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**About this report**

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programme’s/project's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over the review period, and is delivered to the SRO immediately at the conclusion of the review.

**This assurance review was arranged and managed by:**

National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority

HM Treasury Building

1 Horse Guards Road

London

SW1A 2HQ

**Gateway helpdesk:** gateway.helpdesk@NISTA.gov.uk

More information about the National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority and guidance for

central government bodies on the requirements for integrated assurance and approvals is available from:

https://www.gov.uk/government/ [National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-infrastructure-and-service-transformation-authority)

# Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)

See Annex A for SGA criteria and definition

Brief summary e.g. 2 sentences in support of the review rating, followed by an executive summary. As a guide, a maximum of 500 words is suggested, though for more complex projects and programmes please do not exceed 1000 words. Where the terms of reference for this review have been specifically drafted, these should be included at Annex B and the Background to the Project/Programme (completed by the Project/Programme) is at Annex C.

**All Gate Review Guidance and Workbooks can be found** [**here**](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/infrastructure-and-projects-authority-assurance-review-toolkit)**.**

|  |
| --- |
| Delivery Confidence Assessment |
| [Insert status: Red, Amber, Green, etc.] |
| *Insert a short summary in support of the SGA rating - descriptions at Annex A.*  [insert rating] because  [insert short, concise reasoning for this Delivery Confidence Assessment rating.]  *Insert an executive summary. The summary should be an overview of the key issues that the Review Team considers have the greatest impact on Delivery Confidence.*  Where there are one or more risks with high impact or urgency or both, the Review Team will need to consider the extent to which these risks are formally accepted by the programme/Project (with agreement at the appropriate level) or not being appropriately managed. If the risks have not been accepted and/or the review team believes the risk(s) cannot be managed or mitigated, then this may lead to a Red or Amber/Red rating.  The detailed findings and recommendations should be included in the body of the report. |

# 

# Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations

Please record the recommendations made by the review team and show the key risks and issues that they address. Recommendations should be listed in priority order of impact.

*Refer to Annex F for a breakdown of the recommendation classifications and the definitions for Critical, Essential and Recommended.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Priority | Recommendation | Risk\* and Issue Identified with Evidence | Classification  Insert Reference [insert the classification reference from Annex F] | Critical, Essential, Recommended |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |

*\*Risk denotes risks, issues, concerns and key dependencies*

[Add or delete rows as required]

All recommendations should be categorised as Critical, Essential or Recommended:

* **Critical (Do Now)**: To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately.
* **Essential (Do By)**: To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future. *[Note to review teams – whenever possible Essential risk based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]*
* **Recommended**: The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.*[Note to review teams – if possible Recommended risk based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]*

# Blockers to delivery

Please record critical, high impact blockers that are outside the project/programme’s control that will severely impact Time, Cost, and Quality and Scope e.g. lack of clarity around cross-government policy decisions and objectives or a lack of meaningful collaboration with key stakeholders including other departments and DA’s. Please record at what level the blocker sits and a recommended route for escalation. Where possible, indicate timescales or any critical date by when the blocker needs to be resolved. **Example:** The project does not have full funding in place, meaning that there are limited options available to the SRO, to adjust the timing and therefore payment for the project as the plan matures.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref No: | Blocker | Describe specific nature of blocker [include reasoning why this cannot be resolved and provide a suggested escalation route] | Consequence if not resolved  [include any critical path or key dates by which blocker MUST be resolved in order to manage or reduce impact] |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |

[Add or delete rows as required]

# Comments from the SRO

|  |
| --- |
| SRO Comments |
| [Insert comments here] |

# Review Team findings and recommendations

Insert findings – brief paragraphs setting out key findings relating to key risks and blockers identified during this review, and how they may impact time, cost, quality, scope and benefits. This should include a clear summary of the risk/blocker, the cause, summary of evidence, impact, and clear, succinct recommendations relating to individual findings.

**1.**

**2.**

**3. etc**

# Areas of good practice

In addition to sharing findings and recommendations, we suggest you add specific detail on what is being delivered successfully and the areas that you commend the team on. Please add detail to the below table where delivery is successfully taking place.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Commending delivery of [insert the classification reference from Annex F] | Describe specific details of successful delivery [include examples where possible] |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[Add or delete rows as required]

# Acknowledgement

|  |
| --- |
| Review Team Acknowledgement |
| [Insert a note of thanks to the SRO and the client team e.g. ‘The Review Team would like to thank the Project/Programme Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team’s understanding of the Programme and the outcome of this review.’] |

# Next Assurance Review

|  |
| --- |
| Next Assurance Review |
| [Insert suggested next review type, timing, areas to be covered and/or milestone(s) to be achieved.] |

# Additional Information for the MPRG panel or Treasury Approval Point (TAP)

# [Insert the issues that the MPRG/TAP should focus on and, for each issue, the relevant evidence and the suggested lines of enquiry – this should ideally be no more than six issues]

# 1. Issue

# [Insert summary of issue]

# Evidence and findings

# Insert summary of evidence and findings

# Suggested lines of enquiry

# Insert list of suggested lines of enquiry

# 2. Issue

# [Insert summary of issue]

# Evidence and findings

# Insert summary of evidence and findings

# Suggested lines of enquiry

# Insert list of suggested lines of enquiry

# 3. Issue

# [Insert summary of issue]

# Evidence and findings

# Insert summary of evidence and findings

# Suggested lines of enquiry

# Insert list of suggested lines of enquiry

# 

# ANNEX A – Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) Descriptions

From 1 April 2021, the NISTA has moved to a 3 tier SGA RAG status (Red, Amber, Green). The SGA will be based on the following definitions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Colour | Criteria Description |
| Green | Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery.  *Recommendation: The programme/project is ready to proceed to the next stage*. |
| Amber | Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and, if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun.  *Recommendation: This programme/project can proceed to the next stage with conditions but the programme/project must report back to the NISTA and HMT on the satisfaction of each time bound condition within an agreed timeframe.* |
| Red | Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme/project may need re-baselining and/or its overall viability re-assessed.  *Recommendation: This programme/project should not proceed to the next phase until these major issues are managed to an acceptable level of risk and the viability of the project/programme has been re-confirmed.* |

# 

# ANNEX B - Terms of Reference for Hybrid Review

|  |
| --- |
| This is a Gate 0/1/2/3/4/5/ Review.  The standard terms of reference for all Guidance and Workbooks can be found [here](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/infrastructure-and-projects-authority-assurance-review-toolkit) and does not need to be included within the body of the report UNLESS any amendments have been made to the original Terms of Reference.    If, however, this review is based on a hybrid of two stage gates i.e. 0/1, then the bespoke terms of reference should be detailed here. |

# 

# ANNEX C - Background

**[To be Completed by the Project Team in advance of the Planning Meeting.]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Answer |
| Describe the aims of the project/ programme | [Insert 2/3 short paragraphs on the key aims of the project/programme. Consider, for example, the deficiency, need, issue, political imperative or opportunity that instigated the programme.] |
| Reasons for the project/ programme’s existence, by type and description | [Insert 2/3 short paragraphs on why the project/programme came into existence and/or is necessary. Consider, for example, the deficiency, need, issue, political imperative or opportunity that instigated the programme.] |
| The impact if the project/programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on civilians/citizens: | [Insert a statement that describes the impact if the project/programme fails to deliver its benefits.] |
| Project/programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies: | [Insert a statement that describes where or how the project/programme links to departmental or government strategy/policies e.g. net zero strategy, carbon emission, etc.] |
| Projects/programme interdependencies [if applicable]: | [Insert interdependencies for the project/programme] |
| Has the SRO’s Osmotherley letter (letter of appointment) been approved at the appropriate levels? | Yes / No [delete as appropriate].  [if no, please insert reasoning] |
| The procurement / delivery status: | [Have any contractual, commercial and procurement elements been developed in accordance with best practice; taking expert advice as necessary to ensure they are robust and appropriate for the full project/programme life cycle.] |
| Funding / Business Case: | [Insert a statement providing details of whether the project is funded for its current phase]  [State whether the strategic/outline or full business case has been approved and by whom.] |
| Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP): | [Insert a statement providing details of whether an IAAP is in place and being used. If the IAAP is not in place, agree and include a date by when the IAAP will be received.] |
| Programme/Project plan: | Does the project / programme have an appropriate plan in place?    Yes / No [delete as appropriate].  Has the plan been baselined? Please include who signed it off etc.  Yes / No [delete as appropriate].  [If the programme/project plan is not in place, agree and include a date by when the project plan will be received.] |
| Current position regarding previous NISTA assurance reviews: | [Insert a statement that describes which assurance reviews have already taken place on the programme.]  [State whether recommendations of any earlier assurance reviews of the programme have not been implemented and comment on the justification for any alternative course of action].  [State whether any risks identified during this review have been raised in previous reviews]  A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous assurance review can be found in Annex D. |

# ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Progress Against Previous Review | | | |
| Previous Review Date: [Insert dates dd/mm/yyyy] | | | |
| Priority | Summary of risks, issues and related recommendations from the original recommendation | Critical/  Essential/  Recommended | Current status - has the risk / issue been mitigated |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

[Add or delete rows as required]

# ANNEX E – List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Organisation and role |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

[Add or delete rows as required]

# ANNEX F – Recommendation Classifications and Priority Order

There are 13 classifications in the classification set; Review Teams are asked to record the classification reference number of each recommendation as per the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Classification | Definition |
| 1 | Governance | Recommendations related to the oversight, structure and decision making of a project/ programme. This theme also includes recommendations relating to alignment with pan-government priorities, strategies and controls. |
|
|
| 2 | Stakeholder Management | Recommendations related to relationships with all parties with an interest in the outcome of the project/programme, whether internal to the agency, internal to government or external. |
|
|
| 3 | Programme and Project Management | Recommendations related to all aspects of project, programme and portfolio management, but excludes recommendations on Risk, Issues and Dependency Management (Theme 9) and Resource Management (Theme 10) |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 4 | Change Management & Transition | Recommendations related to the Management of Business Change – all the work required with and in the business and with the customer to make ready for the initiative, in terms of changes to business processes including: business continuity planning, changes to work processes and resourcing, changes to organisational structures and staffing to support transformational or process changes to business delivery to ensure a smooth transition to BAU It does not include Technology Readiness for Service (Theme 12). |
|
|
|
| 5 | Financial Planning and Management | Recommendations related to financial planning, organising, directing and controlling of financial activities. |
| 6 | Benefits Management & Realisation | Recommendations related to the identification, ownership, measurement and realisation of benefits and dis-benefits. Benefits can be either financial or non-financial. |
| 7 | Commercial Strategy & Management | Recommendations related to the end-to-end procurement process including: Procurement strategy and planning, Approaches to the market, Contract negotiation and Contract management. |
|
|
| 8 | Context, Aim & Scope | Recommendations that are aimed at the clarity of the change to be implemented. It covers alignment to vision, strategy and policy; the purpose, objectives, justification and description of the change; and the determination of success and the necessary environment to ensure success. |
|
|
|
|
| 9 | Risk, Issues & Dependency Management | Recommendations related to the identification, analysis, impact assessment, response and the on-going review and management of Risks, Issues and Dependencies (i.e. outputs that are required by a project to succeed, but which will be delivered by parties not under the direct control of the project). |
|
|
| 10 | Resource & Skills Management | Recommendations related to all aspects of the identification, supply, optimisation, prioritisation and maintenance of resources and appropriate skills. |
|
|
|
|
| 11 | Knowledge Management | Recommendations related to the process of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organizational knowledge. It includes sharing knowledge and experiences or Lessons Learnt. |
|
| 12 | Technology | Recommendations related to all technology issues, including the alignment of the technology solution to the technology and business strategy, the integration of one or more technology solutions,the operational readiness of the solution (including testing of the solution), and all aspects of security relating to the technology solution. |
|
|
|
| 13 | Other | To be used only when other classifications do not apply. |

Each risk-based recommendation will be recorded as Critical / Essential or Recommended:

* **Critical (Do Now):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately.
* **Essential (Do By):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future. [Note to review teams – whenever possible Essential risk-based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]
* **Recommended:** The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation. [Note to review teams – if possible Recommended risk-based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]