls are in place and the resources are available.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Gate 3 review objectives	Applicable to this review		Review team confidence rating			Report reference
	Yes	No	Not met	Partially met	Met	
7. Confirm funding availability for the whole project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Confirm that the outline development and delivery approach and mechanisms are still appropriate and manageable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. If appropriate, check that the supplier market capability and track record are fully understood (or existing supplier's capability and performance), and that there will be an adequate competitive response from the market to the requirement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. Confirm that the project will facilitate good client/supplier relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. For a procurement project, confirm that there is an appropriate procurement plan in place that will ensure compliance with NSW procurement and legal requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
12. Confirm that appropriate project performance measures and tools are being used.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
13. Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management (business and technical) and that these plans will be shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
14. Confirm that quality procedures have been applied consistently since the previous Review.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
15. Confirm compliance with IT and information security requirements, Privacy , AI and IT standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
16. Confirm that internal organisational resources and capabilities will be available as required for future phases of the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Gate 3 review objectives	Applicable to this review		Review team confidence rating			Report reference
	Yes	No	Not met	Partially met	Met	
17. Confirm that the stakeholders support the project and are committed to its success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
18. Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
19. Confirm that all relevant whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities have been considered.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments if review objectives are not applicable to this review						

5

Part D: Gate 3 Purpose and Report Process

5.1 Gate 3 Review Purpose and Process

Purpose

The Gate 3 review serves the purpose of evaluating the project's readiness for successful delivery and implementation by conducting a comprehensive risk assessment, developing strategies to mitigate identified risks, ensuring stakeholder engagement and alignment with project goals, confirming compliance with project management standards, addressing recommendations from previous reports, obtaining approvals from key stakeholders, identifying and resolving early problems, reviewing procurement strategies, assessing project milestones and deliverables, and monitoring progress through detailed assessments and scores related to various criteria. It will also continue to assess the following:

- Confirmation of Alignment to Government Enterprise Architecture
- Funding model to operate is sustainable for whole of life
- Cyber, Privacy and AI implications are understood, and assurance addressed in the BC.

Process

DCS ICT Assurance will appoint the Reviewer Team to undertake the review and oversee the completion of the Gate 3 Report, including the Report's recommendations and rating. DCS ICT Assurance and the Reviewer Team will participate in a planning session, which the agency will arrange along with any necessary further evidence (documentation), and key interviews required by the Reviewer Team.

The Gate 3 Report is in four parts:

- Project Context – a summary of the delivery outcomes of the project to time, cost, scope and benefits
- Executive Summary – a short and clear summary of the review results including the rating
- Summary of key findings set out key findings and their significance.
- Detailed Recommendations – actions the agency should take to improve the outcome of the project at this critical stage

The Report is to be completed in the template provided by DCS ICT Assurance.

The Report is submitted as Final Draft to DCS ICT Assurance by the Reviewer Team. It should be between 10 and 15 pages. On receipt of the Report, DCS ICT Assurance will:

- Review the Report, seek any clarifications required from the Reviewer Team, add or clarify recommendations and issue to the agency for fact checking and responses to recommendations.
- Issue the report for Fact Check to the Agency

Recommendations from the Review are transferred to DCS ICT Assurance to be actioned or closed-out as appropriate.

Gate 3 does not substitute, negate or supersede any mandatory requirements, policies or guidelines set out by the relevant agencies, project sponsor or NSW Treasury in assessing project outcomes or benefits.

6

Glossary

Term	Definition
Accountable Agency	The agency accountable for the project at its current stage (may be more than one). In the instance where it is more than one, the GCA will assign the lead Accountable Agency responsibilities.
Assurance Reviews	Refers to Gateway Reviews, Health Checks and other reviews conducted under the Gateway policy.
Benefit Owner	The agency or role responsible for the realisation of the benefit.
Cabinet	Refers to the full Cabinet of the NSW Government and any relevant standing sub-committees of Cabinet.
Capital Project	A project primarily comprised of one or more of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Documentation • Application Software • Platform Licences • Operational technology
Close-Out Plan	Document outlining actions, responsibilities, accountabilities and timeframes that respond to recommendations identified in Gateway, and Health Check and Deep Dive Final Review Reports.
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 (or Accountable) Agency	The Government agency (also the Accountable Agency) tasked with developing and/or delivering a project at its stages in its lifecycle applicable under the Digital Assurance Framework (DAF) and the NSW Gateway Policy.
Digital Restart Fund (DRF)	The purpose of the Digital Restart Fund (DRF) is to accelerate whole of government digital transformation. It has been designed to enable iterative, multi-disciplinary approaches to digital/ICT planning, development and service provision and complements existing investment approaches in IDIA. https://www.digital.nsw.gov.au/funding/digital-restart-fund
Digital Assurance Risk Advisory Group (DARAG)	Made up of Chief Information/Digital Officers from every cluster and representatives from the ICT and Digital Assurance Branch from DCS. Responsible for supporting the operation of the DAF by providing advice to the Government Chief Information and Digital Officer (GCIDO) and the IDLG and for monitoring projects by taking a Whole of Government perspective.
Estimated To Complete (ETC)	The financial performance index and project management measure that shows you the remaining cost you expect to pay in order to complete a project.
Expert Reviewer Panel	Panel comprising independent highly qualified Expert Reviewers established to cover all aspects of Gateway Review needs.

Term	Definition
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, under the NSW Gateway Policy.
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.
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/program which may arise between Gateway Reviews.
Key Focus Areas	A specific area of investigation that factors in Gateway Review deliberations.
NSW Assurance Portal	Online portal administered by the GCA for the management of DAF functions.
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 could be longer term and have a life that spans more than 1 year.</p> <p>Projects that form part of a program may be grouped together for a variety of reasons including spatial co-location the similar nature of the projects or projects collectively achieving an outcome. 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 shorter duration than a program, which will deliver one or more outputs in accordance with an agreed business case. Projects are typically delivered in a defined time period on a defined site. Projects have a clear start and finish. 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's assigned group with responsibility for managing the project through the Gateway Review.

Term	Definition
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, sourcing complexity, agency capability, technical complexity, change complexity and cyber security). The Project Tier classification is comprised of five Project Tiers, where Tier 1 encompasses projects deemed as being the highest risk and profile (Tier 1 – High Profile/High Risk projects), and Tier 5 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 1 to 5, Health Check or Deep Dive Review. <i>In the case of Gate 0 – a review committee performs the function of the review team.</i>
Review Team Leader (RTL)	For Gates 1 to 6, Health Checks and Deep Dives 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. 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.
Review Team Member	For Gates 1 to 6, Health Checks and Deep Dives 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.
Risk Review Advisory Group (RRAG)	A committee of the Gateway Coordination Agency (GCA) that reviews project registrations made by agencies in the NSW Assurance Portal and recommends a risk tier (being tier 1, 2, 3 or 4) to the GCA. RRAG is a multi-agency committee and its recommendation is based on a risk review conducted across four criteria, along with the Estimated Total Cost of the project.
Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)	The delivery agency executive with strategic responsibility and the single point of overall accountability for a project.

Acronyms

Abbreviation	Definition
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIO	Chief Information Officer
DARAG	Digital Assurance Risk Advisory Group
IDIA	ICT Digital Investment and Assurance (IDIA) Unit
IDLG	ICT And Digital Leadership Group

Abbreviation	Definition
DCS	Department of Customer Service
DPC	Department of Premier and Cabinet
DRF	Digital Restart Fund
ERC	Cabinet Standing Committee on Expenditure Review
ETC	Estimated Total Cost
FBC	Final Business Case
GCA	Gateway Coordination Agency
GCIDO	Government Chief Information and Digital Officer
HPHR	High Profile/High Risk
DAF	Digital Assurance Framework
ICT	Information and Communications Technology

7

Additional guidelines material for Review Teams

7.1 Focus Areas

The review team should be mindful of the seven focus areas. The seven focus areas are a set of themes common across the project lifecycle that the NSW Government has determined as requiring assessment. They are referred to in the key review scope areas and are used in the review report.

Focus Area	Description
	<p>Affordability and value for money</p> <p>A clear case for change and consideration of technology and market options to show evidence that the proposed changes will be delivered to the highest quality within an acceptable time and at a competitive and affordable price. There must be sufficient financial, physical and human resource to deliver the project and expenditure of these resources must provide value for money over the project's life.</p>
	<p>Risk Management</p> <p>Risk to scope, cost, procurement, time and quality should be identified and managed, as should risks inherent to the nature of new or changing technology, such as data privacy and cyber security risks, use of AI, reputational risks and risks to continuity or quality of business services. Risk management plans must be developed.</p>
	<p>Governance</p> <p>Consideration of project governance (roles and responsibilities to deliver the project, resource allocation, time management and process management) and alignment with business-as-usual agency activities and broader NSW Government and stakeholder governance.</p>
	<p>Stakeholder Management</p> <p>Consideration of the stakeholders that may contribute to or be affected by new ICT environments and capabilities, including end-users, government staff, citizens, business service managers and executive owners, technology providers, and both government and external vendors and service providers.</p>
	<p>Change Management</p> <p>Consideration of how the change will affect stakeholders, expected acceptance or resistance and actions required to move to new ways of working.</p>
	<p>Service Delivery</p> <p>Consideration of the effect of new technology capabilities on business service delivery, such as more efficient business services; maintaining or improving service delivery, such as better access to government services; quality improvements; or enabling new services.</p>
	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>Considerations of benefits realisation planning and tracking; service transition planning and implementation; whether vendor management offices will be required; continuous improvement capabilities and solution road maps; and how data will be archived or retained to meet current and future legislative requirements and data migration requirements.</p>
<p>The Gateway Review Framework provides more details of the Gateway Review process.</p>	


Review teams should:

- Engage and meet with a Project Sponsor from the delivery agency prior to the review; and
- Where possible, engage early with the relevant agency’s project management office (PMO) to understand the project’s background and to adequately plan for interviews and required documentation.



7.2 Assessment of delivery approach

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.



7.2.1 Do all relevant options for delivery consider delivery agency business needs and relevant government priorities?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examination and assessment of options, including internal resources. 	



7.2.2 Are the delivery approach and mechanisms appropriate and agreed to by stakeholders? Have Agile methodologies (if appropriate) been considered?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify of which delivery methodology used – Waterfall, Agile, or Hybrid; • If Agile, use of Agile values, principles, tools and techniques including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Processes to review and respond to feedback, continue to improve and adapt to change; – Research that informs the evolution of the service; – Methods to prioritise requirements and features to ensure the service meets users’ needs; – Decision-making and approval processes; – Engagement plans for each stakeholder; – Plans to share information, collaborate and troubleshoot issues; – Increased communication, collaboration and transparency; and – Whether the organisation has the maturity to use an Agile methodology, and what change is required to maximise the use of Agile methodology. 	



7.2.3 Are business needs understood by the delivery agency and understood by those involved in delivery?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed output/outcome-based definition of requirements; • Specification includes key success factors to show how outputs/outcomes will be assessed; and • Appropriate quality criteria applied to information for the delivery agency (internal or external). 	





7.2.4 Are project outputs/outcomes reflected in the requirement specification?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depending on the nature of the delivery, requirement specification reviewed and endorsed by stakeholders; and • Requirement articulated to potential suppliers, internal or external, quality assured so that suppliers will understand what is wanted. 	




7.2.5 Where appropriate, have options for procurement been evaluated, including sources of supply?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All appropriate sourcing options examined (e.g. use of internal resources, single or multiple suppliers; opportunities for collaboration; shared services, use of existing frameworks, etc.); • Decision to contract for an output or for constituent building blocks or activities is soundly based; • Comparison with similar projects supported by intelligence on market capability; • Reasons for selecting sourcing options documented and justified; and • Supplier risks adequately considered. 	




7.2.6 Will the project be attractive to the market?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
   	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market sounding, including recent similar procurements and indication of suitable suppliers; • Initial assessment of likely suppliers, market capacity to deliver and competitive interest; • If appropriate, assurance that the organisation has adequate expertise and capacity to undertake internal delivery of the requirement; and • Analysis of potential variations or innovations. 	



7.2.7 Has the proposed procurement procedure been evaluated?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Related risks such as impact on timescales and bid costs for suppliers evaluated, with decision justified and documented; • Legal advice sought on procurement approach; • Follows NSW procurement framework policy and processes and ISO standards; • Probity advisors considered or used; • Information security and cyber security implications of specific potential suppliers considered; • Data loss prevention products included; • Procurement strategy and final pricing aligns to the Business Case financial forecasts for both capital and operating costs; and • Evaluation of Agile methods in the procurement process, if applicable. 	


7.2.8 Is the selected outline delivery strategy defined?

  	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery strategy defined, showing reasons for selection and agreed with stakeholders; • Business continuity and future exit, handover and transition strategies considered at high level; • Appropriate people involved in development of the delivery strategy; • Strategy includes as appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Objectives, constraints (e.g. Timescale), funding mechanism and risk allocation; — The delivery route, including sourcing options and contract strategy; — Procurement procedure; time needed for pre-procurement, implementation and contingency in the event of unavoidable slippage, with milestones; — Assessment of market and suppliers; roles, resources and skills required; alignment with implementation plans; — Relevant steps to manage information security and cyber security requirements, e.g. Independent testing where appropriate; and • Procurement innovation and sustainability issues have been considered. 	



7.2.9 Have factors that influence the delivery strategy been addressed?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors influencing the delivery strategy have been considered; and • Efficiency and predictability of process considered, including how deviation from plan and timetable will be addressed and stakeholder and supplier communication. 	



7.2.10 Will the outline delivery strategy facilitate communication and cooperation between all parties involved?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication strategy and support mechanisms; • Delivery strategy includes early involvement of suppliers so design is informed by delivery; and • Defined performance criteria with performance indicators and a system for measuring performance. 	


7.2.11 Is there knowledge of existing and potential suppliers that are most likely to succeed?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of existing and potential suppliers considered; • Commercial market intelligence, market sources and potential suppliers; • Assessment of similar size and complexity projects from public and private sector, including public sector's ability to work in this way; private sector track record in meeting similar or equivalent business need; and • Indications of the types of suppliers most likely to succeed. 	



7.2.12 Is the contract management strategy robust?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract management strategy considers required intelligent customer skills, proposed relationship, management of single or multiple suppliers; and • Evidence of continuity of key project personnel. 	


7.2.13 Do the contracts comply with NSW procurement rules?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of compliance to the NSW procurement framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Procurement policy; — Value for money; — Promotion of competition; — Sustainable procurement; and — Corruption prevention, fairness and probity. — Financial market risk including FX, interest rates and commodities 	



7.2.14 Is the evaluation strategy (including how to demonstrate value for money) accepted by stakeholders and compliant with NSW procurement rules?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation criteria and model(s) approved by stakeholders; • Key evaluation criteria linked to business objectives and given appropriate weighting; • Financial and non-financial aspects of the evaluation separated; • Evaluation criteria included in information to potential tenderers and prioritised, where applicable (e.g. quality of service, innovation); • Where appropriate, evaluation benchmarks the value for money benefits of partnering, internal supplier or framework/call-off arrangements; • Consideration of contract duration, in relation to value for money and whole-life costs; and • Consideration of whether to act as a central purchasing body. 	



7.2.15 Does the project and proposed solution meets the whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency self-assessment template showing compliance with whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities. 	


7.2.16 Is the culture of the delivery agency ready to deliver the project?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff from project teams to board level aware of the implications of chosen methodology (e.g. though training and regular communications); • Reporting and governance structures are ready within the team and for stakeholders; and • If using Agile, delivery agency has the capability and discipline. 	



7.2.17 Do all the stakeholders fully understand the delivery methodology including resource commitments, delegations and governance arrangements?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of understanding with key participants trained to start development; • Ramifications (e.g. empowered staff and evolving/changing requirements) have been considered; and • If relevant, decision making framework for Agile in place and stakeholders aware. 	



7.2.18 Have time, cost and resource implications been considered?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline costs of approach considered against delivery requirements; • Understanding of business as usual activities assigned resources are working on; and • Recognition that plans are developed iteratively. 	

7.2.19 Is it clear that some development may be discarded or approaches change as the development progresses?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that disposal of early iterations is accepted and longer-term planning is not always possible. 	


7.2.20 Does the delivery agency have the capability and capacity to manage simultaneous developments?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing plans clarify what staff resources are available and their role; • Capacity and capability can be interrogated in interviews; and • Enough trained resources to work on multiple developments. 	


7.3 Business Case and stakeholders

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.3.1 Does the Business Case demonstrate business need and contribute to delivery agency's business strategy?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project will meet business need, including priorities remaining where external factors might have an effect; and• Objectives and desired outputs remain aligned with the program to which it contributes, if appropriate.	


7.3.2 Does the project align with the wider change portfolio?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comparison of the change management plans with a wider change portfolio/strategy.	



7.3.3 Is the preferred option still appropriate?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preferred option supported by assessment based on assumptions about interdependencies with other programs and projects, reliance on partners to deliver, availability of internal resources, etc.	


7.3.4 Are ICT security requirements identified?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Security/information security teams engaged; and• Delivery agency's Cyber Security Standards, NSW Cyber Security Policy and NSW Cyber Security Incident Emergency Sub-Plan considered.	


7.3.5 Is the proposed arrangement likely to achieve whole-life value for money?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bases for calculating costs (value of requirements) and comparison of delivery approaches (e.g. tenders) agreed with key stakeholders; • Updated Business Case based on full project definition, market assessment and initial benefits plan; • Delivery strategy reflected in Business Case; • Examination of sensitivities and financial implications of handling major risks; assessment of their effect on project return; and • If the project is not designed to achieve a financial return, comparisons with similar projects used to assess the potential to achieve value for money and to set targets. 	



7.3.6 Are costs within budget? Is whole-life funding affordable and supported by stakeholders?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconciliation of projected whole-life costs with available budget, reviewed and accepted or approved by stakeholders; and • Project costs within organisation's forecasted spending plans. 	


7.3.7 Are costs for appropriate cyber security protection identified?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costing for cyber security has been considered (if relevant). 	



7.3.8 Is the delivery agency realistic about its ability to achieve success?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison with similar projects and organisations; assessment of track record in achieving change; plans to manage known weaknesses; where applicable, plans for incremental/modular approaches; contingency plans; and • If the project traverses organisational boundaries, governance arrangements to align with business objectives of all organisations. 	


7.3.9 Is there a clear definition of the total project scope?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated document showing total project scope including business change, where applicable. 	



7.3.10 Are the risks and issues relating to business change understood? Is there an initial plan to address these issues?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks and issues relating to business change logged, with a management plan and owner for each; and Account taken of relevant impact assessment and appraisal issues such as regulatory impact, sustainable development and environmental appraisal. 	


7.3.11 Do stakeholders support the project? Is the delivery agency still fully committed?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement of and endorsement by stakeholders, including agreed roles and responsibilities. 	


7.3.12 Are benefits understood and agreed with stakeholders? How will these be realised and evaluated?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits clearly stated; Initial plan for realising and evaluating delivery of benefits shows costs offset by improved quality of service and/or savings over the project's expected life; and Critical success factors remain valid and agreed with stakeholders. 	



7.3.13 Have affected business units been involved in the change management plan?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A change management plan developed with stakeholders included, demonstrating how the plan helps to understand stakeholders' views, organisational and business process implications and communication requirements. 	



7.3.14 How will changes across affected business areas within and external to the delivery agency be identified, assessed, communicated and managed?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder and communications management plan developed with stakeholders. 	


7.3.15 Are roles and responsibilities and authority delegations defined?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational model shows roles and responsibilities; • Review team able to assess how the structure works in reality through interviews or observation of the team; and • Stakeholders are aware of their delegations including security deliverables. 	


7.3.16 Has the training of service delivery teams, case workers, administrative staff and front-line staff been considered and planned?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand profile or similar that outlines the skills and experience required; • Suitable external resources available to address short-term skills shortage; and • Skills and knowledge transfer considered. 	


7.3.17 Have benefits changed in a way that could affect the value of the project?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated benefits realisation strategy and benefits realisation register. 	



7.3.18 Is there still a strategy to plan and manage benefits?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated benefits realisation strategy and benefits realisation register; and • Evidence of identified benefits and the realisation of these benefits. 	


7.3.19 Are resources available to maintain momentum or address gaps in the multidisciplinary teams?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing strategy and plan appropriately aligned to demand profile; • Witnessing stand-ups, etc. demonstrate whether everyone who needs to be there attends; • All relevant resources included in budget; and • Need to refresh/replace resources considered. 	


7.3.20 Can business as usual activities be maintained if staff required?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing plan clarifies where the resources are coming from, including whether additional or existing resources. 	


7.3.21 Is there a governance process to monitor and manage progress, and align with corporate strategy and ICT strategy, and intended benefits realisation?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference and governance processes considered; • Needs include escalations; and • Involvement of cyber security stakeholders included where required. 	

7.3.22 Are appropriate business change management processes in place?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Product backlog regularly monitored and where tolerances exceeded, appropriate escalation path in place. 	


7.3.23 How will progress be tracked, reported and, if required, corrected?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backlogs monitored with realignment if required; • Earned value is measured; and • Reports/dashboard made available. 	


7.4 Risk Management

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.4.1 Are major risks and issues identified, understood, financially evaluated and considered in the delivery strategy?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major issues and risks regularly logged, including strategic, political, commercial and legislative. In addition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Interdependencies identified, if applicable, with other projects within the program, or within and outside the organisation; — Risks relating to cyber security and information management security (where applicable) identified and related risk assessments completed; • Risks relating to system uptake/adoption identified; • Each risk assessed financially and included in Business Case either as sensitivity or a separate risk allocation; and • Assessment of all technical risks documented, such as build ability and risks associated with innovation. 	


7.4.2 Are there Risk Management plans?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project risk management strategy in place, developed in line with best practice; • Risk management plans for each risk and responsibilities for managing each risk identified and allocated; approved by stakeholders; • Risk reporting process in place for upward referral of risks; and • Contingency and/or business continuity plans developed if required. 	


7.4.3 Have all issues identified been resolved?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue and risk logs regularly reviewed by project team and evidence of appropriate action taken. 	



7.4.4 Are external issues such as statutory process, communications and environmental issues being addressed?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of external issues and related stakeholders, with plans for each; and External relations plan developed and implemented as part of communications strategy. 	

7.4.5 Have cyber security risks been identified and evaluated?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential dangers to information and system (threats); system weakness that could be exploited (vulnerabilities) identified; Existing controls to reduce the risk of the threat exploiting the vulnerability identified; and Likelihood and severity of threat determined. 	


7.4.6 Will staff be protected from burn out and what mitigation processes are proposed?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures in place to support staff wellbeing. 	


7.5 Review of current phase

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.5.1 Is the project under control?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project running to schedule and costs within budget, as shown in project budget and timetable reports.	


7.5.2 What caused any deviations such as over or under-runs?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reconciliations set against budget and time plan and in accordance with risk allowances.	


7.5.3 What actions will prevent deviations recurring in other phases?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis and plans in project management documentation that is continually reviewed and updated.	


7.5.4 Are any assumptions documented at Gate 3 not verified?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Log of outstanding assumptions and plans to verify them; where applicable, classed and managed as issues.	



7.5.5 Has time been allowed to fix faults and are there arrangements for proactive monitoring and management of any slippage?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolerances given to teams to undertake defect remediation and refactoring; • Monitoring in place to assess progress; • Controls in place to prioritise defect resolution alongside the development of new functionality; and • Sprint planning adequately covers time to fix defects. 	

7.5.6 Is the incremental planning approach overloading staff or schedule?



	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of progress and backlog. 	

7.5.7 Is the budget under control? Will a higher spend burn rate be required, e.g. for developers or coders to maintain pace?

 	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examination of financial management data; • Evidence of regular financial data, ideally linked to each Sprint cycle; and • Reports considered at program board/steering committees. 	


7.5.8 Has the Use of AI been considered?

The implementation of AI technologies within the NSW Government offers significant opportunities for enhancing service delivery, operational efficiency, and decision-making processes. However, it also introduces various risks that must be carefully managed to ensure ethical, transparent, and accountable use of AI.

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<p>Evidence of Risk Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bias and Discrimination: AI systems can inadvertently perpetuate or amplify existing biases present in the training data, leading to unfair treatment of certain groups. It is crucial to implement robust bias detection and mitigation strategies to ensure fairness and equity. Privacy and Security: The use of AI often involves processing large volumes of personal and sensitive data. Ensuring data privacy and security is paramount to prevent unauthorized access, data breaches, and misuse of information. Transparency and Explainability: AI systems can be complex and opaque, making it difficult for stakeholders to understand how decisions are made. Enhancing transparency and explainability is essential to build trust and accountability. Accountability: Determining responsibility for AI-driven decisions can be challenging, especially in cases of adverse outcomes. Clear accountability frameworks must be established to address this issue. Ethical Considerations: AI systems must align with ethical principles and values, ensuring that their deployment does not harm individuals or society. Continuous ethical assessments are necessary to uphold these standards. <p>Benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improved Efficiency: AI can automate routine tasks, streamline processes, and reduce operational costs, leading to increased efficiency and productivity across government agencies. Enhanced Decision-Making: AI can analyse vast amounts of data to provide insights and support evidence-based decision-making, improving the quality and accuracy of decisions. Personalized Services: AI can enable the delivery of personalized services tailored to individual needs, enhancing citizen satisfaction and engagement. Innovation and Growth: The adoption of AI can drive innovation, fostering the development of new solutions and services that benefit the community and contribute to economic growth. Proactive Risk Management: AI can identify potential risks and issues early, allowing for proactive measures to mitigate them and ensure smoother project execution. 	

7.5.9 Have AI Risk Mitigation strategies been considered?



The implementation of AI technologies within the NSW Government offers significant opportunities for enhancing service delivery, operational efficiency, and decision-making processes. However, it also introduces various risks that must be carefully managed to ensure ethical, transparent, and accountable use of AI.

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<p>Evidence of Mitigation Strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bias Mitigation: Implement regular audits and use diverse datasets to minimize bias in AI systems. 2. Data Privacy and Security: Adopt stringent data protection measures, including encryption, access controls, and regular security assessments. 3. Transparency Initiatives: Develop clear documentation and communication strategies to explain AI decision-making processes to stakeholders. 4. Accountability Frameworks: Establish clear roles and responsibilities for AI governance, including mechanisms for addressing grievances and adverse outcomes. 5. Ethical Oversight: Form ethics committees to continuously review and assess the ethical implications of AI projects. 	




7.6 Readiness for next phase: Tender Evaluation

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.




7.6.1 Is the project plan for remaining stages realistic?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives, deliverables and milestones for next stage defined and approved by stakeholders; Recommendations from last review actioned; and Cyber security activities, resources and availability, including testing and remediation, considered. 	



7.6.2 Are the project's timescales reasonable?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timescales are likely to meet business and legislative needs and have been verified with internal stakeholders and suppliers and compared to similar projects; Where appropriate, written record of compliance with NSW procurement rules; and Identified effects of any slippage (e.g. procurement costs) and suppliers (e.g. bid costs), supported by sensitivity analysis. 	


7.6.3 Are arrangements for the next stage defined and resourced?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
  	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan showing roles, responsibilities, training requirements, internal and external resources, skills requirements and project management mentoring resources available; Involvement from a business, user and technical perspective; Key review and decision points, including preliminary reviews, identified; and Appropriate standard form of contract identified as baseline for later adaptations as required. 	


7.6.4 Does the team have resources with appropriate skills and experience?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requisite skills available and access to external expertise available as appropriate; • Requirements for intelligent customer capabilities, where appropriate, identified and planned for; • Project relationships such as team working and partnering considered, with a plan to implement them where appropriate; • Internal and external commitment to provide the resources required; • Job descriptions for key project staff; • Skills audit undertaken and shortfalls addressed; • Contract management staff identified to join procurement team early, to familiarise themselves with the procurement's intent and processes; and • Appropriate allocation of key project roles between internal staff and consultants or contractors. 	

7.6.5 Are end-users adequately prepared for the transition to the new/redesigned digital service?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User research and engagement and communications strategy defines customers and end-users and how they will be engaged. 	

7.6.6 If there are legacy systems, what are the plans to transfer data, integrate with them and exit them adequately?

	Evidence expected	Status/Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of plans to establish viability of approach. 	

7.7 Gate 3 Review: Typical project documentation

The review team should expect to receive evidence as noted below.

Governance, requirements, policy and resourcing

- Approved Business Case and any updates;
- Current governance structure, if not included in the updated Business Case;
- Specification of the project's expected outputs and outcomes;
- Reporting mechanisms;
- Active management of the product backlog and Sprint backlog (Agile);
- Sprint planning, review and retrospective meetings (Agile);
- Relevant approvals, e.g. Under the EP&A Act; Budget Committee of Cabinet, etc.; and
- The agency self-assessment template showing compliance with whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities.

Stakeholder engagement and change management

- Change management plan;
- Updated communications strategy and plan;
- Assessment of opportunities for local industry participation; and
- Community consultation report.

Quality management

- Current and planned business/technical policies, strategies and constraints (e.g. health and safety standards; information assurance requirements such as security schedule);
- Results of any business, commercial or technical benchmarking Project quality documentation; and
- Strategy for measuring project performance.

Financial Management

- The project's costs to date set against budget; and
- Funding approval.

Procurement and commercials

- The delivery/acquisition approach (including the procurement strategy if appropriate) and documented justification for the approach;
- Request for tender documents;
- Evaluation strategy and model for evaluating proposals (e.g. tenders), if required;
- Draft conditions of contract based on suitable standard contract model (for procurements);
- Expressions of Interest (EOI) documents including EOI evaluation report (if applicable); and
- Probity plan.

Risk Management

- Updated risk register, issue log and risk management plans; and
- Updated market intelligence and supplier assessment (for procurement projects).
- Clearances on Cyber, Privacy and AI

Planning and control

- Well-developed requirements documentation, preferably as draft output-based specification or statement of requirements (for procurements);
- Active management of the Scrum Board/holding stand-ups (Agile);
- Tracking of the Sprint Burndown Chart (Agile);
- Proposed implementation strategy for implementing the new service/works contract; and
- Outline project plans to completion and detailed plans for the next phase.

Benefits Management

- Updated benefits management plan and benefits realisation register.

