InfrastructureSA

GATE 3 REVIEW WORKBOOK

Procurement

Version Date: 2026

Endorsed: Director Infrastructure Assurance

Approved: Chief Executive

Assurance Review Purpose and Application

Purpose

Assurance Reviews are an objective point in time assessment of a project that provides agencies and Cabinet, as investor, with confidence that a project is being well planned, developed, managed and delivered. Assurance Reviews are a means to support agencies achieve enhanced project outcomes through independent expert review recommendations and findings.

The Review provides early and continuous oversight of government's investment decisions analysing a range of factors including governance, risk management and performance against the key focus areas of time, cost, scope, impact and delivery. It provides agencies with information to better position the project for success through evidence-based findings and recommendations.

All assurance reviews are undertaken in accordance with the Cabinet approved *Infrastructure SA Assurance Framework (ISAAF),* and ancillary materials such as the Assurance Guide, Workbooks and specific review Terms of Reference (ToR).

The **Gate 3 Procurement** assesses the preparedness, capacity and capability of the Sponsor Agency to translate the approved investment decision into a procurement ready proposition and to procure and deliver the project within Cabinet approved parameters. It identifies if the project is ready to be released to the market and/or proceed to contract award, having regard to the timing of the review and the level of investor exposure.

Application

This Gate 3 Review Workbook provides agency guidance on how to prepare for the review and the Review Team to conduct the review. It outlines key areas to explore and evidence to examine. As each project is unique and circumstances change, it is a guide to the line of inquiry, range of potential questions and evidence to be examined.

The ISA *Assurance Guide* provides further information on the assurance review process including development of the review Terms of Reference.

Terms of Reference

In addition to the requirements outlined in the Purpose, the Review Team is required to assess and provide comment on the following project specific TOR questions:

- *To be inserted*
- .
- .
- .
-
- .

The Review Team should also assess the extent to which the project aligns with relevant whole-of-government policies, strategies and guidance applicable at the time of review, and whether any material policy misalignment introduces any key risks.

Previous Recommendations

The Review Team is required to assess the preceding assurance review report and recommendations to:

- confirm which recommendations have been completed and are adequately supported by documentary evidence,
- determine whether any recommendations not yet completed are being appropriately actioned; and
- where appropriate, combine, carry forward or re-word the recommendations that have not yet been closed out into the new Recommendation Schedule for this assurance review.

Documents

Minimum project information required at least **5 business days** prior to planning meeting:

- Final Business Case “Report” and any supporting documentation, and
- Completed ISA Document and Stakeholder Lists.
- Previous ISA review report

All other supporting information is required prior to the planning meeting. A copy of the planning meeting presentation must be provided. Each KFA section identifies the minimum expected documentary evidence. The Review Team may request additional documents as required.

Interviews

The **Assurance Review Guide** lists stakeholders typically interviewed as part of the review.

Conducting the Review

Project and Review Teams please refer to the **ISA Assurance Guide Appendix B ‘Undertaking Assurance Reviews’** for information on preparing and conducting the review.

Overall Project Confidence Assessment

Risks identified across the Key Focus Areas should be considered collectively in forming the Review Team's conclusions.

The Review Team should consider the cumulative effect of identified risks, interdependencies and uncertainties when assessing overall project confidence assessment and determining the significance and prioritisation of recommendations.

In forming its conclusions, the Review Team must provide a clear narrative assessment of overall project confidence for the next stage of development.

This assessment should consider:

- the strength and credibility of the approach,
- the level of uncertainty remaining,
- the capability and capacity of the agency to move forward, and
- the cumulative effect of risks identified across all Key Focus Areas.

The Review Team should articulate how its confidence judgement has been derived from the evidence reviewed and clearly explain any factors that may constrain successful progression if not addressed.

This assessment does not replace detailed findings or recommendations but provides an integrated investor-focused view of project readiness.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Scope

This KFA examines the extent to which government's approved project scope, service need and outcomes have been translated into a clear, complete and procurement ready scope for delivery that is sufficiently defined to support market engagement, risk allocation and value for money.

> At Gate 3, the scope and functional requirements to be procured addresses the service need and outcomes and is well defined to support market engagement, risk allocation and value for money. The procurement approach and documentation clearly define the scope, outcomes and objectives approved in the final Business Case/ Investment Decision.

In particular, the Review Team will confirm:

- The project continues to be aligned to service need, government policy and objectives and project outcomes are clearly identified.
- The procurement documentation reflects the approved service outcomes and objectives, with appropriate input from the asset owner to ensure procurement outcomes align with service needs and requirements.
- Procurement scope and requirements are fit-for-purpose and aligned to the approved investment decision.
- Scope governance and change control processes are clearly defined and reflected in the procurement documentation.
- Stakeholder roles, responsibilities and engagement arrangements are clearly defined for the procurement phase.
- Integration, interface and dependency requirements are clearly articulated and addressed in procurement documents.
- The government's risk appetite and commercial expectations are clearly articulated, ensuring alignment with value for money objectives.
- Procurement documentation enables flexible and innovative market responses to encourage improved value for money outcomes.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Procurement documentation that clearly defines the scope, functional requirements and outcomes and demonstrates alignment with the approved final business case / investment decision including any agreed scope changes.
- Change and issues register including evidence of approval, governance and management of scope changes since the final business case / investment decision.
- Documentation demonstrating how scope has been structured and articulated for market engagement, including inclusions, exclusions, interfaces and assumptions.
- Benefits management service outcomes are explicitly reflected in the procurement scope and requirements.
- Interfaces and dependencies register, clearly identifying responsibilities and risk allocation between parties.
- Examples of lessons learned that have informed scope definition, packaging or interface management for the procurement phase.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Cost

This KFA examines budget estimates, financial analysis, cost management, commercial viability, and affordability. It examines the extent to which the approved funding envelope and cost parameters have been translated into a robust, risk-adjusted and procurement-ready cost estimate to support market engagement, evaluation and contract award.

> At Gate 3, the cost estimate reflects further refinement of scope, identification and quantification of risks, and inclusion of appropriate contingencies. A pre-tender estimate has been developed to inform the procurement phase and is consistent with the approved funding envelope. Approaches to value management, cost control and risk escalation are clearly defined and documented.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm:

- The procurement model/methodology has been through a robust assessment and best reflects the scale, risk profile and complexity of the project to deliver the optimum value for money outcome.
- Cost plans have been developed to support procurement evaluation and include whole-of-life considerations, key assumptions and identification of interdependencies or integration works.
- Procurement documentation clearly articulates risk allocation, including the quantum and treatment of government-retained risks, and how these are reflected in pricing and evaluation.
- Sufficient site and technical investigation, design development and risk identification have been undertaken to support a credible pre-tender cost estimate.
- Interface and integration works have been appropriately costed or provided for through separate, approved budgets.
- Further risk and opportunity assessment has been undertaken to identify potential cost pressures or efficiencies during the procurement phase.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Pre-tender (or pre-award) cost estimates, including capital, delivery and operational costs (whole-of-life), appropriate to the scale, value and risk profile of the project.
- Cost control, escalation and approval framework.
- Value management outcomes demonstrating how cost optimisation and value-for-money considerations will be achieved.
- Financial models supporting the cost estimate and funding profile.
- Risk modelling or other evidence used to determine contingency levels including any Quantified Risk Analysis.
- Outcomes from market engagement or tender processes to the extent that they validate or inform the pre-tender (or pre-award) cost estimate.
- Cost-relevant elements of the procurement, evaluation and contracting strategy, including how cost and risk are treated in evaluation.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Time

This KFA examines schedules and programs including risk allocations, float, contingency, milestones and external impacts. It examines the extent to which the project schedule and key time parameters approved as part of the investment decision have been translated into a realistic, risk-informed and procurement-ready program.

> At Gate 3, the project schedule will identify the critical path, identify key milestones and dependencies and include a clear planning and approvals pathway to inform completion of the procurement phase and transition to delivery. Key delivery risks have been identified and assessed.

In particular, the review team should confirm:

- The estimate of time to deliver the project including consideration of key milestones and hold points is well developed and will support procurement evaluation and contract award.
- Key risks to on time delivery have been clearly identified, assessed and communicated in the procurement documentation with appropriate risk mitigation strategies in place.
- The procurement approach evaluates risks appropriate to the scale and complexity of the project and procurement model.
- The procurement phase is appropriately sequenced and resourced, with sufficient time allowed to minimise adverse impacts on the delivery phase.
- Variations, constraints or risks to delivery against the proposed schedule have been identified and reflected in the program.
- Key stakeholder requirements and external dependencies that may affect schedule performance are embedded in the procurement and delivery program, with associated schedule risks addressed.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Project schedule, including detailed project program or Gantt chart showing critical path, current status and remaining activities through to completion.
- Documented planning and approvals pathway.
- Identification of project interdependencies and external impacts on services or networks that may affect schedule performance.
- Resource schedule or organisation chart demonstrating sufficient capacity to complete the procurement phase and transition to delivery within the planned timeframe.
- Stakeholder Management Plan to the extent that stakeholder requirements or approvals materially affect schedule and milestone achievement.
- Risk Management Plan and Risk Register, including schedule-related risks.
- Schedule Risk Analysis.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Impact

This KFA examines benefit identification, management, delivery and impact of outcomes and benefits. It examines the extent to which the benefits and impact requirements have been translated into procurement-ready obligations that support delivery of outcomes for the asset owner, end user and investor.

At Gate 3, social, environmental, sustainability, decarbonisation, cultural, heritage and economic requirements are clearly integrated into the procurement documentation to enable delivery of approved project benefits and to avoid, minimise or manage adverse impacts.

In particular, the review team should confirm:

- Any social, environmental, sustainability, decarbonisation, cultural, heritage and economic benefits and impact requirements are measurable, enforceable and appropriately reflected in procurement and evaluation documentation.
- Any scope changes or refinements since the Final Business Case / Investment decision do not adversely impact approved benefits, and that any material changes are appropriately reflected in procurement documentation.
- The procurement approach enables innovative market responses that may drive efficiencies, minimise impacts, enhance delivery of approved benefits or deliver additional benefits.
- Obligations for identifying, managing and reporting on impacts and benefits are clearly defined in the procurement documentation.
- Final contracts clearly reflect the requirements agreed through the procurement and negotiation phase, which are consistent with the Final Business Case / Investment decision approval.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Benefits management outcomes are explicitly reflected in procurement scope, specifications or performance requirements and includes the assumptions/evidence for valuing each benefit.
- Procurement documentation clearly describes roles, responsibilities and obligations for managing the impacts and benefits during delivery.
- Outcomes of stakeholder engagement where they have materially informed impact and benefit requirements, adverse mitigation measures or procurement requirements have been considered and addressed.
- Any additional impact or benefit assessments undertaken since the investment decision have been documented and included in the final benefits management plan and register.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Delivery

This KFA examines the impacts of governance, capability, capacity and market approach for successful delivery on time and on budget. It determines the extent to which the established delivery arrangements have been sufficiently developed and are ready to support procurement and transition into delivery, having regard to governance, capability, capacity and delivery risk.

At Gate 3, a clear delivery strategy has been developed, the procurement approach is supported by appropriate market engagement, and delivery risks have been identified with management strategies defined and risks appropriately allocated. The project team has sufficient capability and capacity to complete the procurement phase and transition into delivery in accordance with the approved scope, time and cost parameters.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm:

- The project has sufficient capability, capacity and resources to complete the procurement phase and transition to delivery without adversely impacting delivery outcomes.
- Required planning and statutory approvals are in place or well advanced and progressing in line with the approved project schedule.
- The project governance framework has been implemented, with processes and controls in place. Delivery governance roles and responsibilities are explicitly defined within the procurement documentation.
- Lessons learned from previous projects and earlier phases have been identified and incorporated into the procurement approach and delivery planning.
- Resource requirements, and any capacity and capability constraints, have been identified with plans in place to sufficiently resource them on transition into delivery.
- Delivery and operational risks have been assessed, key barriers identified, and mitigation strategies developed and integrated into procurement and delivery arrangements.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Documents outlining delivery governance structures and arrangements in place, including roles, responsibilities and decision-making authorities.
- A project organisation chart demonstrating that capability and capacity are in place, or clearly committed, to complete the procurement phase and transition into delivery.
- Project management or project implementation plan, including a RACI matrix that clearly defines delivery roles and accountabilities.
- Agendas and minutes (last three) for the project executive/steering and management governance groups, demonstrating active oversight and decision-making.
- A current Delivery and/or Procurement Plan that clearly sets out the approach to completing procurement and transitioning into delivery.
- Risk Management Plan and Risk Register, including delivery and operational risks relevant to procurement and transition into delivery.
- Examples of lessons learned that have been captured and applied to inform the delivery strategy, procurement approach or transition planning.