

Gate 4 Review: Guideline and Workbook

Tender Evaluation

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 4 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 4..... | 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 4 Review..... | 33 |
| 3.1 | Key Gateways: Gate 0 – 2..... | 34 |
| 3.2 | Initiating a Gate 4 Review..... | 36 |
| 3.3 | Gate 4 Gateway Review and documents..... | 38 |
| 3.3.1 | Mandatory documents..... | 38 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3.3.2 | Information documented to support Gate 4..... | 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 4 Approach..... | 41 |
| 4.2 | Gate 4 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 4 review objectives..... | 44 |
| 5 | Part D: Gate 4 Purpose and Report Process | 46 |
| 5.1 | Gate 4 Review Purpose and Process..... | 47 |
| 6 | Glossary | 48 |
| 7 | Additional guidelines material for Review Teams | 53 |
| 7.1 | Focus Areas..... | 54 |
| 7.2 | Assessment of delivery approach..... | 55 |
| 7.2.1 | Does the proposed solution meet the business need?..... | 55 |
| 7.2.2 | Have suppliers or partners proposed alternatives or other options in addition to a fully compliant bid?..... | 55 |
| 7.2.3 | Will the proposed delivery solution deliver the business need described in the full Business Case?..... | 55 |
| 7.2.4 | Does the proposed delivery solution affect the strategy for business change? | 56 |
| 7.2.5 | Does the proposed delivery solution affect expectations of business benefits or changes to budgets?..... | 56 |
| 7.2.6 | Are the delivery agency (as client) and supplier prepared for the development (if there are new systems and processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services?..... | 56 |
| 7.2.7 | Are there plans and processes to address business and technical issues?..... | 56 |
| 7.2.8 | Are responsibilities between all parties allocated and understood, and any contractual liabilities understood? | 57 |
| 7.2.9 | Does the supplier have the resources to meet contractual obligations? | 57 |
| 7.2.10 | Have technical implications been assessed, such as information assurance and security, the impact of e-business and management of legacy systems? | 57 |
| 7.2.11 | Does the project team have appropriate skills and experience to achieve intended outcomes?..... | 58 |
| 7.2.12 | Does the project and proposed delivery solution meet whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities?..... | 58 |
| 7.3 | Business Case and stakeholders..... | 59 |

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| 7.3.1 | Is the project still required?..... | 59 |
| 7.3.2 | Is the Business Case complete? | 59 |
| 7.3.3 | Does the preferred option meet the business need? | 59 |
| 7.3.4 | Has the most appropriate option been selected? | 59 |
| 7.3.5 | Does the commercial arrangement represent value for money, with an appropriate level of quality over the whole life of the project? | 60 |
| 7.3.6 | Is the delivery agency realistic about their ability to manage the change? | 60 |
| 7.3.7 | Does the Business Case, when incorporating the delivery solution, still demonstrate affordability? | 60 |
| 7.3.8 | Is there an agreed benefits realisation plan? | 60 |
| 7.3.9 | Have suitable stakeholders, business and user representatives been involved and have they approved the tender evaluation report and draft contract? | 61 |
| 7.3.10 | Are affected business units involved as the change management plan is developed? | 61 |
| 7.3.11 | What is the framework to identify, assess, communicate and manage changes across affected business areas?..... | 61 |
| 7.3.12 | Are roles and responsibilities and authority delegations appropriately and clearly defined?..... | 62 |
| 7.3.13 | Has the training of operations teams (e.g. service delivery teams, case workers, administrative staff and front-line staff) been considered and planned?..... | 62 |
| 7.3.14 | Are appropriate business change management processes in place? | 62 |
| 7.3.15 | Are business users sufficiently empowered to effect change if required? | 62 |
| 7.3.16 | Is there an effective system to track, report and, if required, correct, progress? .. | 63 |
| 7.3.17 | Have benefits in the Business Case changed in a way that could affect the value of the project?..... | 63 |
| 7.3.18 | Is there still a strategy to plan and manage benefits? | 63 |
| 7.3.19 | Has the supplier's ability to meet project delivery schedules and outcomes been verified?..... | 63 |
| 7.3.20 | Will the supplier meet the project timeline and have impacts of variations been assessed? | 64 |
| 7.3.21 | Have resource capability and capacity requirements been assessed for production development and business readiness? | 64 |
| 7.3.22 | Are the resources available to maintain momentum or address gaps in the multidisciplinary teams?..... | 64 |
| 7.4 | Risk Management..... | 65 |
| 7.4.1 | Are risk and issue management plans up-to-date?..... | 65 |
| 7.4.2 | Have all major risks been resolved?..... | 65 |
| 7.4.3 | Will business contingency and continuity arrangements and plans minimise the impact of issues during implementation and rollout?..... | 65 |
| 7.4.4 | Does the contract reflect standard terms and conditions and (where applicable) allocate risks between contracting parties? | 66 |
| 7.4.5 | For longer-term service or partnering contracts, have re-competition issues been considered? | 66 |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| 7.4.6 | Does the resource management plan address the risk of staff burn out?..... | 66 |
| 7.4.7 | Have cyber security risks been identified and evaluated?..... | 66 |
| 7.4.8 | Has the Use of AI been considered?..... | 67 |
| 7.4.9 | Have AI Risk Mitigation strategies been considered?..... | 68 |
| 7.5 | Review of current phase | 69 |
| 7.5.1 | Is the project under control?..... | 69 |
| 7.5.2 | What caused any over or under runs?..... | 69 |
| 7.5.3 | What actions will prevent future deviations?..... | 69 |
| 7.5.4 | Have all assumptions from previous gates been validated?..... | 69 |
| 7.5.5 | Have procurement and technical checks been carried out?..... | 70 |
| 7.5.6 | Did the project team follow the delivery strategy?..... | 70 |
| 7.5.7 | Were the documents subject to quality review?..... | 70 |
| 7.5.8 | Has the procurement process managed probity?..... | 70 |
| 7.5.9 | Does the project align with the NSW Government Sustainability Plan?..... | 70 |
| 7.5.10 | If the project is replacing an existing system or infrastructure does it address NSW e-Waste policies?..... | 71 |
| 7.5.11 | Has time been allowed to fix faults and how will slippage be monitored and managed?..... | 71 |
| 7.5.12 | Is the budget under control? Is there a risk that a higher spend burn rate is required, e.g. for developers/coders to maintain pace?..... | 71 |
| 7.5.13 | How has governance and methodology performed? Can they be improved?..... | 71 |
| 7.6 | Readiness for next phase: Readiness for go-live | 72 |
| 7.6.1 | Is the working relationship likely to succeed?..... | 72 |
| 7.6.2 | Are all resources and internal funds in place?..... | 72 |
| 7.6.3 | Are the supplier's project, risk and management plans adequate and realistic?.... | 72 |
| 7.6.4 | Does the client-side plan reflect the supplier's plans, and vice versa?..... | 73 |
| 7.6.5 | Are the long-term contract administration plan and benefit measurement process complete?..... | 73 |
| 7.6.6 | Are mechanisms and processes in place for the next phase?..... | 73 |
| 7.6.7 | Are the service management plan, administration and service level arrangements complete?..... | 74 |
| 7.6.8 | Is the management process for service change complete?..... | 74 |
| 7.6.9 | Is there an acceptance strategy or commissioning strategy, as applicable?..... | 74 |
| 7.6.10 | Is there an implementation strategy?..... | 75 |
| 7.6.11 | Are end users adequately prepared for transition?..... | 75 |
| 7.6.12 | If there are legacy systems, are there plans to transfer data, integrate with them and exit them?..... | 75 |
| 7.6.13 | Will changes to external dependencies effectively feed into development work?..... | 75 |
| 7.7 | Gate 4 Review: Typical project documentation | 76 |

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 4: Tender Evaluation 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 4 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 4: Tender evaluation review evaluates the solution and preferred option prior to committing funds and checks requirements against milestones. The review also confirms that relevant whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities have been considered.

The Gate 4: Tender evaluation review is designed to:

- Confirm the full Business Case and benefits plan once relevant information is confirmed from potential suppliers and/or delivery partners;
- Confirm the objectives and desired outputs of the project align with the program to which it contributes and/or the delivery agency's business strategy;
- Check that necessary statutory and procedural requirements have been followed in the procurement/evaluation process;
- Confirm the recommended contract decision, if properly executed within a standard lawful agreement (where appropriate), will deliver outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and provide value for money;
- Ensure controls are to manage the project to completion, including contract management;
- Ensure continuing support for the project;
- Confirm the approved delivery strategy has been followed;
- Confirm client and supplier/partner development and implementation plans are sound and achievable;
- Check the delivery agency has prepared for the development where there are new processes, implementation, transition and operation of new services/facilities, and that all relevant staff are being (or will be) prepared for the business change;
- Confirm there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business), and that these plans are shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners;
- Confirm the technical implications, such as information assurance and security, and the impact of government frameworks have been addressed;
- Evaluate actions to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability; and
- Confirm 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 the proposed solution;
- Business Case and stakeholders;
- Risk Management;
- Review of current phase; and
- Readiness for next phase: Readiness for go-live.

These key review scope areas will help to structure the Gate 4 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 4 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 4 report purpose and process | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary overview of the Gate 4 Report purpose and process • Where to find applicable templates • Additional material for Reviewers including focus areas | Page: 46 |

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 4 Gateway Review

Follow the steps and timeframes shown in the table below:

| Step | Activity | |
|------|--|---|
| 1 | <p>Entry Criteria</p> <p>Gate 4 entry criteria is the satisfactory completion of Gate 3 and clearance of any Critical issues – if any from Gate 3. [Assumes a Gate 1 & 2 has been completed and cleared and the project is registered.]</p> <p>6 weeks prior to the Gateway commencement date, the Accountable Agency checks readiness of the project for the Gate 4 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 4 readiness checklist template.</p> | <p>1 Month prior</p> <p>Preparation / Planning</p> <p>TOR</p>  |
| 5 | <p>The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency complete the Gate 4 <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. <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 4 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 4 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 4 Review, a Review Report is produced using the Gate 4: Tender Evaluation 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> |
| 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 | | | |
| You are here 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 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 4, the final draft of the Report template, the recommendations and 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 4 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 4 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 4

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 ICT Assurance Framework (IAF). 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 2 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.

Gate 4 is a readiness stage in the project lifecycle where projects are evaluated for their preparedness to transition into the delivery phase.

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 | <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> | | | |
| 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 | <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> | | | |
| 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 <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 | Change and End Users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change, training and transition support | Benefits Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievability of planned benefits • Updated benefits strategy, realisation plan and register • Handover and measurement of benefits | Scope Management <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 4 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 4 Review

Entry Criteria

Completion of Gate 3 and clearance of all Critical Recommendations from previous gateway review. [Note Gate 4 is more commonly undertaken for Tier One high / Significance projects.]

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 4 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 4 readiness checklist template.
6. The Delivery (or Accountable) Agency complete the Gate 4 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 4 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 4 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 4 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
- Any agency project evaluation documentation

3.3.2 Information documented to support Gate 4

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 Accountable Agency and Reviewer Team, to gain an overview of the project and provide guidance on how to complete the Gate 4 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 4 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 4 Approach

The Gate 4 Review is conducted after the detailed design and implementation plans have been completed and before the project transitions into full-scale execution.

The Reviewer Team should use this workbook to guide an assessment of the project against the scope and objectives outlined in the Detailed Design, Implementation Plans, and the associated Risk Management Plans. The review ensures that all required resources, schedules, and controls are in place, and provides practical recommendations to confirm the project's readiness for implementation.

4.2 Gate 4 Review

The Reviewer Team conducts interviews with the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency and stakeholders (as required) to complete the final draft of the Gate 4 Report, writes recommendations and determines the final overall rating for the Report.

The Gateway Review includes:

- Project documentation is released by the Delivery (or Accountable) Agency to the Reviewer Team
- 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 4 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 4 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 4 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.

4.7 Coverage of Gate 4 review objectives

| Gate 4 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 Full Business Case and Benefits Plan now that the relevant information has been confirmed from potential suppliers and/or delivery partners.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>e.g. Review team detailed findings 1. Business Case</i> |
| 1. Confirm the Full Business Case and Benefits Plan now that the relevant information has been confirmed from potential suppliers and/or delivery partners. | <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 and/or the wider organisation's business strategy. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement / evaluation process. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 4. Confirm that the recommended contract decision, if properly executed within a standard lawful agreement (where appropriate), is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget and provide value for money. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| Gate 4 review objectives | Applicable to this review | | Review team confidence rating | | | Report reference |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| | Yes | No | Not met | Partially met | Met | |
| 5. Ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion, including contract management aspects. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 6. Ensure there is continuing support for the project. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 7. Confirm that the approved delivery strategy has been followed. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 8. Confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the client and the supplier or partner are sound and achievable. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 9. Check that the business has prepared for the development (where there are new processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services/facilities, and that all relevant staff are being (or will be) prepared for the business change involved. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 10. Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business), and that these plans are shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 11. Confirm that the technical implications, such as information assurance and security, the impact of government frameworks have been addressed. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 12. 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"/> | |
| Comments if review objectives are not applicable to this review | | | | | | |

5

Part D: Gate 4 Purpose and Report Process

5.1 Gate 4 Review Purpose and Process

Purpose

The Gate 4 review aims to evaluate the solution & the preferred option prior to committing funds, ensuring that the project will be delivered effectively and checks requirements against milestones.

It will also assess the following:

- Assessment of the proposed solution
- Business case and stakeholders
- Risk management
- Review of current phase
- Readiness for next phase

Process

DCS ICT Assurance will appoint the Reviewer Team to undertake the review and oversee the completion of the Gate 4 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 4 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 4 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 IAF functions. |
| Program | 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 span more than 1 year. 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. 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. |
| 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, procurement complexity, agency capability and whether it is deemed as an essential service). 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. |
| Review Team Leader (RTL) | <p>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.</p> <p>The RTL acts as the point of contact between the Review Team and the GCA Review Manager. If agreed by the GCA Review Manager, the RTL may act as the liaison between the Review Team and the delivery agency's SRO and/or Project Director. The RTL provides the Review debrief to the GCA and the delivery agency's SRO on behalf of the Review Team.</p> |
| Review Team Member | 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 Does the proposed solution meet the business need?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delivery solution fully complies with business, technical and security requirements; and• Consultation with appropriate stakeholders and advisors during evaluation and their acceptance of the proposed delivery solution. | |


7.2.2 Have suppliers or partners proposed alternatives or other options in addition to a fully compliant bid?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Options assessed for how they will benefit the project and still remain within the scope of the advertisement. | |



7.2.3 Will the proposed delivery solution deliver the business need described in the full Business Case?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis shows the proposed delivery is defined in business outcome terms, while meeting necessary organisational and business process changes. Proposed services and service levels as defined in the contract or agreement will meet the agreed business requirements. | |



7.2.4 Does the proposed delivery solution affect the strategy for business change?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated plan for managing the business change based on the proposed solution, agreed by project board and agreed with users and stakeholders; and • Analysis of differences from original plan. | |


7.2.5 Does the proposed delivery solution affect expectations of business benefits or changes to budgets?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated benefit realisation plan describes benefits and their owners; and • Analysis of differences from original plan documented and agreed with users and stakeholders. | |


7.2.6 Are the delivery agency (as client) and supplier prepared for the development (if there are new systems and processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed development and implementation plans included in delivery solution and recommended to project board; and • Delivery agency's implementation plan agreed with users or their representatives, if the end-user is the citizen and stakeholders, e.g. staff training, changes in business processes. | |


7.2.7 Are there plans and processes to address business and technical issues?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy for managing change agreed by all parties, including supplier. | |



7.2.8 Are responsibilities between all parties allocated and understood, and any contractual liabilities understood?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined client and supplier organisation, personnel and responsibilities; • On the client's side, identified internal relationships and interfaces with the supplier; • On the supplier's side, reciprocal arrangements including senior management roles; • Where applicable, partnering arrangements defined, where a single supplier describes how they will manage their supply chain; if multiple suppliers, how the delivery agency, as client, manages these interfaces; • Evidence the client and supplier will work as an integrated project team; and • If there are several client organisations, evidence of governance arrangements to align the business objectives of all organisations involved. | |



7.2.9 Does the supplier have the resources to meet contractual obligations?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for implementing the contract, identifying the quantity, type and quality of resources required; • Formal management acceptance of resource requirements, with roles and personnel identified and in place; and • Adequate plans and procedures for contract management, including availability of requisite skills and experience. | |


7.2.10 Have technical implications been assessed, such as information assurance and security, the impact of e-business and management of legacy systems?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery solution is technically acceptable; • Information management, privacy of data and cyber security considered; • Full information lifecycle considered, e.g. retention of data, archiving requirements, transition of data requirements and exit strategy; and • Technology used now and in future is up-to-date with appropriate warranty arrangements agreed and in place. | |

7.2.11 Does the project team have appropriate skills and experience to achieve intended outcomes?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required intelligent customer capability planned for and roles allocated; • Internal and external commitment to provide required resources; • Job descriptions for key project staff; • Skills appraisal undertaken and shortfalls addressed; • Access to external sources of expertise, if required; • Appropriate allocation of key project roles between internal staff and consultants or contractors; and • Standards, manuals and training (where required) for staff implementing and servicing the project. | |


7.2.12 Does the project and proposed delivery solution meet whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment against whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities in completed self-assessment template (available from ICT Assurance). | |


7.3 Business Case and stakeholders

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.3.1 Is the project still required?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation the project still fits with strategic objectives; and• Confirmation that external factors have not affected priorities. | |


7.3.2 Is the Business Case complete?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Re-assessment of updated Business Case, including strategic, economic, financial, commercial and project management factors. | |


7.3.3 Does the preferred option meet the business need?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key objectives revisited against final bid and proposed solution. | |


7.3.4 Has the most appropriate option been selected?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cost/benefit/risk analysis and results, including sensitivity analysis, against final bid information. | |


7.3.5 Does the commercial arrangement represent value for money, with an appropriate level of quality over the whole life of the project?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market assessment, other organisational benchmarks and previous experience; • Tender evaluation criteria drive maximum benefits at optimal cost including consideration of financial risks per the NSW Government Business Case Guidelines; • Results of evaluation address existing commercial arrangements; and • Supplier’s funding arrangements assessed, if appropriate. | |


7.3.6 Is the delivery agency realistic about their ability to manage the change?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account of cultural implications, where appropriate, and organisational culture; and • Organisation culture compared to that of other suppliers. | |


7.3.7 Does the Business Case, when incorporating the delivery solution, still demonstrate affordability?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Case incorporating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Changes from budgetary figures; — Returns and value re-calculated with new benefits plan; — Costs compared with budget; and — Pre-tender estimates. | |



7.3.8 Is there an agreed benefits realisation plan?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits management strategy and plans, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Critical success factors; — Responsibilities for delivering and achieving benefits; — Agreed process for measuring and assessing benefits; — Data to measure baselines for benefits assessment; and — Post-implementation review plan. | |


7.3.9 Have suitable stakeholders, business and user representatives been involved and have they approved the tender evaluation report and draft contract?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of stakeholders and business or user representatives in quality and proposal reviews; • Views of all stakeholders, including users, considered; • Stakeholders represented on the evaluation team; • Approval by project board or steering committee; and • Information security team member involved in meetings with potential vendors. | |



7.3.10 Are affected business units involved as the change management plan is developed?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a change management plan, developed with stakeholders; • Plan demonstrates how the change management strategy incorporates stakeholders' views, organisational and business process implications and communication requirements; and • Change management planning considers cyber security operational and support documentation. | |



7.3.11 What is the framework to identify, assess, communicate and manage changes across affected business areas?

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


7.3.12 Are roles and responsibilities and authority delegations appropriately and clearly defined?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational model shows roles and responsibilities; and • Interview and/or observation of the team interrogates organisational roles. | |


7.3.13 Has the training of operations teams (e.g. 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 outlines the skills and experience to ensure delivery; • Suitably qualified/experience external resources will address short-term skills shortage; and • Skills and knowledge transfer considered. | |



7.3.14 Are appropriate business change management processes in place?

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


7.3.15 Are business users sufficiently empowered to effect change if required?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Product managers can delivery change in the business; and • Product managers have the right information to discuss change broadly. | |


7.3.16 Is there an effective system to track, report and, if required, correct, progress?

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


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

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



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

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits realisation strategy and register updated identifying benefits and the realisation of these benefits; and • Practices in place to update the benefits plan as required. | |


7.3.19 Has the supplier's ability to meet project delivery schedules and outcomes been verified?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the supplier's delivery schedule aligns to project delivery schedule. | |


7.3.20 Will the supplier meet the project timeline and have impacts of variations been assessed?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the supplier’s delivery schedule aligns to project delivery schedule; and • Impact and risk assessment of identified variations. | |

7.3.21 Have resource capability and capacity requirements been assessed for production development and business readiness?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability and capacity assessment completed, and resources identified and secured. | |


7.3.22 Are the 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 aligns with demand profile; • Witnessing stand-ups, etc. demonstrate whether everyone who needs to be there attends; • Relevant resources costed into project budget; and • Need to refresh/replace resources considered. | |


7.4 Risk Management

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.4.1 Are risk and issue management plans up-to-date?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Risk register and issue log regularly reviewed, updated and acted on. | |


7.4.2 Have all major risks been resolved?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updated risk and issue management plans and risk register, including risks associated with project resourcing and funding; team competencies; legislation; technical dependencies; users and stakeholders;• Owners of risks/issues assigned; and• Client-side risk transfer plans, where applicable. | |


7.4.3 Will business contingency and continuity arrangements and plans minimise the impact of issues during implementation and rollout?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Business continuity and contingency approach agreed with stakeholders and suppliers;• Business or client continuity and contingency plans being developed;• Supplier's continuity and contingency plans assessed;• Information assurance including risk assessment and management undertaken; and• Information security and cyber security practices and processes considered. | |



7.4.4 Does the contract reflect standard terms and conditions and (where applicable) allocate risks between contracting parties?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracts comply with standard terms and conditions; • Changes to standard terms and conditions assessed for their impact, legality and acceptability; and • Risk allocation proposed by supplier or partner analysed against expectations or the original project rationale. | |


7.4.5 For longer-term service or partnering contracts, have re-competition issues been considered?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for exit strategy, with review points over the life of the contract to update exit arrangements. | |

7.4.6 Does the resource management plan address the risk of staff burn out?



|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures in place to support staff wellbeing • Communication and feedback loops to monitor the team e.g. pulse surveys team building avoidance of multiple requests for work outside of hours or weekend to meet milestones | |

7.4.7 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) assessed against potential system vulnerabilities that may generate the threat/vulnerability pair; • Controls in place to reduce the risk of the threat exploiting the vulnerability; • Likelihood of threat exploiting a related vulnerability considered; and • Severity of impact on the system by an exploited vulnerability assessed. | |


7.4.8 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. | |

7.4.9 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"> Bias Mitigation: Implement regular audits and use diverse datasets to minimize bias in AI systems. Data Privacy and Security: Adopt stringent data protection measures, including encryption, access controls, and regular security assessments. Transparency Initiatives: Develop clear documentation and communication strategies to explain AI decision-making processes to stakeholders. Accountability Frameworks: Establish clear roles and responsibilities for AI governance, including mechanisms for addressing grievances and adverse outcomes. Ethical Oversight: Form ethics committees to continuously review and assess the ethical implications of AI projects. | |

Note when considering a vendor – it will be critically important that the AI Assessment framework principles will be adhered to, and that evidence of this process is during the development and implementation can be independently reviewed. Therefore, any contract or agreement entered should take this into consideration as a material element of the contract.


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 cost within budget; and• Recommendations from earlier gates actioned. | |


7.5.2 What caused any over or under runs?

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



7.5.3 What actions will prevent future deviations?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis and plans documented and continually updated and reviewed. | |


7.5.4 Have all assumptions from previous gates been validated?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All assumptions validated or examined, registered in risk register/issue management log and assessed with suppliers and partners; and• New assumptions documented. | |


7.5.5 Have procurement and technical checks been carried out?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear bid management review and approval processes; • Compliance with the NSW procurement framework; • Evaluation strategy followed; • Delivery agency (or government) approval for technical attributes if appropriate, e.g. CIO or enterprise and application architecture review; and for information security and cyber security if appropriate, e.g. Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) and internal audit; and • Involvement of cyber security stakeholders included where required. | |

7.5.6 Did the project team follow the delivery strategy?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation that the delivery strategy and plan have been followed. | |


7.5.7 Were the documents subject to quality review?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality review documentation. | |


7.5.8 Has the procurement process managed probity?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probity advisor or equivalent sign-off. | |


7.5.9 Does the project align with the NSW Government Sustainability Plan?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of how the project aligns with sustainability plans or policies where applicable. | |



7.5.10 If the project is replacing an existing system or infrastructure does it address NSW e-Waste policies?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of how the project aligns with sustainability plans or policies where applicable. | |



7.5.11 Has time been allowed to fix faults and how will slippage be monitored and managed?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing allowed for defect remediation and refactoring; • Monitoring and controls in place to prioritise defect resolution alongside the development of new functionality; and • Sprint planning covers time to fix defects. | |

7.5.12 Is the budget under control? Is there a risk that a higher spend burn rate is required, e.g. for developers/coders to maintain pace?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial based management data examined; • Regular financial data ideally links to each Sprint cycle; and • Reports considered at program board/steering committees. | |


7.5.13 How has governance and methodology performed? Can they be improved?

|   | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance structure effectiveness reviewed; and • Chosen methodology performing well. | |


7.6 Readiness for next phase: Readiness for go-live

Each numbered item below is an area to be probed.


7.6.1 Is the working relationship likely to succeed?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Realistic assessment of management style/behaviour and reporting arrangements on both sides;• Procedures and responsibilities for contract management defined and agreed;• Where applicable, plans for partnering workshops in place; and• Personnel will be retained from contract award phase into implementation phase. | |


7.6.2 Are all resources and internal funds in place?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget provided;• Staff resourced provided;• Future expenditure included in project budgets;• Authorisation/approval process in place for payments to suppliers;• Clear process for expenditure reporting and reconciliation; and• Insurances established by supplier where required. | |


7.6.3 Are the supplier's project, risk and management plans adequate and realistic?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supplier or partner project plan meets timescales;• Implementation and risk management plans realistic; and• Relevant accreditations or certifications have (or will) be met, e.g. penetration tests for data security, information and cyber security self or independent assessments. | |


7.6.4 Does the client-side plan reflect the supplier's plans, and vice versa?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated project management plan reflects tender proposals; • Defined organisation, personnel and responsibilities for delivery agency (as client); • Supplier personnel cleared to meet project requirements; • Issues resolution process agreed with supplier/partner; and • All plans have been reviewed, agreed and included in the contract. | |



7.6.5 Are the long-term contract administration plan and benefit measurement process complete?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term plan with contract management strategy and a detailed service delivery plan; • Resources, with identified sources; • Benefit measures agreed with supplier/partner (if supplier payments related to benefits delivery); • Analysis of project plan shows that resources are identified, planned and budgeted for and available when required; and • Roles and responsibilities defined. | |



7.6.6 Are mechanisms and processes in place for the next phase?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project plan confirms arrangements for management, monitoring, transition and implementation; and • Any external consultants accountable and committed to successful delivery. | |




7.6.7 Are the service management plan, administration and service level arrangements complete?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|--|--|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented service management strategy and plan; • Defined and agreed service level management, service levels, service quality and measurement; • Responsibilities defined for each party; • Defined and agreed standards for services; and • Defined and agreed monitoring, reporting and review mechanisms. | |


7.6.8 Is the management process for service change complete?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change control procedures (technical and business) defined, agreed and contracted; and • Defined and agreed management process and responsibilities. | |


7.6.9 Is there an acceptance strategy or commissioning strategy, as applicable?

| | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance/commissioning strategy and plan, with fully documented and timetabled decision paths (e.g. for preferred supplier choices); • Decision makers identified and clear on their role and what information will inform their decisions; • Acceptance criteria agreed with supplier; and • Validated acceptance testing plan, including technical and business components. | |


7.6.10 Is there an implementation strategy?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|--|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation strategy and plan, developed with users, stakeholders and client business management; • Where applicable, plans for transition to new ways of working; and • Monitoring and controlling handover roles defined for client and supplier. | |


7.6.11 Are end users adequately prepared for transition?

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

7.6.12 If there are legacy systems, are there plans to transfer data, integrate with them and exit them?

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

7.6.13 Will changes to external dependencies effectively feed into development work?

|  | Evidence expected | Status/Ref |
|---|---|------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated approach to dealing with external dependencies. | |

7.7 Gate 4 Review: Typical project documentation

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

Governance, requirements, policy and resourcing

- Service management arrangements defining how services will be managed, how performance is measured, and service management responsibilities for the client and supplier;
- Full Business Case and benefits plans for each of the bids that are acceptable in principle to confirm the delivery strategy and that the negotiated and agreed solution(s) meet the original criteria;
- Active management of the product backlog and sprint backlog (Agile);
- Conducting sprint planning, review and retrospective meetings (Agile); and
- The agency self-assessment template showing compliance with whole-of-government ICT policies, standards and priorities.

Stakeholder engagement and change management

- Plan for implementing business change and plans for handling future change;
- An updated communications plan; and
- Change management plan.

Quality management

- Information assurance documentation.

Financial Management

- Financial assessment of the proposed respondent; and
- Confirmation of the funds and authority to proceed.

Procurement and commercials

- Tender documents;
- Contract documents;
- Proposal from the preferred respondent;
- Evaluation report that recommends the selected supplier or partner; justifies the selected supplier; details close contenders; and plans for debrief of unsuccessful suppliers; and
- The operational requirement and draft contract.

Risk Management

- Strategies to manage risks and issues, and a risk register showing risks were identified and managed.

Planning and control

- Project management plan;
- Active management of the scrum board/holding stand-ups (Agile);
- Tracking of the sprint burndown chart (Agile);
- Delivery strategy, including a procurement strategy if appropriate;
- Realistic plans from the supplier for development and implementation;
- Outline project plans through to completion and plans for the next phase; and
- An updated project time plan developed with the selected suppliers.

Benefits Management

- The benefit management strategy, benefit management plans and responsibilities for delivery;
- Updated benefits management plan; and
- Updated benefits realisation register.

