



Gateway Review Process Best Practice - **Gateway to success**

Review 1 **Business Justification & Options - Indicative** **Business Case**

Revised – April 2011



Acknowledgement

The information in this workbook is based on material in the Office of Government Commerce (OGC) UK Successful Delivery Toolkit TM and the OGC GatewayTM Review Pack. The Toolkit and Gateway material are Crown Copyright value added products and are developed, owned and published by the OGC.

© Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and Queen's Printer for Scotland.

OGC GatewayTM is a trademark of the Office of Government Commerce.

Published by the State Services Commission
April 2011

ISBN: 978-0-478-36133-9 (Print)
978-0-478-36140-7 (Online)

© Crown copyright 2011

Terms of Use



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 New Zealand licence.

[In essence, you are free to copy and distribute the work (including in other media and formats) for non-commercial purposes, as long as you attribute the work to the Crown, do not adapt the work and abide by the other licence terms.] To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/nz/>. Attribution to the Crown should be in written form and not by reproduction of any such emblem, logo or Coat of Arms.

Further information

New Zealand Gateway Unit

Telephone: (04) 495 6600

E-mail: www.GatewayUnit@ssc.govt.nz

For up to date copies of the workbooks and further information visit:

Website: www.ssc.govt.nz/gateway

Contents

Introduction to the Gateway Process	2
Why getting programmes and projects right matters.....	2
The Gateway Process	2
Value of the Gateway Process	2
Differences between Programmes and Projects	3
Gateway Reviews as part of the assurance framework.....	3
Role of the Senior Responsible Owner	5
Tailoring the Gateway Review	5
Overview of the Gateway Process	6
Gateway Review 1: Overview	7
About this workbook	7
Business justification.....	7
Purposes of the Gateway Review 1	7
1: Policy and business context	9
2: Business Case and stakeholders	11
3: Risk management.....	15
4: Readiness for next phase: Delivery strategy	17
Typical project documentation	20
Supporting guidance	21

Introduction to the Gateway Process

Why getting programmes and projects right matters

Programmes and projects provide an important vehicle for the efficient and timely delivery of government aims. Procurement expenditure through programmes and projects is a significant and increasing proportion of total government expenditure. Good and effective management and control of programmes and projects is therefore essential to the successful delivery of government objectives. The Gateway Process is designed to provide independent guidance to Senior Responsible Owners (SROs), and indirectly to programme and project teams, on how best to ensure that their programmes and projects are successful.

The Gateway Process

The Gateway Review Process examines programmes and projects at key decision points in their lifecycle. It looks ahead to provide assurance that they can progress successfully to the next stage; the Process is recognised as best practice by New Zealand government. Gateway Reviews are applicable to a wide range of programmes and projects, including:

- policy development and implementation
- organisational change and other change initiatives
- acquisition programmes and projects
- property/construction developments
- IT-enabled business change
- procurements using or establishing framework arrangements.

The principles and process in this workbook can also be applied to management of other areas of expenditure in the organisation. The process is mandatory for qualifying procurement, IT-enabled, and construction programmes and projects.

Value of the Gateway Process

Gateway Reviews deliver a ‘peer review’ in which independent practitioners from outside the programme/project use their experience and expertise to examine the progress and likelihood of successful delivery of the programme or project. They are used to provide a valuable additional perspective on the issues facing the internal team, and an external challenge to the robustness of plans and processes.

The Gateway Review Process provides support to SROs in the discharge of their responsibilities to achieve their business aims, by helping the SRO to ensure:

- the best available skills and experience are deployed on the programme or project
- all the stakeholders covered by the programme/project fully understand the programme/project status and the issues involved

- there is assurance that the programme/project can progress to the next stage of development or implementation and that any procurement is well managed to provide value for money on a whole-of-life basis
- achievement of more realistic time and cost targets for programmes and projects
- improvement of knowledge and skills among government staff through participation in Reviews
- provision of advice and guidance to programme and project teams by fellow practitioners.

Differences between Programmes and Projects

Programmes are about managing change with a strategic vision and a routemap of how to get there. They are able to deal with uncertainty about achieving the desired outcomes.

A programme approach should be flexible and capable of accommodating changing circumstances such as opportunities or risks materialising. It co-ordinates delivery of the range of work (including projects) needed to achieve outcomes, and benefits, throughout the life of the programme.

A project has definite start and finish dates, a clearly defined output, a well defined development path, and a defined set of financial and other resources allocated to it; benefits are achieved after the project has finished and the project plans should include activities to plan, measure and assess the benefits achieved by the project.

Programme Reviews are carried out under Gateway Review 0: Strategic assessment. A programme will generally undergo three or more Gateway Reviews 0: an early Review, one or more Reviews at key decision points during the programme, and a final Review at the conclusion of the programme.

Project Reviews are carried out under Gateway Reviews 0 to 5; typically a project will undergo all six of these Reviews during its lifecycle – four before commitment to invest, and two looking at service implementation and confirmation of the operational benefits. Project Reviews may be repeated as necessary depending on the size, scope and complexity of the project. A Review of a project must take into account the programme context within which the project is located, and possible inter-dependencies with other projects in the programme. The review will also indicate how far procurements align with strategic and policy objectives.

Each of these Reviews is described in the appropriate Gateway Review Workbook.

Gateway Reviews as part of the assurance framework

Every Agency will have its own structures and resources for carrying out internal reviews, healthchecks and audits of its activities, including programmes and projects. The Gateway Review Process provides a snapshot view of progress at a point in time and therefore should be seen as complementary to these internal processes and not a replacement for them.

Organisations should have in place an effective framework to provide a suitable level of assurance for their portfolio of programmes and projects. This requires management to map their assurance needs and identify the potential sources for providing them. Agencies are encouraged to ensure adequate and timely co-ordination and sharing of information, including plans, between the various internal review functions.

In addition, SROs should be aware of the extent and limitations of the various review processes. For example, the fact that a Gateway Review has taken place does not replace the need for a full audit opinion on the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance in the audited area.

Further, none of these review processes is a substitute for a rigorous governance framework in the organisation to manage key processes, including business planning, investment appraisal and business case management (including benefits management), programme and project portfolio management, risk management, procurement/acquisition, and service and contract management.

The New Zealand Government's new regime for Capital Asset Management (CAM) will improve the quality of asset management and create value for money gains. The CAM regime includes:

- a formal two-stage Cabinet approval process, which applies to all new capital investment proposals after Budget 2008 with an expected whole-of-life cost greater than \$25 million (inc. GST) that require Cabinet approval (under current rules) or are assessed as high risk based on the New Zealand Gateway™ risk profiling methodology
- a requirement that new, high risk capital expenditure proposals will be subject to an additional layer of project or programme assurance, based on the UK OGC Gateway™ approach, irrespective of the funding source.

In 2007 Cabinet Minute 07 44/1 directed that Gateway be undertaken for projects initiated after 1 January 2008 that:

- Have an expected whole-of-life cost of more than \$25 million – *or* –
- Are assessed as high risk

In 2010 Cabinet Circular CO (10) 2 refined the requirement:

Cabinet has directed that Gateway reviews are mandatory for performed for all projects that are identified as *high risk*. The Cabinet-mandated process for determining whether a project is eligible for Gateway is:

1. Departments must, and Crown agents are expected to, complete an initial Risk Profile Assessment (RPA) for any project that would expose the government to significant fiscal or owner ship risks if it were not delivered within the projected functionality, cost and timelines.
2. Where an RPA produces a Medium or High risk score, it must be submitted to the SSC Gateway Unit for consideration of eligibility for Gateway.

3. The Gateway Unit and other Central Agency groups review the RPA and determine whether the project must be subject to Gateway.
4. Alternatively, a Minister may request that a project be subject to Gateway even if it is not formally identified as high risk.

Role of the Senior Responsible Owner

A Gateway Review is conducted on a confidential basis for the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), who has prime responsibility for initiating the Review. The ownership of the Review Report rests with the SRO, who is accountable for the implementation of the recommended remedial action and the programme/project progression.


The SRO is the individual responsible for ensuring that a programme of change or a project meets its objectives and delivers the projected benefits. The SRO should be the owner of the overall business change that is being supported by the project, and should ensure that the change maintains its business focus, has clear authority and that the context, including risks, is actively managed. This individual must be senior and must take personal responsibility for successful delivery of the project. They should be recognised as the owner throughout the organisation.

Tailoring the Gateway Review

The workbooks published by SSC provide guidance on the structure of each Gateway Review and the areas of investigation to be addressed by the Review Team, together with examples of the evidence which would demonstrate to the Review Team that the project team has taken an adequate approach to the topic.. These topics and the examples of evidence should be regarded as indicative and not prescriptive, within the overall objectives of each review stage. The Review Team should consider whether additional or different topics need to be addressed and the evidence to be sought. Approaches may vary according to the context of the programme or project – for example, IT-enabled business change, property/construction, or policy development/implementation.

Overview of the Gateway Process

The wider context of the Gateway Process



Gateway Review 1: Overview

About this workbook

This workbook supports Gateway Review 1: Business Justification & Options - Indicative Business Case. This review investigates the Indicative (Stage 1) Business Case and preferred way forward to confirm that the project is achievable and likely to deliver what is required.

The Review checks that:

- stakeholders approve the intended benefits from the project
- linkage with programme and organisational objectives is clear
- the optimum balance of cost, benefits and risk has been identified.

Business justification

The project initiation process produces a justification for the project based on business needs and an assessment of the project's likely costs and potential for success. This Gate 1 Review comes while the Indicative Business Case is being prepared and before any development proposal goes before a Project Board, executive authority or similar group for authority to proceed. This review should be carried out when the Indicative (Stage 1) Business Case is close to undergoing final review – that is, when the document is nearing completion but while there is still scope to make changes based on the findings of the Review.

The Review focuses on the project's business justification. It provides assurance that the proposed approach to meeting the business requirement has been adequately researched and can be delivered. It also confirms that the benefits to be delivered from the project have been identified at a high level, and that their achievement will be tracked using a defined measurement approach.

Purposes of the Gateway Review 1

- Confirm that the Indicative (Stage 1) Business Case is robust – that in principle it meets business need, is affordable, achievable, with appropriate options explored and likely to achieve value for money
- Confirm that appropriate expert advice has been obtained as necessary to identify and/or analyse potential options
- Establish that the feasibility study has been completed satisfactorily and that there is a shortlist of options including a preferred way forward, developed in dialogue with the market where appropriate
- Confirm that the market's likely interest has been considered
- Ensure that there is internal and external authority, if required, and support for the project
- Ensure that the major risks have been identified and outline risk management plans have been developed

- Establish that the project is likely to deliver its business goals and that it supports wider business change, where applicable
- Confirm that the scope and requirements specifications are realistic, clear and unambiguous
- Ensure that the full scale, intended outcomes, timescales and impact of relevant external issues have been considered
- Ensure that the desired benefits have been clearly identified at a high level, together with measures of success and a measurement approach
- Ensure that there are plans for the next stage
- Confirm planning assumptions and that the Project Team can deliver the next stage
- Confirm that overarching and internal business and technical strategies have been taken into account
- Establish that quality plans for the project and its deliverables are in place
- Confirm that the project is still aligned with the objectives and deliverables of the programme and/or the organisational business strategy to which it contributes, if appropriate.

1: Policy and business context

AREAS TO PROBE	EVIDENCE EXPECTED
1.1 Are all relevant government initiatives being addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Evidence that the SRO or equivalent is undertaking their responsibilities as required in relevant policy initiatives.
1.2 Does the preferred option meet wider government and organisational policies, strategic objectives, standards and business change programmes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Assessment against list of wider government objectives, standards and business change programmes ■ Assessment against list of current organisational strategy and business objectives and policy initiatives; confirmation of the role of this project in a wider programme or policy initiative ■ Assessment of business justification as stated in the Strategic Assessment or other strategic documents ■ For construction projects, contribution to property/workspace strategy; health and safety, sustainability and design quality are considered ■ Account has been taken of relevant impact assessment and appraisal issues such as Regulatory Impact, Sustainable Development and Environmental Appraisal.
1.3 Is the project aware of the Government standards that might apply to it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Evidence that appropriate standards and Cabinet directives have been considered when assessing the options for delivering the outcomes, e.g. Public Private Partnerships, Shared Services, and other all-of-government initiatives ■ Legislation, policy and regulatory issues taken into account, including Regulatory Impact Assessment if needed ■ For IT-enabled projects - compliance with Department of Internal Affairs e-government frameworks such as e-GIF (see the Supporting documents section for a full list); consideration of information assurance requirements in relation to business objectives ■ Compliance with IT security requirements (GCSB's NZ Information Security Manual) ■ Compliance with relevant legislation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Official Information Act ■ Privacy Act ■ Public Records Act.

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 1.4 Have the internal and external factors affecting the project been identified and assessed? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Assessment of the objectives, timescales and scale of the project■ Assessment of the stability of the current business environment and strategic direction■ Assessment of dependencies (e.g. other programmes and projects) that could affect current priorities■ Assessments of impact on existing physical and technical environment (e.g. brownfield site, current infrastructure and legacy systems)■ Assessment of the skills and knowledge required. |
|---|--|
-

2: Business Case and stakeholders

AREAS TO PROBE	EVIDENCE EXPECTED
<p>2.1 Is there a clear and agreed understanding of business goals and how the project will deliver these?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Business objectives for the project clearly stated and Specific, Measurable, Agreed, Realistic and Timely (SMART), and meet the business needs of the organisation ■ A strategy for achieving business benefits defined and agreed with the stakeholders ■ Total scope, including timescales, documented and agreed with stakeholders (including end-users or their representatives) and technical authorities ■ Scope and requirements specifications are realistic, clear and unambiguous ■ Delivery approach and mechanisms defined and agreed with stakeholders ■ For IT-enabled projects: IT developments defined as component(s) of wider programme of business change/ new services to the citizen ■ Evidence of options reviewed and justification for their selection.
<p>2.2 Have the critical success factors been identified?</p> <p>These are the essential areas of activity that must be performed well if the mission, objectives or goals of the project are to be achieved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The critical success factors for each of the main objectives.
<p>2.3 Can the critical success factors be quantified or measured?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Explanation of how the factors will be measured; identification of baseline measures where appropriate ■ Definition of effective systems for measuring and tracking the realisation of benefits ■ For construction projects, Design Quality Indicators used.

<p>2.4 Have all the likely stakeholders been identified and their needs clearly understood?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Internal and external stakeholders identified and documented ■ Stakeholders' roles and responsibilities, and their potential influence on the project, defined and agreed ■ End-users for the project identified and documented ■ Evidence that the decision-making process is inclusive of all the relevant stakeholders and is both efficient and effective ■ Results of consultations documented as part of project stakeholder engagement/communications strategy ■ If the project traverses organisational boundaries, there are clear governance arrangements to ensure sustainable alignment with the business objectives of all organisations involved.
<p>2.5 Are the external stakeholder issues being addressed? These may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ communications ■ public relations ■ social inclusion (e.g. equality and diversity issues) ■ environmental issues ■ personnel ■ statutory processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Plans for each stakeholder produced showing responsibilities and, if appropriate, role in the project (part of the Strategic Case).
<p>2.6 Do stakeholders support the preferred option? This includes the potential or recommended delivery approach and mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Consultation, involvement, support and endorsement.

2.7 Has the feasibility study examined a wide enough range of options that will meet the business requirement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Options explored for collaboration with other public sector organisations and programmes/projects ■ Where applicable, options have been assessed in accordance with Regulatory Impact Assessments ■ The advantages and disadvantages for each option to determine its potential for meeting the critical success factors ■ Market sounding indicates that suitable solutions can be provided.
2.8 Has a long-list of options been developed and analysed to identify a 'preferred way forward' without restricting choice to a 'preferred option'?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Options appraised in accordance with principles of the Treasury, SSC, OAG and MED best practice and internal guidance, including the 'do nothing' option ■ Options ranked. Examination of all options that are acceptable in principle ■ Clear analysis of indicative whole-life costs for each option.
2.9 How was the robustness of the options tested?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ High level options assessment, focussing on the advantages and disadvantages of each option, the risks and benefits to government, major sensitivities. ■ This assessment reflected in the risks list ■ Funding options (Not part of BBC but could/should be covered in Action 7).
2.10 Is the project likely to be attractive to the market? (part of the Commercial Case)	<p>(High level/outline only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Market sounding taken, including an examination of recent similar procurements by others, and indication of suitable suppliers available to deliver requirements ■ There is adequate capacity, capability and competitive interest in the market to meet the requirement ■ Early supply-side involvement to help determine and validate what outputs and outcomes are sought for the project, including proof of concept exercises ■ Senior management are sufficiently engaged with the industry to be able to assess supply-side risks.

2.11 Have contract management issues been considered? (part of the Commercial Case)	<p>(High level/outline only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Requirements for ‘intelligent customer’ capability considered ■ Arrangements for managing single/multiple suppliers considered ■ Where multiple suppliers are likely to be appointed, high-level plans for managing the interfaces ■ Appropriate relationship determined and hence optimum scale of contract(s) appropriately considered.
2.12 Is the Indicative Business Case complete? (should be 80-90% complete at the time of the review – structurally complete, some sections may be unfinished but direction should be clear)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Documentary evidence that the preferred way forward has been selected from an appropriately wide range, has been rigorously assessed and satisfies the project objectives (including contribution to the business strategy), is likely to offer value for money, is affordable and achievable ■ Stakeholder views (including the general public, if appropriate) are adequately represented ■ Objectives are clearly defined and expectations are realistic ■ Evidence that appropriate sources of expert advice have been consulted ■ Evidence that it is possible to align the delivery strategy with the overall organisational goal ■ Evidence that indicative scope, costs, benefits and risks been adequately assessed ■ Evidence that technical and acquisition options have been assessed and compared in a balanced manner.

3: Risk management

AREAS TO PROBE	EVIDENCE EXPECTED
3.1 Are there processes to identify, assess, allocate, manage and monitor current, anticipated and emerging risks and issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ List of risks and key issues, categorised as strategic, political/reputational, legislative, implementation and operational service risks (including business, technical, financial and commercial/contractual risks within these categories, as appropriate). In addition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ for IT-enabled projects, information security risks; for e-government, risks relating to poor take-up ■ for construction projects, risks relating to health and safety ■ for policy projects, Regulatory Impact Assessment carried out ■ Risk management strategy developed in accordance with best practice ■ Individual with responsibility for managing risk across the project, mitigation options and contingency plans ■ Defined roles, responsibilities and processes for managing issues and risk across the project, with clearly defined routes for bringing issues and risks to the attention of senior management.
3.2 Have the risks for each of the options been evaluated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Current, emerging and anticipated risks classified by probability, impact, ownership, effect on the project and counter-measure, contingency and/or business continuity.
3.3 Have the risks for the preferred option been fully assessed?*part of the Management Case, but should be included in the Economic Case options analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Involvement of senior stakeholders in assessing strategic risks ■ Assessment of risk, costs and benefits to demonstrate appropriate balance of risk and reward in the preferred option, demonstrating planned risk-taking and support for innovation where appropriate ■ Plans for managing and allocating through the contract(s) the risks associated with the preferred option.
3.4 Have the ‘worst case’ implications associated with these risks been assessed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Risks financially assessed and risk allocation estimated.

3.5 Are the costs and time implications of managing the risks included in the cost and time estimate or treated as a separate risk allocation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Costs and time for managing risks separately identified ■ Costs and time estimated for risk counter-measures and, where appropriate, contingency and business continuity plans ■ Where risks cannot be reduced, the costs of managing these risks separately identified and included as a risk allocation provision ■ Analysis undertaken of the effects of slippage in time, cost, scope or quality ■ For construction projects, decisions on how residual risks are being managed.
3.6 Has the project assessed whether it is breaking new ground in any areas? (part of the Commercial Case)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Examination of leading-edge projects to assess this project's impact on the business, stakeholders and end-users ■ Evidence of similar projects or activities from which lessons may be drawn ■ Innovative solutions assessed by professional advisors ■ Consultation with the market to help refine approach, identify risks and ways in which risks might be mitigated ■ Defined approach to management of change in the affected organisations; sufficient account has been taken of the current organisational culture, and leadership and organisational capability.
3.7 Should the project be broken down into a series of small steps? (recommended for IT-enabled projects and for complex projects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Documentation of the chosen approach and justification for taking that decision ■ Business Case details any phased delivery or expected improvements over time.

4: Readiness for next phase: Delivery strategy

AREAS TO PROBE	EVIDENCE EXPECTED
4.1 Is there an overall project structure for the Delivery strategy phase? (part of the Management Case)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A definition of the project approach to be adopted ■ Assessment of its suitability.
4.2 Is there a realistic plan to reach Gateway Review 2: Delivery Strategy - Detailed Business Case?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Objectives, planning assumptions, constraints, activities, quality plans, deliverables and milestones defined and agreed for the next phase, as well as for the remaining phases ■ Assessment of the validity of current assumptions ■ Evidence that the project addresses both short-term and long-term business requirements ■ Evidence that suitable solutions are available from the market and that it has sufficient capacity ■ For projects with a design phase, such as construction projects, evidence that the project timescale allows enough time for the development of the required design quality ■ For IT-enabled projects, evidence of consideration of a proof of concept stage.
4.3 Have requirements for external specialist advice been determined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Requirements for specialist expertise considered and resourced ■ External advice being used appropriately.
4.4 Are internal Project Team skills adequate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Resource Plan for internal staff. Identification of skills required for next phase of the project. Skills appraisal and plans for addressing shortfalls ■ Training assessment and plans, training sources ■ Appropriate allocation of key project roles between internal staff and consultants or contractors ■ Project Team has requisite skills or access to specialist expertise.

4.5 Is the time plan for the next stage realistic? Does it take into account any statutory lead times?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Time plan identifies statutory lead times and realistic assessment of time needed for pre-procurement activities, if appropriate ■ Senior management commitment to the time plan ■ Time plan for delivery (including procurement if appropriate) justified and not longer than necessary.
4.6 Is there a clearly defined project organisation with agreed roles and responsibilities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Project organisation and methodology ■ Governance/reporting arrangements ■ Named individuals in key positions, with appropriate skills, experience and status (especially appropriate for SRO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ SRO ■ project manager ■ project sponsor and/or project director ■ stakeholder representation ■ Project Board or project steering group ■ for construction projects, there should also be a design champion responsibility; a project sponsor and independent client adviser(s) to support the SRO (Note: a project manager may not necessarily be required) ■ for IT-enabled projects, chief information officer or equivalent role, an IT/information security manager/ accreditor to support the SRO ■ for collaborative projects, a single SRO assigned and senior representatives from each collaborating organisation ■ If the project traverses organisational boundaries, clear governance arrangements to ensure sustainable alignment of the business objectives of all organisations involved, with clear lines of accountability and ownership.

4.7 Are there the necessary funds to reach a Gateway Review 2: Delivery Strategy - Detailed Business Case?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Budget provision made ■ Financial controls for expenditure in place on project.
4.8 How have re-competition issues been addressed with incumbent suppliers, if relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Arrangements in place to provide continuity of service up to transition to new supplier ■ Agreements with current suppliers on how they will support due diligence during procurement phase ■ Clear separation of roles where incumbent supplier is bidding for replacement contract ■ Consideration of workforce issues, where applicable.

Typical project documentation

The areas of investigation, together with examples of evidence, should be available before the Gateway Review starts. The information is likely to be found in the documents suggested below, but may be located in other programme or project documents or elsewhere in the organisation's documentation system:

- Project Brief with the project's scope and the need for change
- project initiation document or equivalent (e.g. Project Charter)
- quality management strategy
- the project approach, including how to deliver the intended outcome
- a strategy outlining the approach to business change (including staff training, new facilities, etc. as appropriate)
- an initial assessment of current and proposed physical and technical environment (e.g. IT infrastructure, workspace facilities)
- cost report on the project to date, against budget
- draft high-level definition of the business requirements and total scope of change
- definition of how to judge the project's success
- high-level benefits management plan
- for policy projects: Regulatory Impact Assessment
- the 80-90% complete Indicative (Stage 1) Business Case addressing business need, affordability, achievability, value for money and range of options estimating the project's cost and benefits; including some form of feasibility study, sensitivity analysis and market sounding
- a communications strategy to keep stakeholders informed of the project's progress
- Risk Register and Issues Register,
- Risk Management Strategy or plan (may be part of the PID or Project Management Plan)
- a high-level activity, time and resource plan for the whole project
- plans to move the project through the next stage on to Gateway Review 2: Detailed Business Case
- funds to cover all work to Gateway Review 2: Detailed Business Case
- Independent Quality Assurance (IQA) reports
- the authority and approval to proceed
- how performance is to be reported and monitored
- project organisation – key roles and governance/reporting arrangements
- for construction projects, Design Quality Indicators
- for IT-enabled projects, business impacts identified.

Supporting guidance

- Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet: defining document for the Gateway review process:
 - Cabinet Circular CO (10) 2: www.dpmc.govt.nz/cabinet/circulars/co10/2.html
- New Zealand State Services Commission:
 - Gateway process: - search for the following documents in www.ssc.govt.nz/gatewayprocess:
 - The Gateway Process: A Manager's Checklist
Provides a set of key questions that SROs should consider to determine the progress of their programme or project and the potential for success.
 - Gateway review workbooks
A workbook for each Gateway review provides detailed questions to support each Review.
 - Guidelines for Managing and Monitoring Major IT Projects: www.ssc.govt.nz/ITguidelines
- New Zealand Treasury:
 - Better Business Cases guidance
www.infrastructure.govt.nz/publications/betterbusinesscases
 - Cost Benefit Analysis primer:
www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/guidance/planning/costbenefitanalysis
 - Treasury Capital Asset management framework: <https://psi.govt.nz/cam/default.aspx>
 - Guidance for Public-Private Partnerships:
www.infrastructure.govt.nz/publications/pppguidance
- New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development (MED); search for the following documents in www.med.govt.nz:
 - Annual Procurement Plan (APP) template (part of Rules; also to give prior warning to market)
 - Government Procurement Advisory Notes
 - Mandatory Rules for Procurement
 - Policy Guide for Purchasers
 - Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA)
 - Strategic Procurement Outlook template (gives prior warning to market)
- Department of Internal Affairs
 - **igovt services** – Public Service departments, the New Zealand Police, the New Zealand Defence Force, the Parliamentary Counsel Office, the New Zealand Security Intelligence Service and Crown agents all need to be aware of directions relating to certain igovt services.

All these agencies have been directed, either by Cabinet or, in the case of Crown agents, by a whole of government direction under the Crown Entities Act, to consult with the Department of Internal Affairs before developing a proposal to invest in or build online

credential management or identity verification capability as an alternative to using all-of-government shared authentication services (the igovt logon service and the igovt identity verification service).

- Directions and Priorities for Government ICT: www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/About-us-Our-Organisation-Directions-and-Priorities-for-Government-ICT?OpenDocument
 - Identity space: www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Services-Identity-Verification-Service-Government-Directions-Regarding-igovt-Services?OpenDocument
 - Enterprise Architecture: www.e.govt.nz/enterprise-architecture
 - NZGOAL: www.e.govt.nz/policy/nzgoal
 - Standards space: www.e.govt.nz/standards/e-gif-3.3/standards
 - e-GIF remains current and includes web standards and authentication. FEA Principles remain current
 - GEA-NZ – Government Enterprise Architecture – NZ is under development by DIA and will incorporate many of these requirements and standards.
- New Zealand Office of the Controller and Auditor-General; search for the following documents in www.oag.govt.nz/reports
 - Achieving public sector outcomes with private sector partners (2006)
 - Managing conflicts of interest: Guidance for public entities (2007)
 - Procurement guidelines for Public Entities (2008)
 - Public Sector purchases, grants and gifts: Managing funding arrangements with external parties (2008)
 - UK Office of Government Commerce OGC is now part of the new Efficiency and Reform Group within the Cabinet Office but the OGC website is still active (www.ogc.gov.uk). Search for the following on this website or at www.best-management-practice.com
 - Managing successful projects with Prince2
 - Managing successful programmes
 - Management of Risk
 - Achieving Excellence in Construction
 - Successful Delivery Toolkit
 - ITIL (Information Technology Infrastructure Library)
 - Risk management principles and guidelines. Australian/New Zealand Standard 2009, AS/NZS 31000:2009
 - www.standards.co.nz/default.htm
 - www.safetyrisk.com.au/2010/05/03/new-risk-management-standard-asnzs-iso-31000/