InfrastructureSA

GATE 5 REVIEW WORKBOOK

Benefits Realisation

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 5 Benefits Realisation** review assesses the extent to which the project has delivered the approved service needs, outcomes and benefits identified in the Investment Decision. It examines whole-of-project performance, value for money achieved, and whether lessons learned have been captured and embedded to inform future investments.

Application

This Gate 5 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:

The Review Team is required to assess and provide comment on the following project specific TOR questions:

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

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" / Investment Decision and any supporting documentation, and
- Completed ISA Document and Stakeholder Lists.
- Previous ISA review reports

All other supporting information is required prior to the planning meeting. A copy of the planning meeting presentation must also be provided. Each KFA section identifies the minimum expected documentary evidence expected. 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

The Review Team is required to provide a clear, evidence-based assessment of overall project confidence, reflecting the cumulative effect of risks, interdependencies and uncertainties identified across all Key Focus Areas.

This assessment should consider:

- the strength and credibility of the outcomes being achieved,
- the level of uncertainty remaining,
- the capability and capacity of the agency to manage the intended service needs, benefits and outcomes, 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 outcomes.

This assessment provides an integrated, investor-focused view of benefits realisation and does not replace detailed findings or recommendations.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Scope

This KFA examines whether the delivered asset and associated services align with the approved service need, functional requirements, outcomes and investment decision, as established through the project lifecycle and relevant assurance processes.

At Gate 5, the Review confirms that the delivered asset and services meet the approved service need, outcomes and objectives identified in the Final Business Case / Investment Decision, and that scope decisions made across the project lifecycle have preserved the original investment rationale and enable ongoing benefits realisation.

In particular, the Review Team will confirm that:

- The delivered asset and associated services are fit-for-purpose and meet the needs of end users, asset owners and operators, consistent with the approved service requirements.
- Delivered scope is traceable to the service needs, functional requirements and investment decision scope, with any approved changes clearly documented and justified.
- Stakeholders are satisfied that the delivered solution supports intended service outcomes, and that any residual or deferred scope issues do not materially impact benefits realisation.
- Scope changes throughout delivery were appropriately governed, assessed for impact on outcomes and benefits, and managed without undermining the investment decision.
- Lessons learned relating to scope definition, change control and service alignment have been captured and are being applied to future investments.
- Stakeholders are satisfied with the delivered solution and outstanding scope issues are resolved.
- Project close-out confirms that final scope aligns with intended service outcomes and enables ongoing benefits realisation.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Approved Benefits Management Plan and Benefits Register demonstrating alignment between delivered scope and intended outcomes.
- Evidence of scope change approvals and impact assessments.
- Lessons Learned Register relevant to scope definition and management.
- Evidence of asset owner, end-user and key stakeholder satisfaction with the delivered outcomes.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Cost

This KFA examines capital and whole-of-life cost performance, including budget estimates, financial performance, cost management, commercial decisions, affordability and value for money relative to the approved investment decision.

At Gate 5, the full project out turn costs are known or can be reliably forecast, and the project close-out process has assessed financial performance against the original investment decision, including affordability and value-for-money considerations.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm that:

- The final project total out-turn cost has been reconciled and assessed against the approved investment decision, with any variations clearly explained and justified.
- Where cost variations occurred, these were appropriately governed and did not undermine the original investment rationale or were justified through the delivery of additional or enhanced benefits.
- A robust cost management process was evident throughout delivery, including the effective management of contingencies and variations.
- The ongoing operational and maintenance costs are within, or appropriately justified against, the range identified in the Final Business Case / Investment Decision.
- Financial lessons learned, including cost estimation accuracy, contingency management and value-for-money considerations, have been captured to inform future investments.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Final capital and operational cost performance against approved budget and investment decision.
- Reconciliation of final out-turn cost to the original investment decision, including explanations of key variances.
- Evidence supporting any material changes to affordability or value-for-money assumptions.
- Lessons Learned Register relevant to cost estimation, management and financial governance.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Time

This KFA examines schedule performance across the project lifecycle, including milestone achievement, schedule governance and the management of delays or accelerations.

At Gate 5, the project close-out process compares forecast and actual schedules and assesses the causes and impacts of any variances including implications for service commencement and benefits realisation.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm:

- The project was delivered to the timeframes projected at the time of the investment decision, or that any variances are clearly explained and understood.
- Variations to the project schedule were justifiable, appropriately governed, and managed through robust schedule management and risk processes.
- Schedule delays or accelerations did not materially undermine the approved outcomes or benefits or were appropriately mitigated.
- Lessons learned relating to schedule planning, contingency management and risk response have been captured to inform future investments.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Actual project schedule performance compared to forecasts approved at decision points.
- Analysis of key schedule variances and their causes.
- Register of any outstanding or unresolved risks with potential project close out implications if not already achieved.
- Lessons Learned Register relevant to schedule planning and management.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Impact

This KFA examines benefit identification, management and realisation of benefits and outcomes for the asset owner, end user and investor.

At Gate 5, the Review confirms that the benefits management process has been capturing, measuring and reporting on the realisation of benefits (and any disbenefits) evidenced following completion, and that realised or emerging benefits remain aligned with the approved investment decision.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm:

- There is clear alignment between realised benefits (or benefits tracking toward realisation) and those identified in the Benefits Management Plan and the outcomes and objectives in the Final Business Case / Investment Decision.
- The project is meeting, or credibly tracking against, the benefits identified in the Final Business Case / Investment Decision, with variances clearly explained and understood.
- Non-quantifiable benefits are being systematically captured, monitored and reported.
- The benefits management process has been effective in identifying, measuring, capturing and reporting on realised benefits and any disbenefits.
- Unintended benefits and disbenefits have been identified, assessed and documented, and lessons learned are being captured to inform future investments.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Register of any unresolved stakeholder issues.
- Benefits Realisation Register (including status, measures and ownership).
- Stakeholder satisfaction surveys or equivalent evidence.
- Register of unresolved stakeholder issues and identified disbenefits.

Key Focus Area (KFA): Delivery

This KFA examines the effectiveness of governance, capability, capacity, procurement and market approach in supporting successful project delivery, achieving approved outcomes and the realisation of benefits.

At Gate 5, the project close-out assesses the effectiveness of the governance framework, procurement model and delivery approach in achieving the approved outcomes and benefits realisation and provide lessons to improve the deliverability of future investments.

In particular, the Review Team should confirm:

- The procurement model and delivery approach adopted were appropriate and effective in supporting delivery of the project outcomes within the approved time, cost and scope parameters.
- The governance framework and decision-making processes were effective in managing risk, contingencies and project outcomes, including timely escalation and resolution of issues.
- Project risks that materialised during delivery were identified, managed and mitigated effectively, with impacts on outcomes and benefits understood.
- Lessons learned relating to governance, procurement, capability and delivery have been identified, documented and are being applied to improve the deliverability of future investments.

Expected Level of Evidence:

- Agendas and minutes (last three) for the project executive/steering and management governance groups, demonstrating active consideration of the effectiveness of the project delivery performance to deliver the approved outcomes.
- Project close-out report, including delivery performance and lessons learned.