Gateway WA

Third Lessons Learned Review 2022

FINAL

31st December 2022

Table of Contents

1: Executive Summary

This report analyses 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews over a twenty-two-month period from 1st March 2021 to 31st December 2022, to document the lessons learned as part of an ongoing commitment to improve project delivery in Western Australia.

This is the third Gateway Lessons Learned report and, together with the two previous Lessons Learned reports, represents a continuous series since 1st June 2015 and documented as follows:

> Lessons Learned One: 1st June 2015 - 31st May 2018 (48 reviews)
> Lessons Learned Two: 1st June 2018 - 28th February 2021 (68 reviews)
> Lessons Learned Three: 1st March 2021 - 31st December 2022 (44 reviews)

This report has analysed 449 individual recommendations from these 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews, which involved 40 different projects for 22 different agencies across three Project Types, namely: Infrastructure, ICT and Services.

Snapshot Statistics – All Lessons Learned Reviews

Since the commencement of the Lessons Learned process on 1st June 2015:

1. **160** Gateway Reviews have been undertaken generating **1,668** recommendations.
2. Gateway Reviews have maintained an average of approximately **10** recommendations per review.
3. Gateway reports have maintained an average of approximately:
    30% Red recommendations
    50% Amber recommendations
    20% Green recommendations
4. Project Management comprises an average of **20%** of all Lessons Learned Categories.
5. **55%** of all Delivery Confidence Ratings have been split ratings (i.e. Amber/Red and Green/Amber) since the introduction of the tiered Delivery Confidence rating framework in June 2020.
6. No review has recorded a Delivery Confidence Rating of Red since the introduction of the tiered Delivery Confidence rating framework in June 2020.
7. ICT Project Types now comprise **66%** of all Gateway Reviews rising from **48%** in the 2018 Lessons Learned Review.
8. Business Case (Gate 2) and Readiness for Service (Gate 5) reviews together represented approximately **55%** of all reviews undertaken since 1st June 2015, whereas Benefits Evaluation (Gate 6) Reviews represent approximately **3.75%**.
9. Reviews of Services Project Types have increased **300%** since the 2021 Lessons Learned Review, albeit based on a small sample size.

Detailed Findings from the 2022 Lessons Learned Review

The findings of this 2022 Lessons Learned review are as follows:

1. **Absence of effective benefits management**
   Review Teams identified the absence of effective benefits management as a recurring theme across all three Project Types and across all six Gates. This theme was also identified by Review Teams in both the 2018 and 2021 Lessons Learned reports.

   The major themes identified in review reports relating to benefits management were:

   - an absence of agreed benefit metrics including baselines, targets and methods of measurement; and
   - an absence of ongoing management and reporting against these baseline metrics.

   As a consequence, Review Teams had difficulty in identifying either the value proposition of an investment and/or the ongoing changes to the underlying value proposition as the project or program progresses.

   The analysis of the database identified that Gate 6 Benefits Evaluation reviews are the least-applied of all Gateway Gate assurance reviews. This situation was also identified in the 2018 Review and the 2021 Review. Over the entire Lessons Learned Review period (since 1st June 2015), just six Benefits Evaluation reviews have been undertaken during which time, whilst 154 reviews in the remaining Gates have been undertaken.

2. **Absence of an applied industry standard framework**
   Review Teams identified the low incidence of the effective application of a range of recognised industry standard frameworks across all Gates. Good practice frameworks stipulated by Review Teams included:

   - the WA Government's *Strategic Asset Management Framework* to assist options evaluation, Multi Criteria Assessments and the development of an Investment Logic Map;
   - Gateway Review Workbooks;
   - industry standard risk management protocols; and
   - a recognisable project management methodology (including PRINCE2).

3. **Absence of key project management artefacts**
   Review Teams identified either the absence of, or lack of rigour in, a key project management artefacts, in particular:

   - Master Schedule with an identified critical path, interdependencies, milestones and work breakdown structures;
   - Resource Plan, given the risks of market capability and capacity and the need to supplement project teams with specialist skills;
   - Organisational Change Management Plan;
   - Project Initiation Document or similar, especially at Business Case stage;
   - Detailed Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Plan;
   - Contract Management Plan;
   - Procurement Plan (including procurement options assessments);
   - Benefits Management Plan; and
   - A clear and concise project governance Terms of Reference.

4. **Whole-of-Life financial model (or Total Cost of Ownership)**
   Review Teams identified an absence of a whole-of-life (or Total Cost of Ownership) financial model which takes account of both capital and operational costs over the life of the investment.

   In addition, Review Teams identified a lack of clarity regarding the development of underlying financial modelling assumptions for escalation, contingency, real and nominal values.

5. **Ineffective project management reporting**
   Review Teams identified weaknesses in the manner in which project teams identify and report on project progress against agreed baselines, particularly scope, quality, benefits, schedule and risks.

   Review Teams recommended that project reporting adopt and apply forms of exception-based reporting based on pre-agreed tolerances (also referred to in reviews as baseline reporting and/or traffic light reporting).

Specific findings in relation to ICT Project Types are summarised as follows:

1. **Emerging systemic or program-wide risks**
   Review Teams noted that a proportion of ICT Project Types had whole-of-sector and/or whole-of-state impacts and influences and that these impacts and influences were often beyond the scope of the project teams to effectively manage. These impacts and influences were variously termed 'systemic risks', 'program-wide interdependencies' and 'portfolio' risks, and included the following elements:

   - multiple large-scale and complex ICT projects accessing the market concurrently;
   - access to, and availability of, specialist ICT skills and resourcing to supplement skills gaps in project teams;
   - the capability and capacity of the ICT sector to manage the scope and scale of ICT projects;
   - significant supply-side cost pressures;
   - significant state-wide organisational change and/or industrial relations impacts; and
   - unsupported legacy systems and pressures on maintaining Business As Usual and delivery timelines.

   These 'systemic risks' were not identified in either the 2018 or 2021 Reviews and the adequacy, or otherwise, of how these emergent 'systemic risks' are being managed by project teams was a major focus of the Review Teams.

   The Review Teams identified various responses to managing these systemic risks for ICT projects, including:
   - develop and/or involve an enterprise Program Management Office;
   - seek active engagement of the System Manager in the governance forums and/or as the 'Systemic Risk Owner'; and
   - identify 'Systemic Risks' as a special risk category for project risk management activities.

2. **Absence of key ICT project artefacts**
    The Review Teams identified recurring lack of rigour in the following:

    - data management plans including data cleansing and the impacts on cost, risk and schedule of data migration, and integration activities;
    - Master Schedule and an absence of:
        - Proof of Concept – development and approval;
        - User Acceptance Testing;
        - Transition and Handover to Business As Usual; and
        - Go/No Go or Go-Live decision framework.
    - Target Operating Model to inform design development, benefits and whole-of-life costs; and
    - application of ICT Lessons Learned from other jurisdictions.

    In relation to Business Case (Gate 2) ICT Reviews, there was a recurring need identified by Review Teams to clarify which Business Case framework was to apply for funding submissions, i.e., whether Treasury and/or the Office of Digital Government and/or Gateway or elements of all three.

3. **Lessons Learned: ICT versus Infrastructure projects**

    1. The Lessons Learned Categories of Project Management, Risk Management and Governance comprise approximately 42% of all recommendations, compared to 47% for the 2021 Review and 58% for the 2018 Review, indicating that applied project management disciplines show an improving trend. This improving trend was, however, most evident for Infrastructure projects which was a similar trend identified in the 2021 Review.

    2. ICT projects had a disproportionately higher number of recommendations than Infrastructure projects for the Lessons Learned categories of: Project Outcomes, Project Management, Risk Management and Governance, indicating areas requiring further capability building and/or sourcing specialist skills in these areas for ICT project teams.

    3. The increased number of recommendations for the Lessons Learned category of Project Outcomes did not lessen over the six Gates, with a higher proportion of recommendations in this category attributed to ICT projects. This indicates that benefits management is functioning at a lower system-wide standard vis-a-vis other Lessons Learned Categories, particularly for ICT projects. This was also a finding in the 2021 Review.

        There appears to be an absence of benefits realisation practices consistent with the Gateway Assurance Review framework at both the systemic and project levels.

The findings of the 2018 Lessons Learned Review and the 2021 Lessons Learned Review are included in Appendix 1 and 2, respectively.

Ria Bleathman
Director
five consulting pty ltd
14th February 2023

2: Introduction

Purpose of this Document

This report was prepared by five consulting pty ltd to provide a review and an analysis of the Lessons Learned from all Gateway Assurance Reviews undertaken in Western Australia from 1st March 2021 until 31st December 2022.

This is the third Lessons Learned review commissioned by the Western Australian government, with the previous two reviews having been conducted in 2018 ('the 2018 Review') and 2021 ("the 2021 Review") and detailed as follows:

  2018 Review: 1st June 2015 – 31st May 2018 (48 reviews, 525 recommendations)
  2021 Review: 1st June 2018 – 28th February 2021 (68 reviews,694 recommendations)
  2022 Review: 1st March 2021 – 31st December 2022 (44 reviews, 449 recommendations)

Both the 2018 Review and the 2021 Review are available on the Department of Finance WA website as follows:

https://www.wa.gov.au/government/publications/gateway-review-lessons-learned-report

Background to the Review

The Gateway Assurance Review methodology, launched by the Western Australian Government in 2008, is a project assurance methodology designed to support the effective development, planning, management and delivery of major projects and programs. Gateway Assurance Reviews are managed by the Department of Finance ('Gateway Unit'), which commissioned this review.

Gateway Assurance Reviews were developed and implemented in the United Kingdom and have, since 2003, been progressively adopted by all Australian states and territories and New Zealand.

Gateway Assurance Reviews involves a review of a major project or program at critical points of the investment lifecycle by a pre-qualified and independent team (Review Team). The Review Team reviews project plans and processes and interviews key stakeholders through which risks and issues are identified. The Review Team provides a range of evidence-based findings and recommendations in a formal report to the Senior Responsible Officer to assist the project or program as it progresses into the next phase.

The recommendations of each Gateway Assurance Review are entered into a database by the WA Gateway Unit. These recommendations are allocated to one of eleven different Lessons Learned Categories in the database.

The Lessons Learned database also informs reporting to the Gateway Steering Committee and at awareness raising sessions facilitated by the Gateway Unit. The Lessons Learned database provides the basis of the findings in this report.

The Gateway Assurance Review Process in Western Australia

Under the Gateway Assurance Framework, there are six key decision points or 'gates' in an investment lifecycle at which a Gateway Assurance Review can be undertaken. Each gate focusses on specific areas of a project or program for Review Teams to probe at a point in time.

The six Gates in the Gateway Assurance Review process are:

Gate 1: Strategic Assessment – confirms business strategy and need.

Gate 2: Business Case – confirms business justification for the investment.

Gate 3: Readiness for Market – confirms procurement method and sources of supply.

Gate 4: Tender Decision – confirms investment decision.

Gate 5: Readiness for Service – confirms readiness to implement the business changes.

Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation – confirms 'in service' benefits.

In addition to the above 'gated' Gateway Assurance Reviews, periodic program reviews, strategic assessments, desk top reviews, recommendation reviews and health checks may be undertaken at various times during a project or program lifecycle.

Additional details on the Gateway Assurance Review process in Western Australia is available at:

https://www.wa.gov.au/service/government-financial-management/procurement/gateway-review-process-and-gateway-reviewer-training

Role and Importance of Gateway Assurance Reviews in Western Australia

On 28 December 2016, the Department of Premier and Cabinet released Premier's Circular number 2016/05 mandating that agencies undertake a Gateway Assurance Review on the following types of projects:

- Infrastructure projects or programs valued at $100 million and above.
- ICT projects or programs valued at $10 million and above.
- Other projects identified by the Department of Treasury.

On 15th July 2020, the Department of Premier and Cabinet released Premier's Circular number 2020/03 re-stating the above mandated requirements for projects and programs in Western Australia, as well as the new requirement for agencies to brief the relevant Minister(s) when the Gateway Assurance Review process results in the project being rated as 'Red' or 'Amber/Red' or when an individual recommendation is rated as 'Red'.

Reasons for this Review

This third Lessons Learned Review report was commissioned by the Department of Finance WA, Gateway Unit to provide a follow-up to the previous 2018 and 2021 Lessons Learned Reviews. This 2022 report is part of a suite of activities by the WA Gateway Unit to assist agencies in their project management and delivery of major projects and programs in Western Australia.

Similar lessons learned reports are also developed by other Gateway jurisdictions in Australia and New Zealand.

Terms of Reference

five consulting pty ltd was engaged to deliver a report detailing lessons learned from Gateway Assurance Reviews for the period from 1st March 2021 until 31st December 2022 with the following specific Terms of Reference:

- emulate the previous WA Lessons Learned reports;
- analyse data for the period 1st March 2021 to 31st December 2022;
- identify trends and themes within each category of data provided;
- include an analysis of each trend or theme identified and present key findings in each category;
- include an analysis of reviews by gate, project type, delivery confidence and recommendation rating;
- include an ICT-specific lessons learned;
- include an analysis of trends between Lessons Learned Reports 1, 2 and 3; and
- be in a format suitable to publish on the Department of Finance website.

Review Methodology

The methodology applied in this review, and the two previous reviews, involved a five-step process as follows:

- **Step One**: Establish data sets and metrics from the WA Gateway Unit's Lessons Learned database aligned to the 2018 and 2021 Lessons Learned reviews.
- **Step Two**: Review all Gateway Reports to ensure complete data sets and undertake a qualitative analysis of findings and recommendations.
- **Step Three**: Analyse data in a form consistent with the 2018 and 2021 Lessons Learned reviews.
- **Step Four**: Review each recommendation to validate or confirm trends from the data analysis.
- **Step Five**: Submit a draft report to the WA Gateway Unit and incorporate feedback into this final report.

Review Period

This Third Lessons Learned Review report considered 449 recommendations from 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews, including project and program reviews, health checks and strategic assessments.

During the review period, four Recommendation Reviews were undertaken. These are reviews that assess the status of actions arising from the recommendations in a prior Gateway Review. The recommendations arising from these reviews have not been included in this review given the project is not re-statussed.

The analysis in this third Lessons Learned Review has been undertaken across two time periods to identify trends between each period under review, as well as identify trends across previous time periods in the two previous Lessons Learned reviews as follows in Table 1:

Table 1: Lessons Learned Reviews – Time Periods

	2018 Review	**2021 Review**	**2022 Review**
Year 1:	1st June 2015 to 31st May 2016	1st June 2018 to 31st May 2019	1st March 2021 to 31st Dec. 2021
Year 2:	1st June 2016 to 31st May 2017	1st June 2019 to 31st May 2020	1st Jan 2022 to 31st Dec. 2022
Year 3:	1st June 2017 to 31st May 2018	1st June 2020 to 28th Feb. 2021	Not applicable

For the purposes of this review, the date at which the Gateway Assurance Review reports are issued by the Review Team to the Senior Responsible Officer on the final day of the review, and recorded in the WA Gateway Unit database, are the dates that determine their inclusion within these time periods.

Delivery Confidence Rating Changes

Prior to July 2020, each project or program reviewed by the Review Team was assigned a single 'Overall Rating' based on a three-tiered rating of Red, Amber or Green.

In July 2020, the WA Gateway Unit introduced a five-tiered 'Delivery Confidence Rating' to replace the previous three-tiered 'Overall Rating' for each Gateway Assurance Review whereby a combined Green/Amber and Amber/Red rating were added to the then-existing, three-tiered rating. Concurrent with these changes, the 'Overall Rating' was replaced with a 'Delivery Confidence Rating'.

Delivery Confidence is defined as:

> The Gateway Review Team's confidence in the project/program's ability, on its current trajectory, to deliver outcomes and benefits to the agreed time, cost, scope and quality.

Each of the five-tiered Delivery Confidence Ratings are defined as follows:

> **Green** – Successful delivery to time, cost and quality of the project/program appears highly likely at this stage. No significant outstanding major risks or issues or unaddressed risks are apparent.

Green / **Amber** – Successful delivery of the project/program appears probable at this stage. Some aspects require attention to ensure they do not threaten delivery or materialise into major risks or issues.

Amber – Successful delivery of the project/programme appears possible at this stage. Some unresolved risks and issues exist that require prompt attention to avoid compromising quality, project time and cost overruns.

Amber / **Red** – Successful delivery of the project/program appears doubtful at this stage. Multiple significant risks and issues are unresolved and require urgent attention. Project time, cost and/or quality are at risk.

Red – Successful delivery of the project/program appears unachievable at this stage. Multiple significant major risks and issues are evident and appear irrecoverable. Project time, cost and/or quality parameters appear likely to be exceeded if the project proceeds as is.

Gateway Assurance Review - Recommendation Rating

The Gateway Review Team allocates a rating for *each* recommendation as being one of three colour, or severity ratings, (Red, Amber or Green) which are defined as follows:

Red – (critical and urgent). To achieve success the project should take action on recommendations immediately.

Amber – (critical and not urgent). The project should go forward with actions on recommendations to be carried out before further key decisions are taken.

Green – (recommended – not critical or urgent). The project is on target to succeed but may benefit from the uptake of recommendations.

The individual 449 recommendations in the Gateway data base analysed as part of this review have applied these colour rating definitions.

Gateway Assurance Review - Data Base

The analysis in this report is based on the WA Gateway Unit's data base (reference: *Gateway Review Lessons Learnt (summary)_Master Copy20December2022*) which classifies each recommendation in a Gateway Report into one of eleven Lessons Learned Categories, defined as follows in Table 2:

Table 2: Lessons Learned Categories

	Lessons Learned Category	Definition
1.	Strategic Alignment	Issues related to government/organisation objectives, interdependencies with other initiatives/projects, approval/endorsement for project.
2.	Document Quality and Control	Includes aspects relating to the management of project documentation, version control, completeness of documentation, use of templates, referencing, documents held with individuals vs project team etc.
3.	Financial Issues	Issues related to project funding, financial/cost benefits analysis.
4.	Business Case	Record aspects relating to the development of the business case including rationale for project, clarity of scope, options analysis, estimated costs, drivers/objectives for the project, consistency with government process for approval.
5.	Stakeholder Communication	Issues related to the identification and management of stakeholders including communication plans, key messages, level of support, timelines, frequency of comms and reporting of issues.
6.	Project Resources	Capture issues associated with the allocation of human/people resources for the project. This may include need to develop a resource plan, attraction and retention strategies and costs for the project team.
7.	Project Outcomes	Includes issues related to the project's key deliverables, the benefits to be realised, critical success factors, value for money.

	Lessons Learned Category	Definition
8.	Procurement Strategy	Includes issues related to the procurement planning, specifying requirements, market engagement, contract award and management strategies, KPIs, assessment of procurement options, evaluation plans/reports and tendering.
9.	Governance	Focuses on governance in relation to roles, responsibilities, accountabilities and terms of reference or composition of committees including overall project governance, Steering Committees, Project Control Groups.
10.	Risk Management	All issues related to the identification and management of risks (or lack of) including mitigation strategies, contingencies, formal reporting of risk etc.
11.	Project Management (processes and issues combined)	Includes generic issues related to the process of managing a project such as the project management methodology, planning/scheduling work, reporting but excludes risk management issues. Records project management issues that are specific and unique to the project.

The WA Gateway Unit's database also includes a 'Project Type' classification which allocates projects to being one of three Project Types as defined in Table 3:

Table 3: Project Type

	Type	Definition
Project Type 1:	Infrastructure	Projects with a large building/construction component.
Project Type 2:	ICT	ICT projects i.e., minimal or no building or construction.
Project Type 3:	Services	Includes outsourced maintenance and services contracts.

Limitations and Constraints of this Review

Data sets - this analysis is based on 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews which *may or may not* be representative of the issues, concerns and/or risks being encountered by projects or programs in WA that have not been subject to a Gateway Assurance Review.

Data Metrics Tables

The data metrics, on which the analysis in this report has been based, are included in the tables in Appendix 3 to 5.

Scope

The WA Gateway Unit's Lessons Learned database for this Review comprised 449 recommendations from 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews conducted over the twenty-two-month review period, which involved 40 different projects for 22 agencies (compared to 33 different projects and 18 agencies in the 2018 Review and 49 different projects for 23 agencies in the 2021 Review).

3: Detailed Analysis

Analysis by Delivery Confidence Rating

The Overall Delivery Confidence Rating of the 44 Gateway Assurance Reviews over the period of this Lessons Learned Review (and compared to 2018 and 2021 reviews) is detailed in Table 4 as follows:

Table 4: Delivery Confidence Rating

Rating	Year 1	Year 2	Total	% of total 2022		% of total 2018	% of total 2021
Red	-	-	-	-		41.7	17.7
Amber/Red	2	12	14	31.8		n/a	2.9
Amber	9	8	17	38.6		56.3	54.4
Green/Amber	8	3	11	25.0		n/a	10.3
Green	-	2	2	4.6		2.0	14.7
Total	19	25	44	100.0		100.0	100.0

Table 4 shows that, since the introduction of the split Delivery Confidence ratings of Amber/Red and Green/Amber in June 2020, no project or program has recorded a Red Delivery Confidence Rating.

In addition, combined Delivery Confidence Ratings (i.e. Amber/Red and Green/Amber) comprised 56.8% of all Delivery Confidence Ratings during this review period representing an increasing trend identified in the 2021 Lessons Learned Review which identified that 50% of all reviews applied the split Delivery Confidence Rating.

This trend indicates that the combined Delivery Confidence Ratings are being fully embraced by the Review Teams.

Analysis by Individual Project by Delivery Confidence

The Delivery Confidence Ratings of individual projects are summarised in Table 5:

Table 5: Individual Project Delivery Confidence Rating (note: projects are anonymised to maintain confidentiality)

	Gate 1 Strategic Assessment	Gate 2 Business Case		Gate 3 Readiness for Market	Gate 4 Tender Decision	Gate 5 Readiness for Service	Gate 6 Benefits Realisation	Total
Project 1	Amber				Green / Amber	Amber / Red		
Project 2		Amber / Red						
Project 3	Amber / Red	Amber / Red						
Project 4 +		Amber	Amber					
Project 5				Amber				
Project 6		Amber / Red						
Project 7	Amber / Red							
Project 8							Green	
Project 9		Amber / Red						
Project 10		Amber						

	Gate 1 Strategic Assessment	Gate 2 Business Case	Gate 3 Readiness for Market	Gate 4 Tender Decision	Gate 5 Readiness for Service	Gate 6 Benefits Realisation	Total
Project 11					**Amber /** **Red**		
Project 12		**Green / Amber**					
Project 13		**Green / Amber**					
Project 14		**Amber**					
Project 15		**Amber / Red**					
Project 16		**Amber / Red**					
Project 17		**Amber**					
Project 18		**Amber / Red**					
Project 19	**Amber**						
Project 20			**Green /** **Amber**				
Project 21			**Amber /** **Red**				
Project 22			**Green**				
Project 23					**Amber**		
Project 24		**Amber**					
Project 25					**Green /** **Amber**		
Project 26						**Green /** **Amber**	
Project 27			**Amber**				
Project 28			**Amber /** **Red**				
Project 29		**Green / Amber**					
Project 30			**Amber**				
Project 31		**Amber**					
Project 32			**Amber**				
Project 33			**Green /** **Amber**				
Project 34					**Green /** **Amber**		
Project 35		**Amber / Red**					
Project 36			**Amber**				
Project 37					**Green /** **Amber**		
Project 38	**Amber**						
Project 39					**Green /** **Amber**		
Project 40			**Amber**				
TOTALS	**5**	**18**	**11**	**1**	**7**	**2**	**44**

+ denotes a repeat review of the same Gate

Table 5 shows that, of the 40 different projects that undertook a Gateway Assurance Review, just two undertook a subsequent review (versus 15 from 49 in 2021 and 6 from 33 in 2015) and one undertook a repeat Gateway Assurance Review of the same Gate. It is noted that this 2022 Review is over two years rather than a three-year review period as was the case for the 2018 Review and 2021 Reviews which could impact the reduced frequency of subsequent reviews undertaken.

Analysis by Gate

The number of Gateway Assurance Reviews completed during the review period broken down by Gate, and totals from the 2018 and 2021 reviews, is detailed in Table 6:

Table 6: Number of Reviews by Gate

Gate	Year 1	Year 2	Total	% of Total		Total 2018	% of Total	Total 2021	% of Total
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment	2	3	5	11.4		3	6.3	14	20.6
Gate 2: Business Case	4	14	18	40.9		6	12.5	19	27.9
Gate 3: Readiness for Market	7	4	11	25.0		4	8.3	7	10.3
Gate 4: Tender Decision	1	-	1	2.3		12	25.0	10	14.7
Gate 5: Readiness for Service	4	3	7	15.9		20	41.6	17	25.0
Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation	1	1	2	4.5		3	6.3	1	1.5
Total	19	25	44	100.0		48	100.0	68	100.0

Table 6 shows that there was a continuing increase in the frequency of both Business Case (Gate 2) and Readiness for Market (Gate 3) reviews since the 2018 Review whilst, conversely, there was a continuing decline in the frequency of Tender Decision (Gate 4) and Readiness for Service (Gate 5) Reviews.

Across all Reviews, Benefits Evaluation reviews continue to be significantly underrepresented as a proportion of all Gateway Assurance Reviews undertaken, comprising just 4.5% of all reviews undertaken during the review period. This under-representation was evident in both the 2018 and 2021 Reviews.

Analysis by Project Type

A breakdown of Reviews by Project Type and year is as follows in Table 7:

Table 7: Project Type by Year

Project Type	Year 1	Year 2	2022 Total	% of Total	2018 Total	% of Total	2021 Total	% of Total
Project Type 1: Infrastructure	6	6	12	27.3	20	42	26	38
Project Type 2: ICT	11	18	29	65.9	23	48	41	61
Project Type 3: Services	2	1	3	6.8	5	10	1	1
Total	19	25	44	100.0	48	100	68	100

Table 7 shows the changing Project Types being reviewed since 2015, whereby Infrastructure projects represent a reducing proportion of all reviews undertaken in favour of ICT projects. ICT projects represented approximately 48% of all projects reviewed during the 2018 Review and 61% in the 2021 Review and now comprise 65.9%, or nearly two-thirds, of all reviews undertaken during this 2022 Review.

Conversely, Infrastructure Project Types have continued to reduce as a proportion of all Gateway Reviews falling from 42% in the 2018 Review to 27.3% in this 2022 Review.

Projects classified as Services recorded three reviews during the review period reflecting the lowest proportion of all Project Types which was also the case in both the 2018 and 2021 Reviews. This low proportion could be attributed to the fact that Services projects are not part of the Premier's circulars 2016/05 and 2020/03 and thereby not specifically mandated for Gateway Assurance Reviews.

Nevertheless, the frequency of Gateway Assurance Reviews for Services projects increased, albeit from a low base, which could reflect the Government's "Health Care in Public Hands" March 2020 commitment to return privatised services to the public sector "where possible and economically beneficial to do so". Two of the three Services projects during this Review period were health-related.

Delivery Confidence Ratings by Project Types

Delivery Confidence Ratings by Project Types are detailed in Table 8 as follows:

Table 8: Project Type by Delivery Confidence Rating 2022

Project Type	Red	Amber / Red	Amber	Green / Amber	Green	Total 2022	% of Total
Project Type 1: Infrastructure	-	2	7	2	1	12	27.3
Project Type 2: ICT	-	11	10	7	1	29	65.9
Project Type 3: Services	-	1		2		3	6.8
Total	-	14	17	11	2	44	100.0

Table 8 shows that, despite comprising approximately 66% of all Gateway Assurance Reviews undertaken during the review period, ICT Projects received nearly 80% of the severest (Amber/Red) Delivery Confidence Ratings assigned indicating a disproportionately higher level of concern by Review Teams with ICT projects compared to Infrastructure projects.

A further breakdown by Project Type into recommendation severity (Red/Amber/Green) and by year is as follows in Table 9:

Table 9: Project Type by Recommendation Severity 2022

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure									
% of Infrastructure Projects per Year	37.3%	37.3%	25.4%	32.8%	39.7%	27.6%	35.2%	38.4%	26.4%
Sub-total	67			58			125		
Project Type 2: ICT									
% of ICT projects per Year	15.0%	50.5%	34.6%	32.1%	54.7%	13.2%	25.9%	53.2%	20.9%
Sub-total	107			190			297		
Project Type 3: Services									
% of Services Projects per Year	0.0%	76.9%	23.1%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%
Sub-total	13			14			27		
Total All Projects per Year	187			262			449		

Table 9 indicates that recommendations for Infrastructure Project Types have maintained a consistent proportion of rating severity (Red) over the review period whereas, by comparison, ICT Project Types recorded a marginally less severe severity (Red) overall albeit showing a worsening level of severity for Year 2. This sharp increase in severity rating for ICT Project Types from Year 1 to Year 2 could be due to the Review Teams identifying the impact of 'systemic risks' currently observable for ICT projects and referenced elsewhere in this report.

Services Project Types recorded the highest proportion of severity ratings (Red) of all three project categories although, it should be noted, just three Service reviews were undertaken during the review period.

Analysis by Recommendation Ratings

This Lessons Learned Review analyses 449 recommendations compared to 525 and 694, respectively, for the 2018 and 2021 Reviews and detailed as follows in Table 10:

Table 10: Recommendation Severity from the 2022 Review (versus 2018 and 2021)

Rating	2022 Review	% of Total 2022		2018 Review	% of Total 2018	2021 Review	% of Total 2021
Red	133	30		189	36	208	30
Amber	218	48		267	51	306	44
Green	98	22		69	13	180	26
Total	449	100		525	100	694	100

Table 10 indicates that, as a proportion of recommendations, Red, Amber and Green recommendations have remained constant across all three Lessons Learned reviews.

The average proportions of recommendation ratings across all Reviews since 2015 shows that Red ratings account for approximately 30% of all recommendations, Amber ratings account for approximately 50% of all recommendations and Green ratings account for approximately 20% of all recommendations.

Benchmark Average

The 449 recommendations analyses as part of this review can be further broken down into recommendation severity (Red/Amber/Green) by year as follows in Table 11:

Table 11: Recommendation Severity

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Ratings by Year All Gates	41	89	57	92	129	41	133	218	98
Total All Ratings by Year	187			262			449		
% for Year All Gates	21.9%	47.6%	30.5%	35.1%	49.2%	15.6%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%

Table 10 and Table 11 both show that, as a proportion, Red, Amber and Green recommendation ratings have remained largely consistent with the long-term trend whereby Red-rated recommendations comprise approximately 30% of all recommendations, whilst Amber recommendations comprise approximately 50% of all recommendations and Green recommendations comprise approximately 20%.

For the purposes of this report, these 2022 proportions (namely 30%, 50% and 20%) have been adopted as the Benchmark Average to assist in Lessons Learned comparative analysis. For the two previous Lessons Learned reviews the Benchmark averages were:

2018: 35%, 50% and 15%
2021: 30%, 45% and 25%

Analysis by Gate and Recommendation

The 449 recommendations were recorded against the respective Gates (versus 2018 and 2021) in Table 12:

Table 12:: Analysis by Gate (Note: some columns do not add exactly to 100 due to rounding)

Gate	Individual Recommendation Rating				% of total recs.		2018 Total	2018 %	2021 Total	2021 %
	Red	Amber	Green	Total						
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment	25	31	9	65	14		25	5	144	21
Gate 2: Business Case	67	88	30	185	41		68	13	190	27
Gate 3: Readiness for Market	36	57	33	126	28		88	17	92	13
Gate 4: Tender Decision	0	3	3	6	1		137	26	118	17
Gate 5: Readiness for Service	5	31	11	47	10		184	35	146	21
Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation	0	8	12	20	4		23	4	4	1
Total	133	218	98	449	100		525	100	694	100

Analysis by Lessons Learned Categories

Recommendations broken down by Lessons Learned category (versus 2018 and 2021) are detailed in Table 13 as follows:

Table 13: Analysis by Lessons Learned Category (Note: some columns do not add exactly to 100 due to rounding)

Lessons Learned Category	Red	Amber	Green	2022 Total	2022 %		2018 Total	2018 %	2021 Total	2021 %
1. Strategic Alignment	0	3	4	7	2%		9	1.7	4	0.6
2. Document Quality and Control	0	3	2	5	1%		3	0.6	14	2.0
3. Financial Issues	12	9	6	27	6%		25	4.8	31	4.5
4. Business Case	21	30	14	65	14%		34	6.5	109	15.7
5. Stakeholder Communication	5	10	6	21	5%		27	5.1	26	3.7
6. Project Resources	9	17	7	33	7%		39	7.4	46	6.6
7. Project Outcomes	5	29	13	47	10%		39	7.4	83	12.0
8. Procurement Strategy	13	31	10	54	12%		44	8.4	55	7.9

Lessons Learned Category	Red	Amber	Green	2022 Total	2022 %		2018 Total	2018 %	2021 Total	2021 %
9. Governance	16	18	9	43	10%		49	9.3	85	12.2
10. Risk Management	15	29	11	55	12%		83	15.8	102	14.7
11. Project Management	37	39	16	92	20%		173	33.0	139	20.0
Total	133	218	98	449	100%		525	100.0	694	100.0

Table 13 shows that the Lessons Learned category of Project Management (Lessons Learned Category 11) has recorded the highest proportion of recommendations during this review period of 20%. This Lessons Learned Category also recorded the highest proportion of recommendations in both the 2018 and the 2021 Reviews of 33% and 20% respectively, indicating ongoing concerns by Review Teams with project management.

Risk Management (Lessons Learned Category 10) and Governance (Lessons Learned Category 9) have shown a marginal reduction in the proportion of recommendations since the 2018 and 2021 Reviews.

Procurement (Lessons Learned Category 8) has recorded an increase in the proportion of recommendations since the 2021 Review. All other Lessons Learned Categories have recorded consistency in the proportion of recommendations since the 2018 Review.

Lessons Learned Categories related to key project management disciplines, namely Project Management, Risk Management and Governance, comprise 190 or 40% of all recommendations during the review period (versus 46.9% in 2021 and 58% in 2018) indicating the need for improvement in broader project management disciplines over the three reviews compared to other Lessons Learned Categories.

Recommendations by Lessons Learned Category for each Gate are detailed in Table 14:

Table 14: Lessons Learned Category by Gate (Note: some columns do not add exactly to 100 due to rounding)

Lessons Learned Category	Gate 1	Gate 2	Gate 3	Gate 4	Gate 5	Gate 6	Total	% of Total
1. Strategic Alignment	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	2
2. Document Quality and Control	0	2	1	0	1	1	5	1
3. Financial Issues	0	11	13	0	1	2	27	6
4. Business Case	7	48	8	0	1	1	65	14
5. Stakeholder Communication	3	8	9	0	0	1	21	5
6. Project Resources	5	12	12	0	2	2	33	7
7. Project Outcomes	8	18	5	1	11	4	47	10
8. Procurement Strategy	3	16	34	0	0	1	54	12
9. Governance	11	17	8	2	4	1	43	10
10. Risk Management	10	20	13	1	9	2	55	12
11. Project Management	18	26	23	2	18	5	92	20
Total	65	185	126	6	47	20	449	100%
Av. No. of recommendations per review 2022	13.0	10.3	11.5	6.0	6.7	10.0	10.2	
Av. No. of recommendations per review 2021	10.3	10.0	13.1	11.8	8.6	4.0	10.2	
Av. No. of recommendations per review 2018	8.3	11.3	22.0	11.4	9.2	7.6	10.9	

Table 14 indicates that the average proportion of recommendations across all Lessons Learned Categories by Gate for the 2022 Review (10.2) is consistent with both the 2021 Review (10.2) and the 2018 Review (10.9).

Analysis by Lessons Learned Categories by Project Type

An analysis of Lessons Learned Category by Project Type is detailed as follows:

Table 15: Lessons Learned by Project Type

	Rating	Year 1			Year 2			Total 2022			Total 2021			Total 2018		
		Infra	ICT	Services	Infra	ICT	Services	Infra	ICT	Services	Infra	ICT	Services	Infra	ICT	Services
1.	Strategic Alignment	0	1	0	5	1	0	5	2	0	1	3	0	3	3	3
2.	Document Quality and Control	2	0	1	2	0	0	4	0	1	1	13	0	1	2	0
3.	Financial Issues	8	8	0	4	7	0	12	15	0	11	20	0	11	13	1
4.	Business Case	4	12	1	15	33	0	19	45	1	45	64	0	7	26	1
5.	Stakeholder Comms	6	2	0	6	7	0	12	9	0	12	14	0	7	14	6
6.	Project Resources	5	10	0	2	14	2	7	24	2	24	21	1	18	19	2
7.	Project Outcomes	4	13	4	2	24	0	6	37	4	26	56	1	15	17	7
8.	Procurement Strategy	6	26	0	6	16	0	12	42	0	23	32	0	19	25	0
9.	Governance	7	6	0	2	23	5	9	29	5	33	51	1	22	24	3
10	Risk Management	8	16	3	5	21	2	13	37	5	47	55	0	40	38	5
11	Project Mgt - Processes	17	12	4	9	44	5	26	56	9	34	84	3	69	82	13
	Project Mgt - Issues	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	11	0	5	2	2
	Total	67	107	13	58	190	14	125	297	27	264	424	6	217	265	43
		187			262			449			694			525		

Table 15 indicates that, by Lessons Learned Category, ICT projects had a higher number of recommendations than Infrastructure projects for both Project Resourcing and Project Outcomes. A review of individual Gateway Assurance Review reports confirms that this difference can be attributed to underdeveloped benefits management practices and emergent systemic risks relating to the availability of specialist ICT skills and ICT industry capability and capacity.

Furthermore, whilst Risk Management Lessons Learned Category (10) and Governance Category (9) showed a reduction in recommendations over the three Lessons Learned reviews for Infrastructure projects, the number of recommendations for ICT Projects in these two Lessons Learned Categories over the same period showed no reduction corroborating the emergence of systemic risks identified by Review Teams for ICT Projects and the requirement to enhance or supplement governance forums.

The Lessons Learned Category of Project Management (11) showed a reducing trend in recommendations for Infrastructure projects over the three Lessons Learned review periods compared to ICT projects indicating a need for sourcing specialist ICT skills commensurate with the risk profile of these projects.

4: Analysis by Themes and by Lessons Learned Category

1. Strategic Alignment

Seven recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category, representing 1.6% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 16).

Table 16: Strategic Alignment Recommendations

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
1. Strategic Alignment	0	1	0	0	2	4	0	3	4
Sub Total	1			6			7		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%

Table 16 shows that not a single, Red-rated recommendation was recorded in this Lessons Learned Category over the review period. Whilst Amber-rated recommendations were consistent with the Benchmark Average, Green-rated reviews were above the Benchmark Average for this Category indicating relatively mild concerns from Review Teams relating to this Category.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category was the need for project teams to engage more broadly with other agencies to recognise the network-wide implications of their projects and to ensure ongoing alignment with whole-of-government policies.

2. Document Quality and Control

Five recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 1.1% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 17).

Table 17: Document Quality and Control Recommendations

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
2. Document Quality and Control	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	3	2
Sub-total	3			2			5		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%

The above table shows that not a single, Red-rated recommendation was recorded in this Lessons Learned Category over the review period. Both Amber and Green-rated recommendations were above the Benchmark Average. There were no recommendations in this Category relating to ICT projects.

A common theme in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category was the need for project teams to develop a document control system, particularly with a common project nomenclature and agreed document access arrangements.

3. Financial Issues

Twenty-seven recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 6.0% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 18).

Table 18: Financial Issues Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
3. Financial Issues	6	7	3	6	2	3	12	9	6
Sub Total	16			11			27		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	37.5%	43.8%	18.8%	54.5%	18.2%	27.3%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%

Financial Issues recorded a disproportionately higher profile of recommendation severity (Red-rated) than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category, applicable to both ICT and Infrastructure projects, were:

- absence of apparent rigour in the cost estimates including independent verification and/or validation of assumptions and
- clearly identifying sources of funding.

For ICT Projects the review reports in this Category emphasised the need to develop:

- a total cost of ownership model which included both capital and operating costs over the investment term;
- identification and evaluation for discrete options that included a Minimum Viable Product, Customised Off the Shelf, Customised Off the Shelf (+customisation) and bespoke solution; and
- inclusion of a Cost Benefit Analysis to support the investment decision.

4. Business Case

Sixty-five recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category (14.5%) across all Lessons Learned Categories over the review period (Table 19).

Table 19: Business Case Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
4. Business Case	5	5	7	16	25	7	21	30	14
Sub Total	17			48			65		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	29.4%	29.4%	41.2%	33.3%	52.1%	14.6%	32.3%	46.2%	21.5%

Business Case rating severity for this Lessons Learned Category was consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category for both ICT and Infrastructure projects are:

- low incidence of a formal application of the *Strategic Asset Management Framework* in developing a business case, particularly in relation to the options assessment;
- enhancing the analytical rigour and transparency in the options analysis including asset and non-asset solutions, comparative Benefit Cost Ratio analysis and clarity around the application of Multi Criteria Analysis;
- improving the quality and clarity of key elements of the business case, particularly scope definition and assumptions (their identification and verification);
- development of a program-wide framework within which the project is being delivered; and
- absence of a whole-of-life costing model.

The Review Teams also identified the absence of a clear, concise understandable narrative outlining the criticality and urgency of the investment as was the need to apply an Investment Logic process to more clearly articulate the problems the investment is attempting to address.

A key theme identified in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category specific to ICT projects was the need to develop greater scope clarity including the concept of a Minimum Viable Product as part of an objective options assessment. In addition, the lack of clarity on the applicable business case framework was also a theme, particularly whether Treasury and/or the Office of Digital Government framework and/or the Gateway Guidelines should be applied or elements of all three.

5. Stakeholder Communication

Twenty-one recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 4.7% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 20).

Table 20: Stakeholder Communication Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
5. Stakeholder Communication	2	4	2	3	6	4	5	10	6
Sub Total	8			13			21		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	23.8%	47.6%	28.6%

Stakeholder Communications recommendation rating severity (Red) for this Lessons Learned Category is lower than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category, applying to both ICT and Infrastructure projects, was the inadequacy or the non-existence of a communications plan to inform stakeholder engagement activities. In addition, recommendations also stipulated the need to engage with key stakeholders during both the options assessment and design development phases.

A key theme for ICT Projects was the need to include the Organisational Change Management task in communications and stakeholder engagement activities.

6. Project Resources

Thirty-three recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 7.3% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 21).

Table 21:Project Resources Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
6. Project Resources	2	10	3	7	7	4	9	17	7
Sub Total	15			18			33		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	13.3%	66.7%	20.0%	38.9%	38.9%	22.2%	27.3%	51.5%	21.2%

Project Resource review recommendation rating severity was consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category, for both ICT and Infrastructure projects, were the absence of an effective Resource Management Plan and the consequent risks of sourcing the requisite skills to mitigate the risks to project delivery given current market capacity and constraints.

For both ICT and Services projects, this skill deficiency also included the need to procure external technical expertise to supplement the skills sets of project teams, notably in areas related to organisational change management and contract management.

7. Project Outcomes

Forty-seven recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 10.5% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 22).

Table 22: Project Outcomes Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
7. Project Outcomes	2	9	10	3	20	3	5	29	13
Sub Total	21			26			47		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	9.5%	42.9%	47.6%	11.5%	76.9%	11.5%	10.6%	61.7%	27.7%

Project Outcomes recorded a lower proportion of Red-rated recommendations and a higher proportion of Amber-rated recommendations than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category for Infrastructure, ICT and Services projects included the requirement to:

- develop a formal benefits realisation plan; and
- develop key metrics in support of these plans.

Review reports in this category tended to stipulate the basic requirements of what a Benefits Realisation Plan should include i.e. a 'how to' explanation typically focussing on baseline metrics, targets and methods of measurement. This was also a theme in the 2018 and 2021 Reviews.

The recommendations in this Lessons Learned Category were disproportionately focussed on ICT projects and Services, indicating a need to develop a benefits management culture within these Project Types.

8. Procurement Strategy

Fifty-four recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 12% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 23).

Table 23: Procurement Strategy Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
8. Procurement Strategy	7	19	6	6	12	4	13	31	10
Sub Total	32			22			54		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	21.9%	59.4%	18.8%	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	24.1%	57.4%	18.5%

Procurement Strategy recorded a lower proportion of Red-rated recommendations and a higher proportion of Amber-rated recommendations than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category across all Project Types were:

- improving the objectivity and rigour relating to procurement options assessments and
- improving procurement planning regarding formal plans for evaluation, negotiations and scheduling which consider the end-to-end tender process.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned Category specific to ICT projects were:

- absence of a description of the future operating model that the solution will be supporting;
- the need to develop more detailed Procurement Plans that included probity, contract management and transition arrangements; and
- absence of a clear link in the tender documentation between the proposed solution and business outcomes.

These themes for ICT projects are also consistent with the 2021 Review.

9. Governance

Forty-three recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 9.6% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 26).

Table 24:Governance Recommendations

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
9. Governance	2	5	6	14	13	3	16	18	9
Sub Total	13			30			43		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%	46.7%	43.3%	10.0%	37.2%	41.9%	20.9%

Recommendations in this Lessons Learned category have a higher severity (Red-rating) than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category were to improve governance arrangements with an emphasis on:

- developing and applying clear Terms of Reference including clarity of roles and responsibilities; and
- establishing clear and succinct reporting e.g. baseline or exceptions-based reporting.

These themes were similar to those identified in the 2018 and 2021 Reviews for this Lessons Learned Category.

The major theme identified for ICT projects was the need for projects to develop a portfolio or a system or program-wide approach to managing risks and issues beyond the scope of the project, notably: market capability and capacity, change management and resourcing. Recommendations in this Category sought wider stakeholder representation on governance forums (specifically: inter-agency representatives, system manager and/or an agency portfolio manager) to take account of these wider systemic risks.

Other themes in this Lessons Learned Category specific to ICT projects included: the lack of a fit-for-purpose governance structure with specific skills for that particular stage of the project relating to: probity, enterprise architecture, design management, data management and business services (business owner).

10. Risk Management

Fifty-five recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned Category representing 12.2% of all recommendations over the review period (Table 25).

Table 25:Risk Management Recommendations

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
10. Risk Management	6	12	9	9	17	2	15	29	11
Sub Total	27			28			55		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	32.1%	60.7%	7.1%	27.3%	52.7%	20.0%

Recommendation severity in this Lessons Learned Category is consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category were:

- an absence of industry-standard or good practice risk management arrangements;
- *establishing* and *implementing* a Risk Management Plan;
- developing and actively managing a risk register with regular risk workshops;
- incorporating a broader range of risks into the risk register;
- assessing and recording both pre and post-implementation risk ratings; and
- absence of effective issues and risk reporting protocols.

These themes were also identified in the 2021 Review.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned category specific to ICT projects were an absence of a risk-based contingency allowance and how this contingency was to be managed.

11. Project Management (Issues and Processes Combined)

Ninety-two recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing the highest proportion (20.5%) across all Lessons Learned Categories over the review period (Table 26).

Table 26: Project Management Recommendations

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Category									
11. Project Management	9	15	10	28	24	6	37	39	16
Sub Total	34			58			92		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	26.5%	44.1%	29.4%	48.3%	41.4%	10.3%	40.2%	42.4%	17.4%

Recommendations in this Lessons Learned category recorded a higher severity rating Red-rated) than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the review reports for this Lessons Learned Category were:

- developing and implementing integrated project scheduling which covers all stages of the project;
- improving status reporting to project governance bodies particularly baseline reporting for schedule, risks, budget (costs) and benefits;
- applying industry standard project management disciplines, particularly for scheduling and risk management and an absence of key project artefacts, particularly organisational change management and contract management; and
- an absence of next stage planning artefacts, notably: Project Initiation Documentation, Project Management Plan and/or a Roadmap.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned Category for ICT projects were the need to manage business change requirements as part of agreed business outcomes.

Appendix 1: First Lessons Learned Report 2018

Summary of Findings

The summary findings from the 2018 Review are as follows:

1. Core project management disciplines, particularly project management, risk management and governance, were identified by reviewers as the more prevalent and recurring concerns where projects are often not applying a formal or recognisable good practice project management standard.

2. Gateway recommendations are not being fully actioned as the project progresses into subsequent phases whereby governance, risk management and project management disciplines show an increasing trend, in both the number and severity of recommendations, as the project progresses into subsequent phases.

3. ICT and Services projects have recorded a higher proportion of Red recommendations than Infrastructure projects indicating that ICT and Services projects are not being resourced with the requisite levels of capability commensurate with their complexity nor to the same extent as Infrastructure projects.

4. Common themes identified in recommendations requiring specific focus by project teams:
   a. apply good-practice standards for: options assessments, benefits management, risk management, resource planning, governance and project management.
   b. develop documents as "dynamic" project management tools rather than as project reporting tools.
   c. develop beginning-to-end planning for projects also recognising interdependencies and co-dependencies across government.
   d. timely appointment of specialist resources to the project teams particularly for: Organisational Change Management, Contract Management, Benefits Management and Communications and Stakeholder Engagement.

5. ICT-specific themes identified in the reviews were:
   a. Business Case – clearly identify the processes for managing both Business As Usual and the Project activities;
   b. Procurement – engage more thoroughly with the vendor market when selecting the preferred procurement approach to:
      i. explain and validate the rationale for the procurement approach;
      ii. explain and validate the process for agreeing Proof of Concept;
      iii. explain the manner in which Value for Money will be assessed;
      iv. explain the negotiation process for selecting the preferred vendor and
      v. develop a clear process for scope management.

    c.   Stakeholder Communication – clearly articulate the intended business benefits and apply rigorous change management protocols

    d.   Project Management – develop clear and transparent processes for: transition in and transition out, Go-No/Go decision criteria, end-state environment, User Acceptance Testing and Data Migration.

6.   Few projects undertake post-implementation or Benefits Realisation reviews to determine whether the original investment decision has realised the intended benefits to the extent envisioned in the original investment proposal.

7.   There appears to be a reduced propensity to undertake subsequent Gateway reviews when the Overall Rating of a project is either deteriorating or not improving.

The analysis found that just five projects undertook a subsequent Gate (i.e. next Gate, not a repeat of the same Gate) review during the review period and, for these Projects that recorded a worse Overall Rating than the preceding review, no subsequent Gate reviews were undertaken.

None of the projects that recorded a Red Overall Rating undertook a subsequent Gate review during the review period.

Appendix 2: Second Lessons Learned Report 2021

Summary of Findings

The summary findings from the 2021 Review are as follows:

1. This Review comprised an analysis of 68 Gateway Assurance Reviews conducted over the three-year review period which involved 49 different projects for 23 agencies (compared to 33 projects and 18 agencies, respectively in the 2018 Review) reflecting a wider application of the Gateway Assurance Review framework across the WA public sector since the first review. (notwithstanding the shorter Year 3 period of 8 months in this review).

2. Since the introduction of the split Amber/Red and Green/Amber Delivery Confidence Ratings in June 2020 (five-tier system), no project or program has recorded an overall red delivery confidence rating.

   In addition, 50% of all reviews since the introduction of the five-tier system (9 from 18 reviews) have allocated the split Delivery Confidence Rating indicating that the new five-tier approach has been fully embraced by the Gateway Review Teams.

3. Of the 49 different projects assured by a Gateway Review, fifteen of these projects had undertaken a subsequent Gateway Review (4), health check (6) or recommendation review (5) representing 30% of all projects reviewed (compared to 18% in the 2018 Review).

   Of those fifteen projects that undertook subsequent reviews (or repeat reviews) all recorded an improvement in overall rating (or no worse rating) except for one. Furthermore, for every project given a red Overall Rating, where subsequent reviews were undertaken, this rating improved in *all* cases.

   The qualitative reviews of all 68 Gateway Reviews (i.e. Step 2) identified that a contributing factor to these improved ratings for repeat reviews was that the project teams had acted upon the recommendations from the preceding Gateway Assurance Review.

4. All three Project Types, namely Infrastructure, ICT and Services, have recorded a similar proportion of Red recommendations (around 30%) which is a marginal improvement in the proportion of Red recommendations from the 2018 Review (36%) indicating a trend of less severe ratings across all three project types. This trend implies improved project delivery practices since the previous 2018 Review.

5. Three-quarters of all Gateway Assurance Reviews during the review period have been Gates 1, 2 and 5 which is consistent with the proportions identified in the 2018 Review. It is noted that no business case (Gate 2) reviews have been undertaken in Year 3 of this review period.

Over both review periods, the proportion of Gate 6 (Benefits Realisation) reviews is significantly under-represented, and is declining, such that one Gate 6 review (representing 1.5% of all reviews) was undertaken during this review period (versus three or 6.3% in the 2018 Review). A Benefits Realisation Review has not been undertaken since October 2018.

6. The Lessons Learned categories of Project Management, Risk Management and Governance comprise approximately 47% of all recommendations compared to 58% in the 2018 Review indicating that applied project management disciplines have improved since the 2018 Review. Noting (as per Finding 8.) these improvements were largely attributable to Infrastructure projects).

7. The proportion of recommendations for Document Quality, Business Case and Project Outcomes Categories have more than doubled between reviews indicating a potential deterioration between the 2018 and the 2021 reviews in terms of the quality of documentation, business case and the outcomes (benefits) measurement. ICT Projects contributed disproportionately to the deterioration in this metric.

8. ICT projects had a disproportionately higher number of recommendations than Infrastructure projects for the Lessons Learned categories of: Project Outcomes, Project Management, Document Quality and Financial Issues indicating areas requiring further capability building for ICT project teams.

   In particular, ICT projects that were being delivered as a program were noted in the reports as having substantial deficiencies in Program-level documentation.

9. The increased number of Lessons Learned recommendations pertaining to Project Outcomes category did not lessen over the six Gates indicating that benefits management is functioning at a lower system-wide standard *vis-a-vis* other Lessons Learned Categories.

   Together with finding 5 above, there appears to be an absence of benefits realisation practices consistent with the Gateway Assurance Review framework at both the systemic and project levels.

10. Common themes identified across all Lessons Learned Categories also identified in the 2018 Review were:
    a. improving the application of good-practice standards for options assessments, benefits management, risk management, resource planning, governance and project management.

    b. a tendency to develop documents as project reporting tools rather than as "dynamic" project management tools requiring constant refresh and re-alignment as the project changes throughout its lifecycle.

    c. limited beginning-to-end planning for projects which also recognises interdependencies and co-dependencies across government.

11. ICT-specific themes identified in the 2021 review were:
    a. Business Case – ICT projects need to clearly identify the processes for managing both Business As Usual and the Project activities particularly for developing a clear and concise narrative explaining the project as well as developing an Investment Logic Map, or equivalent, to enhance clarity;
    b. Procurement – ICT projects are approaching procurement from the perspective of securing a technical solution rather than as an enhancement to a service or business outcome;
    c. Stakeholder Communication – ICT projects need to clearly articulate the intended business benefits for both internal and external stakeholders; and
    d. Project Management – ICT projects need to develop clear and transparent processes for: transition in and transition out processes.

Appendix 3: Ratings by Gate for each year under review.

Table 27: Ratings by Gate

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment									
Rating per Year (by no.)	2	10	6	23	21	3	25	31	9
Sub-total All Gate 1 Recs by year	18			47			65		
% of Gate 1 Recs per Year	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	48.9%	44.7%	6.4%	38.5%	47.7%	13.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	4.9%	11.2%	10.5%	25.0%	16.3%	7.3%	18.8%	14.2%	9.2%
% of Total Recs per Year	1.1%	5.3%	3.2%	8.8%	8.0%	1.1%	5.6%	6.9%	2.0%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.4%	2.2%	1.3%	5.1%	4.7%	0.7%	5.6%	6.9%	2.0%
Gate 2: Business Case									
Rating per Year (by no.)	14	14	11	53	74	19	67	88	30
Sub-total All Gate 2 Recs by year	39			146			185		
% of Gate 2 Recs per Year	35.9%	35.9%	28.2%	36.3%	50.7%	13.0%	36.2%	47.6%	16.2%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	34.1%	15.7%	19.3%	57.6%	57.4%	46.3%	50.4%	40.4%	30.6%
% of Total Recs per Year	7.5%	7.5%	5.9%	20.2%	28.2%	7.3%	14.9%	19.6%	6.7%
% of Total Recs for all Years	3.1%	3.1%	2.4%	11.8%	16.5%	4.2%	14.9%	19.6%	6.7%
Gate 3: Readiness for Market									
Rating per Year (by no.)	24	42	20	12	15	13	36	57	33
Sub-total All Gate 3 Recs by year	86			40			126		
% of Gate 3 Recs per Year	27.9%	48.8%	23.3%	30.0%	37.5%	32.5%	28.6%	45.2%	26.2%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	58.5%	47.2%	35.1%	13.0%	11.6%	31.7%	27.1%	26.1%	33.7%
% of Total Recs per Year	12.8%	22.5%	10.7%	4.6%	5.7%	5.0%	8.0%	12.7%	7.3%
% of Total Recs for all Years	5.3%	9.4%	4.5%	2.7%	3.3%	2.9%	8.0%	12.7%	7.3%
Gate 4: Tender Decision									
Rating per Year (by no.)	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
Sub-total All Gate 4 Recs by year	6			0			6		
% of Gate 4 Recs per Year	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	3.4%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	3.1%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
Gate 5: Readiness for Service									
Rating per Year (by no.)	1	16	9	4	15	2	5	31	11
Sub-total All Gate 5 Recs by year	26			21			47		
% of Gate 5 Recs per Year	3.8%	61.5%	34.6%	19.0%	71.4%	9.5%	10.6%	66.0%	23.4%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	2.4%	18.0%	15.8%	4.3%	11.6%	4.9%	3.8%	14.2%	11.2%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.5%	8.6%	4.8%	1.5%	5.7%	0.8%	1.1%	6.9%	2.4%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.2%	3.6%	2.0%	0.9%	3.3%	0.4%	1.1%	6.9%	2.4%

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation									
Rating per Year (by no.)	0	4	8	0	4	4	0	8	12
Sub-total All Gate 6 Recs by year	12			8			20		
% of Gate 6 Recs per Year	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	4.5%	14.0%	0.0%	3.1%	9.8%	0.0%	3.7%	12.2%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.0%	2.1%	4.3%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	1.8%	2.7%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.0%	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	1.8%	2.7%
Ratings by Year All Gates	41	89	57	92	129	41	133	218	98
Total All Ratings by Year	187			262			449		
% for Year All Gates	21.9%	47.6%	30.5%	35.1%	49.2%	15.6%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%
% per Year All Recs	9.1%	19.8%	12.7%	20.5%	28.7%	9.1%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%

Appendix 4: Ratings by Project Type for each year under review.

Table 28: Ratings by Project Type

	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure									
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	2	6	3	0	0	0	2	6	3
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	4	6	0	10	15	7	14	21	7
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	19	9	6	9	8	9	28	17	15
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	4	8
Sub-Total (by no.)	25	25	17	19	23	16	44	48	33
Sub-total all Infrastructure per Year	67			58			125		
% of Infrastructure Projects by Rating	37.3%	37.3%	25.4%	32.8%	39.7%	27.6%	35.2%	38.4%	26.4%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	61.0%	28.1%	29.8%	20.7%	17.8%	39.0%	33.1%	22.0%	33.7%
% of Total Recs per Year	13.4%	13.4%	9.1%	7.3%	8.8%	6.1%	9.8%	10.7%	7.3%
% of Total Recs for all Years	5.6%	5.6%	3.8%	4.2%	5.1%	3.6%	9.8%	10.7%	7.3%
Project Type 2: ICT									
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	0	4	3	11	19	3	11	23	6
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	10	8	11	43	59	12	53	67	23
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	5	33	14	3	7	4	8	40	18
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	1	6	6	4	15	2	5	21	8
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4
Sub-Total (by no.)	16	54	37	61	104	25	77	158	62
Sub-total all ICT per Year	107			190			297		
% of ICT Projects by Rating	15.0%	50.5%	34.6%	32.1%	54.7%	13.2%	25.9%	53.2%	20.9%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	39.0%	60.7%	64.9%	66.3%	80.6%	61.0%	57.9%	72.5%	63.3%
% of Total Recs per Year	8.6%	28.9%	19.8%	23.3%	39.7%	9.5%	17.1%	35.2%	13.8%
% of Total Recs for all Years	3.6%	12.0%	8.2%	13.6%	23.2%	5.6%	17.1%	35.2%	13.8%
Project Type 3: Services									
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	0	0	0	12	2	0	12	2	0
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	10	3
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total (by no.)	0	10	3	12	2	0	12	12	3
Sub-total all Services per Year	13			14			27		
% of Services Projects by Rating	0.0%	76.9%	23.1%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	11.2%	5.3%	13.0%	1.6%	0.0%	9.0%	5.5%	3.1%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.0%	5.3%	1.6%	4.6%	0.8%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.7%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.0%	2.2%	0.7%	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	0.7%
Total	41	89	57	92	129	41	133	218	98
Sub-total per Year	187			262			449		
% for Year All Gates	21.9%	47.6%	30.5%	35.1%	49.2%	15.6%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%
% per year all recs	9.1%	19.8%	12.7%	20.5%	28.7%	9.1%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%

Appendix 5: Ratings by Lessons Learned Category for each year under review

Table 29: Ratings by Lessons Learned

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
1.Strategic Alignment	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**0**	**3**	**4**
Sub Total		1			6			7	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	9.8%	0.0%	1.4%	4.1%
% of all recs for the year	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%
% of total recs ALL years	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%
2. Document Quality and Control	**0**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**2**
Sub-total		3			2			5	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	2.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.8%	2.4%	0.0%	1.4%	2.0%
% of all recs for the year	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%
% of total recs ALL years	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%
3. Financial Issues	**6**	**7**	**3**	**6**	**2**	**3**	**12**	**9**	**6**
Sub Total		16			11			27	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	37.5%	43.8%	18.8%	54.5%	18.2%	27.3%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	14.6%	7.9%	5.3%	6.5%	1.6%	7.3%	9.0%	4.1%	6.1%
% of all recs for the year	3.2%	3.7%	1.6%	2.3%	0.8%	1.1%	2.7%	2.0%	1.3%
% of total recs ALL years	1.3%	1.6%	0.7%	1.3%	0.4%	0.7%	2.7%	2.0%	1.3%
4. Business Case	**5**	**5**	**7**	**16**	**25**	**7**	**21**	**30**	**14**
Sub Total		17			48			65	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	29.4%	29.4%	41.2%	33.3%	52.1%	14.6%	32.3%	46.2%	21.5%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	12.2%	5.6%	12.3%	17.4%	19.4%	17.1%	15.8%	13.8%	14.3%
% of all recs for the year	2.7%	2.7%	3.7%	6.1%	9.5%	2.7%	4.7%	6.7%	3.1%
% of total recs ALL years	1.1%	1.1%	1.6%	3.6%	5.6%	1.6%	4.7%	6.7%	3.1%
5. Stakeholder Communication	**2**	**4**	**2**	**3**	**6**	**4**	**5**	**10**	**6**
Sub Total		8			13			21	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	23.8%	47.6%	28.6%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	4.9%	4.5%	3.5%	3.3%	4.7%	9.8%	3.8%	4.6%	6.1%
% of all recs for the year	1.1%	2.1%	1.1%	1.1%	2.3%	1.5%	1.1%	2.2%	1.3%

% of total recs ALL years	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%	0.9%	1.1%	2.2%	1.3%
6. Project Resources	2	10	3	7	7	4	9	17	7
Sub Total	15			18			33		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	13.3%	66.7%	20.0%	38.9%	38.9%	22.2%	27.3%	51.5%	21.2%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	4.9%	11.2%	5.3%	7.6%	5.4%	9.8%	6.8%	7.8%	7.1%
% of all recs for the year	1.1%	5.3%	1.6%	2.7%	2.7%	1.5%	2.0%	3.8%	1.6%
% of total recs ALL years	0.4%	2.2%	0.7%	1.6%	1.6%	0.9%	2.0%	3.8%	1.6%
7. Project Outcomes	2	9	10	3	20	3	5	29	13
Sub Total	21			26			47		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	9.5%	42.9%	47.6%	11.5%	76.9%	11.5%	10.6%	61.7%	27.7%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	4.9%	10.1%	17.5%	3.3%	15.5%	7.3%	3.8%	13.3%	13.3%
% of all recs for the year	1.1%	4.8%	5.3%	1.1%	7.6%	1.1%	1.1%	6.5%	2.9%
% of total recs ALL years	0.4%	2.0%	2.2%	0.7%	4.5%	0.7%	1.1%	6.5%	2.9%
8.Procurement Strategy	7	19	6	6	12	4	13	31	10
Sub Total	32			22			54		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	21.9%	59.4%	18.8%	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	24.1%	57.4%	18.5%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	17.1%	21.3%	10.5%	6.5%	9.3%	9.8%	9.8%	14.2%	10.2%
% of all recs for the year	3.7%	10.2%	3.2%	2.3%	4.6%	1.5%	2.9%	6.9%	2.2%
% of total recs ALL years	1.6%	4.2%	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	0.9%	2.9%	6.9%	2.2%
9.Governance	2	5	6	14	13	3	16	18	9
Sub Total	13			30			43		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%	46.7%	43.3%	10.0%	37.2%	41.9%	20.9%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	4.9%	5.6%	10.5%	15.2%	10.1%	7.3%	12.0%	8.3%	9.2%
% of all recs for the year	1.1%	2.7%	3.2%	5.3%	5.0%	1.1%	3.6%	4.0%	2.0%
% of total recs ALL years	0.4%	1.1%	1.3%	3.1%	2.9%	0.7%	3.6%	4.0%	2.0%
10.Risk Management	6	12	9	9	17	2	15	29	11
Sub Total	27			28			55		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	32.1%	60.7%	7.1%	27.3%	52.7%	20.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	14.6%	13.5%	15.8%	9.8%	13.2%	4.9%	11.3%	13.3%	11.2%
% of all recs for the year	3.2%	6.4%	4.8%	3.4%	6.5%	0.8%	3.3%	6.5%	2.4%
% of total recs ALL years	1.3%	2.7%	2.0%	2.0%	3.8%	0.4%	3.3%	6.5%	2.4%
11. Project Management - Processes	9	14	10	28	24	6	37	38	16
Sub Total	33			58			91		
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	27.3%	42.4%	30.3%	48.3%	41.4%	10.3%	40.7%	41.8%	17.6%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	22.0%	15.7%	17.5%	30.4%	18.6%	14.6%	27.8%	17.4%	16.3%
% of all recs for the year	4.8%	7.5%	5.3%	10.7%	9.2%	2.3%	8.2%	8.5%	3.6%
% of total recs ALL years	2.0%	3.1%	2.2%	6.2%	5.3%	1.3%	8.2%	8.5%	3.6%

12. Project Management - Issues	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Sub Total		1			0			1	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
% of all recs for the year	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
% of total recs ALL years	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Combined Project Management	9	15	10	28	24	6	37	39	16
Sub Total		34			58			92	
% of Lessons Learned Type by Rating	26.5%	44.1%	29.4%	48.3%	41.4%	10.3%	40.2%	42.4%	17.4%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	22.0%	16.9%	17.5%	30.4%	18.6%	14.6%	27.8%	17.9%	16.3%
% of all recs for the year	4.8%	8.0%	5.3%	10.7%	9.2%	2.3%	8.2%	8.7%	3.6%
% of total recs ALL years	2.0%	3.3%	2.2%	6.2%	5.3%	1.3%	8.2%	8.7%	3.6%
Total (not including Combined above)	41	89	57	92	129	41	133	218	98

Appendix 6: Project Type by recommendation severity for each year under review

Table 30: Projects Type by Severity

Project Type	Year 1			Year 2			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure	25	25	17	19	23	16	44	48	33
Sub-total Total Infrastructure Projects by Year	67			58			125		
% of Infrastructure Projects per Year	37.3%	37.3%	25.4%	32.8%	39.7%	27.6%	35.2%	38.4%	26.4%
Project Type 2: ICT	16	54	37	61	104	25	77	158	62
Sub-total ICT Projects by Year	107			190			297		
% of ICT projects per Year	15.0%	50.5%	34.6%	32.1%	54.7%	13.2%	25.9%	53.2%	20.9%
Project Type 3: Services	0	10	3	12	2	0	12	12	3
Sub-total Services Projects by Year	13			14			27		
% of Services Projects per Year	0.0%	76.9%	23.1%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%
Total Projects per Year per rating	41	89	57	92	129	41	133	218	98
Total Projects per Year	187			262			449		
% for the year for all gates	21.9%	47.6%	30.5%	35.1%	49.2%	15.6%	29.6%	48.6%	21.8%