



National Infrastructure
& Service Transformation
Authority

International Gate 2 Review: Delivery Strategy

August 2026



This Guidance was produced by the United Kingdom's National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority.

It is for international use only. The views herein are not and should not be taken to be applicable to the UK or representative of UK domestic policy. Overseas use should always be in conjunction with relevant local law and policy.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/> National Infrastructure and Service Transformation Authority – GOV.UK

© Crown copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v 3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk

Contents

Gate 2 Review: About this Gate Review Workbook	4
Gate 2 Review: Overview	4
Purpose of the Gate 2 Review	4
Assessment of the Business Case	6
1. <i>Strategic Case</i>	6
2. <i>Economic Case</i>	6
3. <i>Commercial Questions</i>	8
4. <i>Financial Questions</i>	9
5. <i>Management Questions</i>	10
Glossary	14
Report criteria – Lines of enquiry	17

Gate 2 Review: About this Gate Review Workbook

Gate 2 Review: Overview

This Gate Review Workbook explains how to conduct the Gate 2 Review: Delivery Strategy and should be read together with the Guidance to Conducting Gateway Reviews. This is the second of the five standard gate reviews.

Gate 2 examines the Intermediate Business Case (IBC) and tests whether the project has developed a clear, feasible and affordable delivery strategy. The review should be undertaken before the IBC is submitted to the Project Board for approval and is intended to help the Board decide whether the project is ready to go to market. It is a particularly important Gate Review since it determines if the project is in a fit state to be procured in the market. It would be damaging to a government's reputation if it were subsequently to reverse its decision and stop the project from proceeding; therefore, this should be viewed as a critical stop/go point for a project.

Set out below are a number of criteria or "Lines of Enquiry" which should be used to explore issues in any assurance interview or Business Case review. It is not necessary to explore all of these Lines of Enquiry at interview, especially if the matter appears to have been dealt with in the relevant Business Case; the Review Team should use its discretion to decide what issues to concentrate on, bearing in mind (a) that Interviews should last no more than 45 minutes and (b) the Report Criteria it should use in writing the Report as listed at the end of this Workbook..

Purpose of the Gate 2 Review

Gate 2 focuses on whether the project has moved convincingly from early justification into a fully defined concept with a credible strategy for delivery. The Review checks that:

- the preferred option has been selected from the shortlist and is fully reflected in the business case;
- the scope of the project is now fixed and clearly described;
- the Intermediate Business Case is complete, coherent and based on sufficient analysis;
- the project's objectives and expected outputs remain aligned with the wider programme or organisational goals;
- the proposed delivery strategy is robust and appropriate for the nature, scale and complexity of the project;
- the project plan through to completion is realistic, including the intended commercial and contract management approach (where applicable);
- financial controls, cost estimates, affordability analysis and funding plans are sufficiently mature for this stage;
- the project has identified the resources, skills and capability required for the next stages, and has plans in place to secure them;
- risks, issues and dependencies have been updated since Gate 1, and management plans are in place and will be shared with delivery partners when appropriate;
- appropriate performance measures, quality management processes and assurance activities are planned;
- key stakeholders remain supportive and early engagement or market facing activity has been undertaken where relevant;
- the project has assessed market conditions and supplier capability, and - where procurement is planned - is preparing an approach that should attract a competitive and credible response; and
- the delivery approach and mechanisms remain appropriate and manageable, including compliance with relevant technical, environmental, security, safety and sustainability expectations for the sector.

International Gate 2 Review: Delivery Strategy

The Review concludes with an assessment of whether the proposed delivery strategy is viable and whether the project is ready to proceed, based on its current prospects of being delivered to time, cost and quality.

Assessment of the Business Case

1. Strategic Case

17. Reconsider the Strategic Case and reconfirm the strategic need

1.1 Strategic – Has the Strategic Case been reviewed and updated since the Early Business Case (EBC) to reconfirm the strategic need, and to reflect any changes to objectives, assumptions, dependencies or strategic-level risks?

Evidence:

- Confirmation that the project continues to address the agreed strategic needs and organisational or programme priorities.
- Confirmation that the project's objectives and intended outputs remain valid and aligned.
- Where applicable, updates to key assumptions and dependencies that influence the strategic need or delivery.
- Confirmation that strategic-level risks identified at EBC have been reviewed and updated.
- Identification of any new strategic risks emerging from further analysis or external developments.
- Completion of the EBC → IBC change log, clearly setting out how the Strategic Case was presented in the EBC, the reasons for any change, and how it is now presented in the IBC.

2. Economic Case

18. Prepare the economic analysis for short-list options

2.1 Economic – Has the project updated the shortlist and explained any changes since the Early Business Case?

Evidence:

- Summary of any changes to the shortlist since EBC and reasons for these changes.
- Updated assumptions, data sources, uncertainties or limitations influencing shortlisted options, including with reference to the ESIA studies prepared during and since EBC

2.2 Economic – Has the project calculated the public value of each short-listed option on a quantitative basis to come up with an overall ranking of the options? This must be based on the economic cost, benefit and risk of each shortlisted option in accordance with applicable principles of economic evaluation?

Evidence:

- Updated quantified economic benefits for each option (with discounting and optimism-bias adjustments).
- Updated economic costs for each option (with discounting and optimism-bias adjustments).
- Risk-cost estimates for each option based on proportionate quantitative analysis.
- All relevant environmental and social costs, benefits and risks been included in the analysis (refer to ESIA related studies undertaken during and since EBC).
- Clear explanation of assumptions, optimism-bias rates, and data limitations.
- If the leading option is a PPP, evidence that a “public sector comparator” financial model has been created.

19. Undertake qualitative benefits & risk analysis

2.3 Economic – Has the project calculated the benefit-cost ratio of each option and considered whether this should affect the overall ranking of each option?

Evidence:

- Public Value calculations for each option.
- Benefit-cost ratios for each option
- Explanation of whether the BCR of any option should affect its overall ranking

2.4 Economic – Has the project assessed qualitative benefits and risks for each option?

Evidence:

- Qualitative benefits (including social, environmental and distributional impacts).
- Qualitative risks and disbenefits (including environmental and social impacts).
- Explanation of whether any qualitative findings has caused adjustment to the relative ranking of options, and why

2.5 Economic – Has the project presented a transparent comparison of all options and explained the ranking?

Evidence:

- Combined comparison table showing:
 - Public Value
 - Benefit cost ratio
 - Qualitative benefits
 - Qualitative risks
 - Overall ranking
- Clear explanation of the decision-making process and the reasons for the ranking.

20. Select preferred option and undertake sensitivity analysis

2.6 Economic – Is the preferred option clearly justified and has appropriate sensitivity testing been undertaken?

Evidence:

- Clear rationale for selecting the preferred option.
- Sensitivity tests on key variables (costs, benefits, risks, demand, etc.).
- Explanation of how sensitivity results affect value for money and robustness.

21. Review ESIA, technical and other studies

2.7 Economic – Has the project reviewed environmental, climate/carbon and social impact scoping, assessments and/or other technical studies, and used the findings to refine the appraisal and preferred option?

- Evidence: Quality assurance/ review of ESIA (or equivalent) and findings for each shortlisted option, covering material environmental, climate, carbon and social impacts.
- If required, has national geographical distribution analysis been conducted.

- Evidence that ESIA findings relating to natural capital, biodiversity, ecosystems, land/soil, air quality and water bodies have been considered in refining the appraisal and preferred option.
- Evidence that relevant environmental and biodiversity frameworks (e.g., Convention on Biological Diversity, Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, national biodiversity strategies or action plans) have been recognised when reviewing impacts.
- Identification of opportunities for biodiversity or nature-positive enhancements, where proportionate to the project's scale and context.
- Consideration of wider sustainability goals, including where relevant contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Explanation of how ESIA-related risks, constraints or opportunities influenced option development or selection of the preferred option.
- Identification of additional environmental, climate, social or technical studies required for the Full Business Case.
- Evidence that an Environmental and Social Management Plan has been developed for the preferred option.

3. Commercial Questions

22. Develop a contractual structure for the preferred option; allocate risk

3.1 Commercial – Has a contractual structure for the preferred option been developed, and are proposed risk allocations defined?

Evidence:

- A high-level contractual structure has been produced for the preferred option, setting out proposed contract form, boundaries of responsibility and commercial interfaces.
- Key commercial risks have been captured in the risk register, with clear proposed risk ownership (client/supplier) and rationale for allocation.
- Risk allocation reflects the delivery model selected earlier in the Business Case and is proportionate to market capability.

23. Draft project specification and Heads of Terms

3.2 Commercial – Has a draft project specification and Heads of Terms been prepared?

Evidence:

- Draft output-based specification describing required outcomes and performance expectations.
- Draft Heads of Terms identifying major commercial positions, including scope intent, payment/performance direction, core obligations, and expected contract governance.
- Requirements reflect the strategic objectives and intended benefits set out in earlier cases.

24. Undertake market engagement

3.3 Commercial – Has market engagement been undertaken to validate deliverability, capability and commercial approach?

Evidence:

- Market sounding has been completed, providing insight into capacity, capability, delivery constraints and potential interest.
- Feedback from industry has been incorporated into planning, including procurement packaging, timescales, and risk allocation considerations.
- Evidence that the proposed approach is deliverable and likely to attract competitive responses.

25. Draft procurement plan and engage with MDBs (if applicable)

3.4 Commercial – Has a draft procurement plan been produced, and MDBs engaged where applicable?

Evidence:

- A draft procurement plan is in place, setting out the proposed procurement route, timetable, governance arrangements and dependencies.
- The selected procurement route is justified with reference to market capability, project complexity and the contractual structure identified above.
- Where multilateral development bank (MDB) involvement is relevant, early engagement has occurred to ensure alignment with their funding and procurement requirements¹.

4. Financial Questions

26. Confirm financing sources

4.1 Financial – Have financing sources been confirmed?

Evidence:

- Identification of funding and finance sources, including any credit-enhancement, risk-mitigation or hedging products available to support project financing.
- A confirmed list of potential sources of finance is in place, supported by up-to-date funding analysis and consistent with updates since the Early Business Case.
- Letters of support or written confirmations from internal finance functions, external funders or other stakeholders indicating the feasibility of raising required finance.
- A summary showing how estimated whole-life costs relate to available funding, demonstrating whether finance can be secured.
- A summary of risks and issues affecting the project's ability to secure finance, including factors that may affect feasibility.
- Optimism bias has been applied to relevant cost components, ensuring funding requirements reflect uncertainty at this stage.
- Where funding risks cannot be reduced, these have been costed separately as part of a risk allocation provision, clearly identifying the financial implications of unresolved funding issues.
- Inclusion of appropriate contingency allowances consistent with the level of definition at this stage.
- High-level testing of macroeconomic and fiscal sustainability to confirm the project remains feasible within expected fiscal constraints.

¹ In recent years, climate finance investors and lenders have paid increasing consideration to social impacts to local communities when designing and delivering infrastructure projects. Leading investors have enhanced their social safeguards/risks management policies and requirements and many have taken further actions (e.g. more favourable terms) linked to supporting social inclusion and empowerment of local communities.

27. Build financial model

4.2 Financial – Has the financial model been built and does it capture the required costs, assumptions and sensitivities?

Evidence:

- Evidence that the financial model brings together capital, revenue and whole-life costs for the preferred option in line with the required modelling standard.
- A concise summary of key outputs of the financial model is provided, including whole-life cost totals and the main cost components.
- Use of appropriate benchmarks and data sources in preparing the cost estimates.
- Core assumptions within the model are explicitly documented and justified, such as inflation, demand profiles, and any other financial parameters used in the estimate.
- Evidence that the model supports:
 - accurate cost estimation,
 - accurate revenue estimation (if relevant),
- assessment of funding and finance sources, and
- evaluation of the project's financial position over its lifecycle.
- Performance of sensitivity analysis to assess the effect of key variables on the project's financial position.
- Confirmation that the financial model is sufficient to support the affordability assessment required at the IBC stage.

28. Test affordability

4.3 Financial – Does affordability testing confirm the preferred option is affordable and financially robust?

Evidence:

- Testing confirms that the preferred option is affordable overall and year-by-year, consistent with available funding and organisational spending plans.
- Affordability analysis highlights risk to affordability, such as exposure to cost escalation, revenue under-performance or changes in funding conditions.
- Where affordability is uncertain or subject to material risk, solutions are proposed, such as refining scope, staging delivery, adjusting funding strategy, or engaging in further commercial negotiation.
- Confirmation that contingencies allowed for in the estimate are appropriate to the project stage and support the affordability position.
- High-level assessment that the project is consistent with overall fiscal sustainability and does not exceed reasonable spending limits within the planning period.

5. Management Questions

29. Finalise delivery, management and governance structure

5.1 Management - Has the delivery, management and governance structure for the project been finalised and clearly defined?

Evidence:

- There is a confirmed delivery structure, including the key delivery team roles, responsibilities and reporting lines.
- The governance structure is clearly defined, including decision-making routes, tolerances and escalation pathways and is operating effectively.
- Evidence of a named project sponsor and other key delivery leadership roles, with clear accountability for project delivery.
- Where multiple organisations are involved in delivery, confirmation that delivery responsibilities across organisations are defined and agreed.

30. Draft section on use of advisors

5.2 Management - Has the project identified the advisors required for the next stage and set out their roles and scope of support?

Evidence:

- Identification of advisors needed for the next phase (e.g., commercial, legal, technical, financial).
- Defined scope, timing and purpose of advisory inputs have been documented.
- Confirmation that advisory support aligns with the needs of the project's next stage of development.

31. Develop project plan and assurance and approvals plan

5.3 Management - Has the project prepared a project plan and an assurance and approvals plan ?

Evidence

- There is a project plan setting out key activities, milestones and interdependencies, underpinned by a sensible set of assumptions that have been stress-tested.
- An Integrated Assurance and Approvals Plan (IAAP) outlining the internal and external assurance and approval activities required.
- Evidence that the assurance framework is operating effectively
- Identification of any key risks where delay or additional cost may arise, and summary mitigations.
- A summary of the results of the Routemap findings and recommendations if it was undertaken.

32. Finalise project delivery budget

5.4 Management - Has the project finalised the delivery budget required for the next stage of the business case and project development?

Evidence:

- There is a defined project delivery budget covering delivery team staffing, advisors, assurance and governance functions.
- Confirmation that the delivery budget is aligned with available funding in the Financial Case.
- Identification of any constraints or assumptions affecting delivery budget requirements.

33. Finalise and implement stakeholder engagement plan

5.5 Management - Has the stakeholder engagement plan been updated and prepared for implementation for the next stage?

Evidence:

- There is an updated stakeholder engagement plan reflecting stakeholder needs, influences and required engagement.
- An updated stakeholder map identifying key relationships and areas requiring active management.
- Summary of engagement undertaken since the Early Business Case with key issues captured.

34. Finalise change management strategy and plan

5.6 Management - Has the change management strategy and plan been finalised to support the next stage of delivery?

Evidence:

- There is a defined change management strategy covering organisational impacts, readiness and communication needs.
- There is a plan outlining key change interventions and required actions for the next stage.
- Major change-related risks or dependencies that require project board oversight have been identified.

35. Finalise benefits realisation plan and risk management strategy and plan

5.7 Management - Have the benefits realisation plan and the risk management strategy and plan been updated and finalised for the next stage?

Evidence:

- An updated benefits realisation plan detailing benefits, measures, owners and tracking approach.
- An updated risk management plan setting out risk identification, monitoring and mitigation arrangements.
- Updated risks, assumptions, issues and dependencies (RAID) structure has been prepared to capture those relevant to the next delivery stage.

36. Draft project evaluation plans

5.8 Management - Has the project prepared draft evaluation plans setting out how delivery and benefits will be evaluated?

Evidence:

- There is a draft evaluation plan describing purpose, scope, timing and required data for evaluation.
- Identification of evaluation methods for delivery, completion and post-implementation review.
- Clear links shown between the evaluation plan, the benefits plan and the overall delivery approach.

5.9 Management – Are sustainable development objectives (environmental, climate and social) clearly defined, resourced and integrated into delivery and evaluation?

Evidence:

- Roles and responsibilities for delivering the project's environmental, climate and social objectives have been clearly assigned across the project's governance structure, with overall accountability held at senior leadership/SRO level.

- Environmental and social specialists with adequate capacity and capability are in place (or planned) to monitor, advise on and evaluate project impacts both during delivery and into the operational phase.
- Environmental, climate and social considerations have been integrated into the project's management arrangements and delivery plans, with relevant performance indicators identified and embedded into reporting and monitoring requirements.
- Where appropriate, indicators used to track environmental, climate and social performance are disaggregated (e.g. by sex, age or income) to support inclusive reporting and alignment with wider social objectives.

The draft evaluation plan includes the full range of environmental, climate and social risks and describes how these will be assessed during delivery, post-completion, and at long-term evaluation points.

Glossary

Appraisal as regards:

- options, is a process of comparing different options; and
- projects, is a process of considering the overall state of a project (considering objectives, options, costs, benefits, risks and uncertainty) before reaching a decision.

Assurance is a review process designed to produce:

- an assessment for its sponsor and approver that shows the assurance team's confidence in the project's ability to meet its aims and objectives; and
- advice as to whether it has reached a sufficient stage of maturity to proceed to the next stage.

Assurance and approvals plan is a plan setting out the planning, co-ordination and provision of assurance activities and approval points throughout its life.

Authority is a local or central public sector body, which may commission a project.

Business as Usual is the project option that provides for a continuation of the current arrangements. This provides a benchmark against which to compare other options. Sometimes this is referred to as the 'Do Nothing' option.

Change management means the different plans/approaches needed to help manage organisational change. This should be supported by an overall strategy that explains the goals and aims, and a plan that explains how these will be achieved.

Contingency is an allowance of cash or resource to cover the cost of risks that may arise.

Cost benefit analysis is a type of socio-economic analysis used to compare different project options and their effect on social welfare, quantifying as many of the costs and the benefits as feasible, including costs/benefits for which there are no satisfactory measures of economic value.

Critical success factors (CSFs) are the high priority objectives for a project, against which the success of the project may be judged.

Delivery confidence is the likelihood of a project delivering the agreed outputs to time, cost and quality.

Discounting is a method used to convert future costs and benefits to present values using a discount rate.

Early Business Case is the first stage in developing a project's business case. It focuses primarily on the Strategic and Economic Cases, establishing the 'strategic need' for the project, and a shortlist of options. High-level costs, benefits and risks are also developed.

Economic analysis is a means of assessing the costs and benefits of options to society as a whole, using cost benefit analysis, and an assessment of qualitative benefits and risks.

Environmental and social impact assessment is an assessment of the potential environmental and social impacts of a proposed project prior to the decision to move forward with the project.

Environmental and social impact risks are risks of potential negative consequences that result from impacts (or perceived impacts) on the natural environment or communities of people.

Financing, for a project, is the up-front borrowing and/or investment used to pay for capital costs.

Five Case Model (5CM) is a framework for the development and presentation of a business case, comprising the strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management – the five dimensions of the case. It is the methodology described in this Guidance.

Full Business Case is the third stage in developing a project business case. It focuses primarily on the procurement process, and updates the Economic, Commercial, Financial and Management Cases to reflect the negotiated deal.

Funding is the source of income used to repay the up-front finance for a project over its life.

G20 Principles refers to the “G20 Principles for the Infrastructure Project Preparation Phase” issued in July 2018 by the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors at the Buenos Aires summit.

Gateway approach involves a project passing through ‘gates’ or assurance review points before it is put forward for relevant central government approval. Each gateway requires the assurance team to develop an assessment report of the project and its business case.

Gender and Inclusion where ‘gender’ refers to gender equality and women’s economic empowerment, and ‘inclusion’ refers to the reduction of poverty and delivery of inclusive growth among excluded groups, such as women, youth, people with disabilities, and rural communities. Greater inclusion can be achieved through empowerment (through building assets, capabilities and opportunities) and transformation (addressing systemic barriers to economic empowerment).

- **Disability:** Long-term mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which, in interaction with various attitudinal, informational and environmental barriers, may hinder full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.
- **Disability inclusion:** A process that actively seeks to ensure the full participation of persons with disabilities as empowered self-advocates in all development processes and emergency responses. Specifically, disability inclusion addresses barriers that hinder access to key services and employment opportunities, and highlights ways to improve health and social wellbeing outcomes.
- **Gender:** Socially constructed roles, attributes, opportunities and relationships that a given society considers appropriate for men and women. While many societies recognise that there are more than two genders, for the purposes of this analysis we focus on men and women. Expectations relating to gender differ from society to society and change over time.
- **Gender equality:** Women having the same opportunities in life as men, including equal access to services, equal pay for equal work, equal participation in decision-making, etc.
- **Social inclusion:** The process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society – improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity.

Intermediate Business Case is the second, and most substantial, stage in developing a project business case. It focuses on the Economic, Commercial, Financial and Management Cases, assessing the shortlist of options through cost benefit analysis to determine a ‘preferred option’, considering the affordability and commercial viability of the ‘preferred option’, and identifying the expected resources and management arrangements for the project.

Life cycle costs are the costs of an asset over its useful life, including dismantling costs (sometimes known as Whole-Life Costs).

MDB is a Multilateral Development Bank.

Objectives are the ‘targeted’ outcomes for a project, which reflect its overall rationale, and which must be made SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound) for the purposes of evaluation – sometimes also referred to as project objectives, investment objectives or spending objectives.

Optimism bias is the demonstrated tendency for the writers of business cases to be over-optimistic about costs, benefits and time taken to complete a proposal.

Option appraisal is the process of examining options and weighing up the costs, benefits, risks and uncertainties of those options before a decision is made.

Outcomes refers to the consequences to society as a whole of a project.

Outputs refers to the change in the level or quality of a service delivered.

Preferred approach is the best ranking solution emerging from the options analysis at the Early Business Case stage. It is not the preferred option, which only emerges after full economic appraisal in the Intermediate Business Case stage.

Preferred option is the option selected, as offering best value, after a detailed analysis of the shortlist of options in the Economic Case at the Intermediate Business Case stage.

Programme is a series of coordinated activities designed to pursue a long-term goal. In the infrastructure area, it is normally seen as an overarching structure under which a number of related individual projects can be coordinated and delivered. A programme business case can also be produced using the Five Case Model.

Project Sponsor is the senior person who represents and champions the Project within the relevant Ministry or Local Authority and who has overall responsibility for the success of the Project. The Project Sponsor is not part of the project executive team, but will chair the supervisory board overseeing the Project. In the UK this person is known as the "Senior Responsible Officer". Guidance setting out the responsibilities of the Project Sponsor/SRO can be found at <https://projectdelivery.gov.uk/library-product/the-role-of-the-senior-responsible-owner/>

Public Value is the net measure of social welfare resulting from an option or project looking at the 'whole of society', or more particularly, it is the sum of total benefits and total costs, including private and social costs and benefits. It is sometimes referred to as 'net present social value'.

Qualitative risk/benefits are risks/benefits that are not easily measurable in financial terms.

Quantitative risk/benefits are risks/benefits that are easily measurable in financial terms.

Risk is the possibility of a negative event arising that could adversely affect the project.

Sensitivity analysis is an analysis tool used in the cost benefit analysis of the Economic Case; it is a process of changing key variables and modelling their impact on the preferred options.

Shortlist refers to the shortlist of project options to be taken forward to detailed economic analysis in order to find a single preferred option.

SMART Objectives are objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound.

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.¹⁰⁷

The UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are a collection of 17 global goals set by the United Nations General Assembly in 2015 for the year 2030. They address global challenges, including those related to poverty, inequality, climate, environmental degradation, prosperity, and peace and justice.

Value for money (VfM) is the optimum combination of whole-of-life costs and quality, or fitness for purpose, also taking account of risk, of a good or service that meets the user's requirements (though there are many different possible definitions).

Report criteria

Objective

Review of the Project and its Intermediate Business Case to consider if the Project is ready to “go to market”

Timing

Prior to launching the procurement process

#	Criteria	Definition
1	Strategic Reconsider the Strategic case and reconfirm strategic need	Assessment and recommendations related to: reconsideration of the Strategic Case and strategic need from the Early Business Case Hints: • Have there been any changes to the strategic context or any other relevant factor since the Early Business Case? • Have these been reflected adequately in the Strategic case in the Intermediate Business Case? How have these affected the overall strategic need and aims of the Project?
2	Economic Further Options Analysis and choice of Preferred Option	Assessment and recommendations related to: economic analysis of each of the shortlisted options, value for money calculations and choice of preferred option Hints: • Has a Preferred Option Workshop been held, with relevant experts attending? • Has economic appraisal for each of the shortlisted options been conducted in accordance with relevant regulations, and have Public Values and Benefit Cost Ratios calculated for each? • Have qualitative factors and sensitivity analysis been applied to the shortlist and a clear explanation provided as to the ranking of the different options? • Are there a clear rationale and value for money case for the selection of the Preferred Option?
3	ESIA	Assessment and recommendations related to: the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management Plan Hints: • Has a detailed ESIA or required E&S studies identified during EBC been carried out? • Have the results of the ESIA/ E&S studies been taken into account in for each of the shortlisted options? • Has an Environmental and Social Management Plan been developed for the preferred option? • Are there any significant social or environmental issues which could disrupt or delay the project? • Has geographical distribution been considered as part the preferred option assessment?

4	Commercial and Contract	Assessment and recommendations in respect of: commercial approach, contract preparation, market engagement and procurement plan Hints • Are contract documents, or Heads of Terms including risk allocation, sufficiently developed to go to market? • Have market soundings been completed? Have these shown any significant issues? Are the results of these reflected in the procurement and contract arrangements? • Has a “market open day” been held and is there evidence of sufficient market interest in the project to enable a robust competitive process to be achieved? • are international contractors/bidders expected to bid? • is any MDB supporting the project? What evidence of commitment has been provided? • Is the developed procurement plan suitable to the complexity of the project and reflecting any requirement (including pertaining to environmental and social impacts) of any supporting MDB? If it is a PPP has a negotiated procedure been adopted?
5	Finance and Funding	Assessment and Recommendations in respect of: availability and adequacy of finance and funding for the project. Hints: • Where is finance expected to come from and what degree of confidence is there that it will be available? • Has a detailed financial model been created for the project and, if it is designed as a PPP, a public sector comparator? • Are there any funding gaps in the model (on a year-by-year basis) and, if so, a convincing explanation as to how these will be covered? • Are the assumptions behind the model clearly stated and reasonable? • Have adequate contingencies and allowance for optimism bias been built into the model?
6	Management	Assessment and recommendations in respect of: fully worked up plans for: (a) the project management team (b) the advisory team, (c) the project plan (d) the assurance and approvals plan (e) the sustainable development plan (f) stakeholder management plan (g) the benefits realisation plan (h) the risk management plan and (g) the Change management plan Hints: • Are there fully developed plans for the above and an adequate project delivery budget to fund the activities? • Is the project timetable realistic? Has optimism bias been provided for? • Are there any significant stakeholder issues and is there a plan to manage them? • Is this considered a big, novel or contentious project? Is it a PPP? • Is the management team, supported by the advisory team, suitably experienced and expected to be adequate for the job? • If the project is a PPP, has the project team ever been engaged in a PPP before? • Has the oversight and governance structure worked effectively? Are any changes needed?

7	Compliance with 5 case methodology	Assessment of degree of compliance with the overall business case regulatory requirements and recommendations as to how any areas of weakness or omission should be dealt with. Hints: • Rank each of the 5 cases as (a) good (b) adequate (c) inadequate
8	Outstanding actions	Have all required actions left over from the previous Gateway Review been cleared Are there any other issues which you have identified which would impact the suitability of the project to pass through Gateway 2 and proceed to market?
9	Delivery confidence	Is there any other matter which should be flagged which could have an effect on overall Delivery Confidence?