Gateway WA

Second Lessons Learned Review

12th May 2021

Table of Contents

1: Executive Summary

This report encompasses an analysis of 68 Gateway™ Reviews over a thirty-two month period from 1st June 2018 to the 28th February 2021 to document the lessons learned as part of an ongoing commitment to improve project delivery in Western Australia.

This report has analysed 694 individual recommendations from these Gateway™ Reviews which involved 49 different projects for 23 agencies across three project categories, namely: Infrastructure, ICT and Services.

A summary of the detailed Findings (refer page 11) is as follows:

➤ **Since the 2018 Lessons Learned Review** there has been:
  a) a wider application of the Gateway™ Review process to more projects and for more agencies in Western Australia;
  b) an increased application of repeating Gateway assurance reviews across a project's lifecycle and
  c) an improvement in project and program delivery prospects when Gateway™ Review recommendations are acted upon.

➤ **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.

 Half of all reviews since the introduction of the five-tier system (9 from 18 reviews) have allocated the split Delivery Confidence Rating.

 Since the 2018 Review, all three Project Types, namely Infrastructure, ICT and Services, have recorded a marginal improvement in the severity of recommendations **indicating improved project delivery practices**.

➤ **Three quarters of all Gateway™ 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 reviews is significantly under-represented, and is declining**, such that a Benefits Realisation Review has not been undertaken since October 2018.

➤ The applied project delivery disciplines of **project management, risk management and governance have improved since the 2018 Review** although this improvement is largely attributable to Infrastructure projects.

➤ **There was a deterioration in the quality of documentation, business cases and the outcomes (benefits) measurement since the 2018 Review.** ICT Projects contributed disproportionately to the deterioration in this metric.

➢ 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 further capability building requirements for ICT project teams.**

Those ICT projects that were being delivered as a program were noted in the reports as having substantive deficiencies in program-level documentation.

➢ 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 the fourth point above, there appears to be a **deficiency of benefits realisation practices** consistent with the Gateway Assurance Review framework at both the systemic and project levels.

The findings of the 2018 First Lessons learned Report are included in Appendix 1.

Ria Bleathman
five consulting pty ltd

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™ Reviews undertaken in Western Australia from 1st June 2018 until 28th February 2021.

This is the second such review commissioned by the Western Australian government, the previous review having been conducted in 2018 ('the 2018 Review') and currently available on the Department of Finance WA website:

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

Background to the Review

The Gateway™ Review methodology was launched by the Western Australian Government in 2008 and is a project assurance methodology designed to support the effective development, planning, management and delivery of major projects and programs. Gateway™ Reviews are managed by the Department of Finance ('Gateway™ Unit') which has requested 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 involves a review by a pre-qualified and independent team (Review Team) of a major project or program at critical points of the investment lifecycle. The Review Team will review project plans and processes and interview 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™ 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 collected data in this report informs a broader Lesson Learned process and are provided to the Gateway Steering Committee and at awareness raising sessions as requested by agencies which are facilitated by the Gateway Unit.

The Gateway™ Review Process in Western Australia

There are six key decision points or 'gates' in an investment lifecycle at which a Gateway™ Review can be undertaken. Each Gate focusses on specific areas of a project to probe and at a point in time. The six Gates in the Gateway™ Review process are detailed as follows:

> **Gate 1: Strategic Assessment** – to confirm business strategy and need.
>
> **Gate 2: Business Case** – to confirm business justification.
>
> **Gate 3: Readiness for Market** – to confirm the procurement method and sources of supply.
>
> **Gate 4: Tender Decision** – to confirm the investment decision.
>
> **Gate 5: Readiness for Service** – to confirm readiness to implement the business changes.
>
> **Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation** – to confirm 'in service' benefits.

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

Additional details on the Gateway™ 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™ 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™ 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™ Review process results in the project being rated as 'red' or 'red-amber' or when an individual recommendation is rated as 'red'.

Reasons for this the Review

This Second Lessons Learned Review report was instigated by the Department of Finance WA, Gateway™ Unit to provide a follow-up to the 2018 First Lessons Learned Review. This 2021 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.

Terms of Reference

five consulting pty ltd was engaged to deliver a report detailing lessons learned from Gateway Reviews for the period 1st June 2018 until 28th February 2021 with the following specific Terms of Reference:

- emulate the previous WA Gateway review lessons learned report;
- include analysis from data for the period reviewed;
- 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 and
- be in a format suitable to publish on the Department of Finance website.

Review Methodology

The methodology applied in this review has involved a five-step process as follows:

- Step One: Establish data sets and metrics from the Gateway data base aligned to the 2018 Review.
- Step Two: Qualitatively review specific Gateway Reports to ensure complete data sets.
- Step Three: Analyse data and identify trends.
- Step Four: Review each recommendation to validate or confirm trends from the data analysis.
- Step Five: Submit Draft Report to the Gateway Unit and incorporate feedback into this report.

Review Period

This Second Lessons Learned Review report incorporates 694 recommendations from 68 Gateway™ Reviews, including project, program, health checks (are reviews that involve a point-in-time assurance of the general health of the project often with specific terms of reference), recommendation reviews (reviews that assess the status of actions arising from recommendations in the previous Gateway Review) and strategic assessments between the period of 1st June 2018 to 28th February 2021 (inclusive).

This report is a continuation of the period from the First Lessons Learned Review covering 1st June 2015 and 31st May 2018 (inclusive) which included analysis of 48 Gateway™ Reviews with 525 recommendations.

The longitudinal analysis in this report has been undertaken across three time periods as follows in Table 1:

Table 1: Lessons Learned Review – Time Periods

	First Lessons Learned Review	Second Lessons Learned Review
Year 1:	1st June 2015 to 31st May 2016	1st June 2018 to 31st May 2019
Year 2:	1st June 2016 to 31st May 2017	1st June 2019 to 31st May 2020
Year 3:	1st June 2017 to 31st May 2018	1st June 2020 to 28th February 2021

For the purposes of this report, the date at which the Gateway™ Review reports are issued by the Gateway™ Review Team to the Senior Responsible Officer on the final day of the review 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 Gateway™ Review Team was assigned a single 'Overall Rating' based on a three-tiered rating of Red, Amber or Green.

In July 2020, WA Gateway™ Unit introduced a five-tiered 'Delivery Confidence Rating' to replace the previous three-tiered 'Overall Rating' for each Gateway™ 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 agreed time, cost, scope and quality.

The new five-tiered Delivery Confidence Ratings are each 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™ 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 694 recommendations in the Gateway data base analysed as part of this review have applied these colour rating definitions.

Gateway™ Review - Data Base

The analysis in this report is based on the WA Gateway™ Unit's data base (reference: *gateway reviews frm 1.6.18 to 28.2.21 LL data*) which classifies each recommendation in a Gateway Report into one of eleven Lessons Learned Categories defined as follows:

Table 2: Lesson 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.
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 term 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 data base also includes a 'Project Type' classification which classifies projects as being one of three types 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 activities.
Project Type 3:	Services	Includes outsourced maintenance and services contracts.

Limitations and Constraints of this Review

The limitations and constraints to this review are:

1. Data sets - this analysis is based on 68 Gateway™ Reviews which may not be representative of the same issues and risks facing projects or programs in WA that have not been subject to a Gateway™ Review.

2. Review period - the trends identified in this report are based on a review period of three years which may not be representative of trends over the longer term.

3. The third year in this review encompasses eight months rather than a full twelve-month year which limits a like-with-like comparison with the previous yearly periods in this and the 2018 reviews.

4. Detailed comparisons in trends between the 2018 Review and this 2021 review were not included in the scope of this review.

Data Metrics Tables

The data metrics, on which the analysis in this report has been based, are included in the tables in appendices 2 to 5.

Scope

The WA Gateway™ Unit's data base for this Review comprised 694 recommendations from 68 Gateway™ 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 First Lessons Learned Review in 2018).

Findings

The findings from the analysis of the Gateway Unit's data base are summarized as follows:

1. This Review comprised analysis of 68 Gateway™ 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™ 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™ 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 could imply improved project delivery practices since the previous 2018 Review.

5. Three quarters of all Gateway™ 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 the 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 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;
    d. Project Management – ICT projects need to develop clear and transparent processes for: transition in and transition out processes.

3: Detailed Analysis

Analysis by Delivery Confidence Rating

The Overall Rating of the 68 Gateway reviews over the review period is detailed in Table 4 as follows:

Table 4: Delivery Confidence Rating

Rating	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Red	6	6	0	12
Amber/Red	n.a.	n.a.	2	2
Amber	15	15	7	37
Green/Amber	n.a.	n.a.	7	7
Green	3	5	2	10
Total	24	26	18	68

The above table shows that, since the introduction of the additional Amber/Red and Green/Amber Delivery Confidence Ratings in June 2020, no project or program has recorded a Red rating. Similarly, the number of Green Delivery Confidence Ratings has halved from 4 to 2 over the same period.

Whilst the sample size may be insufficient to infer whether this trend indicates that project and program delivery confidence is improving, it does indicate that the new five-tier approach has been fully embraced by the Gateway™ Review Teams given 50% of all reviews since the introduction of the five-tier system (9 from 18 reviews) have used the split Delivery Confidence Rating.

Analysis by Individual Project by Overall Rating / Delivery Confidence

Table 5: Individual Project Rating

	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
Project 1			Amber						
Project 2						Amber			
Project 3			Red						
Project 4			Amber						
Project 5							Amber		
Project 6			Red						
Project 7 +							Amber	Green/ Amber	
Project 8 +							Green/ Amber	Green/ Amber	
Project 9	Red								
Project 10	Amber / Red								
Project 11 +	Green	Amber							
Project 12	Amber / Red								
Project 13 *			Red	Green					
Project 14			Amber						

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Project 15	Amber					
Project 16*		Red / Amber				
Project 17	Amber					
Project 18 +		Red / Amber				
Project 19	Amber					
Project 20*				Amber	Amber / Green/Amber	
Project 21 *		Green	Green/Amber	Amber		
Project 22 *		Red / Green				
Project 23					Amber	
Project 24 *					Red / Amber	
Project 25				Amber		
Project 26				Amber		
Project 27			Amber			
Project 28	Amber	Amber	Red	Green/ Amber		
Project 29		Amber				
Project 30 +				Green / Green		
Project 31		Amber				
Project 32			Amber	Amber		
Project 33			Amber			
Project 34		Amber				
Project 35						Amber
Project 36					Green	
Project 37 *					Red / Amber	
Project 38				Amber		
Project 39		Amber				
Project 40					Amber	
Project 41 +					Green / Green	
Project 42			Green/ Amber			
Project 43					Red	
Project 44	Amber					
Project 45		Amber				
Project 46	Green/ Amber					
Project 47			Amber			
Project 48					Green	
Project 49	Amber					

* includes Recommendation Reviews

+ includes repeat review (of the same Gate)

Seven Recommendation Reviews were undertaken during the 2021 review period, five of which included recommendations from Gateway Reviews within this review period (and two from the previous Lessons Learned 2018 period). Of these seven Gateway Reviews all had

an overall delivery rating of Red whilst all Recommendation Reviews pertaining to these overall delivery ratings resulted in an improvement to either Amber (4) or Green (3).

Table 5 shows that, of the 49 different projects that undertook a Gateway Review, fifteen of these projects had undertaken a subsequent Gateway review and/or a health check or recommendation review representing 30% of all projects reviewed. This compares to 18% of projects in the 2018 First Lessons Learned Review (i.e. 6 from 33).

Of the fifteen reviews that undertook subsequent reviews during the review period, five of these subsequent reviews were Recommendation Reviews, six were repeat reviews and four projects completed subsequent Gate reviews. Of these subsequent Gate reviews, one project undertook four Gateway Gate reviews over the review period, one project undertook two Gateway Gate reviews and the remaining two reviews undertook a single subsequent Gateway Gate review.

The 2018 review noted that, for those six projects where subsequent Gateway™ Reviews were undertaken, there was no improvement in the Overall Status of these projects and that none of the 33 projects that recorded a Red Overall Rating undertook a subsequent Gate review during the review period.

For this 2021 review, those projects that undertook subsequent reviews (or repeated the same Gate reviews) all recorded an improvement in overall rating (or no worse Overall Rating) except one. Where subsequent reviews were undertaken for all red-rated Overall Ratings, there was an improvement in Overall Ratings. The recurring comment in the report conclusions stated that the improved ratings were due to the recommendations from the previous review having been, mostly or in full, acted upon.

The analysis in Table 5 indicates that, since the 2018 Review:

- there is increased application of repeating Gateway assurance reviews across a project's lifecycle and
- there is an improvement in project and program delivery prospects when Gateway™ Review recommendations are acted upon.

Analysis by Gate

The number of Gateway™ Reviews completed during the review period, broken down by Gate, is as follows:

Table 6: Number of Reviews by Gate

Gate	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	% of Total		Totals 2018	% of Total
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment	5	4	5	**14**	**20.6**		**3**	**6.3**
Gate 2: Business Case	10	9	0	**19**	**27.9**		**6**	**12.5**
Gate 3: Readiness for Market	2	1	4	**7**	**10.3**		**4**	**8.3**
Gate 4: Tender Decision	4	4	2	**10**	**14.7**		**12**	**25.0**
Gate 5: Readiness for Service	2	8	7	**17**	**25.0**		**20**	**41.6**
Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation	1	0	0	**1**	**1.5**		**3**	**6.3**
Total	**24**	**26**	**18**	**68**	**100.0**		**48**	**100.0**

Table 6 shows that three quarters of all Gateway™ Reviews during the review period have been Gates 1, 2 and 5 which is consistent with the proportions identified for these Gates in the 2018 review. It is noted that no business case (Gate 2) review has been undertaken in Year 3 of this review period.

Over both review periods the proportion of final Gate 6 Benefits Evaluation reviews (as a proportion of all Gateway™ Reviews undertaken) is significantly under-represented, and 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 Gate 6 review has not been undertaken since October 2018.

This indicates that Benefits Evaluation does not instil the same level of institutional commitment as other Lessons Learned categories which is corroborated by the increased number of Lessons Learned recommendation pertaining to Project outcomes Lessons Learned category (taken as a de-facto Benefits Evaluation for the purposes of this review). (Refer Table 13).

This indicates that benefits management is functioning at a lower standard vis a vis other Lessons Learned Categories and less than the level of good practice envisaged by the Gateway™ assurance framework.

Analysis by Project Type

A breakdown of the reviews by Project Type and year is as follows:

Table 7: Project Type by Year

Gate	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	2021 Total	%	2018 Total	%
Project Type 1: Infrastructure	11	10	5	**26**	38	20	42
Project Type 2: ICT	13	16	12	**41**	61	23	48
Project Type 3: Services	0	0	1	**1**	1	5	10
Total	24	26	18	68	100	48	100

The above Table 7 shows the changing type of projects being reviewed, a trend evident in the 2018 review, whereby Infrastructure projects are a reducing proportion of all reviews undertaken. Whereas in the 2018 Review ICT projects represented 47% of all reviews, ICT projects represent approximately 68% of all projects reviewed during this review. (noting that Year 3 reviews are based on an eight-month period.

Reviews of projects classified as Services recorded just one review during the period reflecting a decreasing trend evident in the 2018 review. This is likely due 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 Reviews.

A further breakdown by Project Type into recommendation severity (Red/Amber/Green) and by number per year is as follows in Table 8:

Table 8: Project Type (Recommendation Severity)

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure												
% of Infrastructure Projects by Rating	37.3%	52.9%	9.8%	27.1%	57.0%	15.9%	21.8%	49.1%	29.1%	29.9%	53.8%	16.3%
Number of recommendations	102			107			55			264		
Project Type 2: ICT												
% of ICT Projects by Rating	28.9%	30.3%	40.8%	24.8%	42.3%	32.9%	37.4%	42.3%	20.3%	30.0%	38.0%	32%
Number of recommendations	152			149			123			424		
Project Type 3: Services												
% of Services Projects by Rating	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
Number of recommendations	0			0			6			6		
Total Recommendations by year	254			256			184			694		

Table 8 indicates that 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 proportions for Red recommendation sin the 2018 review. This indicates, concomitantly, that there has been a marginal improvement in the severity ratings across all three project types (further detail is provided in the table in Appendix 5).

Analysis by Recommendation Ratings

The 68 reviews produced 694 recommendations with the following status in Table 9:

Table 9: Recommendations from the 2021 Review (versus 2018)

Rating	Number 2021	% of Total 2021	Number 2018	% of Total 2018
Red	208	30	189	36
Amber	306	44	267	51
Green	180	26	69	13
Total	694	100	525	100

Of the 694 recommendations in Table 9, Recommendation Reviews accounted for 84 recommendations broken down in Table 10 as follows:

Table 10: Recommendations from Recommendation Reviews

Rating	Number	% of Total
Red	5	6
Amber	18	21
Green	61	73
Total	84	100

Table 10 highlights that Recommendation Reviews exhibit a higher proportionate number of Green recommendations than those recommendations for Gateway Reviews.

Benchmark Average

These 694 recommendations 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			Year 3			Total		
Ratings by Year All Gates	82	100	72	66	124	66	60	82	42	208	306	180
Total All Ratings by Year	254			256			184			694		
% for Year All Gates	32.3%	39.4%	28.3%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%	32.6%	44.6%	22.8%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%

Table 9 and 11 show that, as a proportion, Red, Amber and Green recommendation ratings have remained largely constant across the three-year review period. Red recommendations comprise approximately 30% of all recommendations, whilst Amber recommendations comprise approximately 45% of all recommendations and Green recommendations approximately 25%. (In the 2018 review, these proportions were approximately 35%, 50% and 15%, respectively)

For the purposes of this report, these 2021 proportions (namely 30%, 45% and 25%) have been adopted as the Benchmark Average to assist in comparative analysis.

Analysis by Gate and Recommendation*

* note ;some tables do not add exactly to 100 due to rounding

The 694 recommendations were recorded against the respective Gates as follows in Table 12:

Table 12: Analysis by Gate

Gate	Rating				% of total recs.
	Red	Amber	Green	Total	
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment	57	67	20	144	20.7
Gate 2: Business Case	58	67	65	190	27.4
Gate 3: Readiness for Market	34	49	9	92	13.3
Gate 4: Tender Decision	31	54	33	118	17.0
Gate 5: Readiness for Service	28	66	52	146	21.0
Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation	0	3	1	4	0.6
Total	208	306	180	694	100.0

Analysis by Lessons Learned Categories

Recommendations broken down by Lessons Learned category are as follows in Table :

Table 10: Analysis by Lessons Learned Category

Lessons Learned Category	Red	Amber	Green	Total	% of Total Recs		Total	2018 %
1. Strategic Alignment	1	1	2	**4**	0.6		9	1.7
2. Document Quality and Control	2	9	3	**14**	2.0		3	0.6
3. Financial Issues	8	15	8	**31**	4.5		25	4.8
4. Business Case	38	29	42	**109**	15.7		34	6.5
5. Stakeholder Communication	4	14	8	**26**	3.7		27	5.1
6. Project Resources	15	17	14	**46**	6.6		39	7.4
7. Project Outcomes	12	49	22	**83**	12.0		39	7.4
8. Procurement Strategy	27	16	12	**55**	7.9		44	8.4
9. Governance	33	38	14	**85**	12.2		49	9.3
10. Risk Management	22	58	22	**102**	14.7		83	15.8
11. Project Management	46	60	33	**139**	20.0		173	33.0
Total	**208**	**306**	**180**	**694**	**100.0**		**525**	**100.0**

Table 13 shows that the Lessons Learned categories related to key project management disciplines, namely Project Management, Risk Management and Governance, comprise 326 or 47% of all recommendations during the review period (versus 58% in 2018) indicating possible improvement in these project management disciplines between reviews.

However, the proportion of recommendations for both the Business Case and the Project Outcomes Category have doubled between reviews indicating a potential deterioration between the 2018 and the 2021 reviews in terms of the quality of business case and the outcomes (benefits) measurement.

Recommendations by Lessons Learned category are broken down by Gate as follows:

Table 14: Lessons Learned Category by Gate

Lessons Learned Category	Gate 1	Gate 2	Gate 3	Gate 4	Gate 5	Gate 6	Total	% of Total
1. Strategic Alignment	1	2	0	1	0	0	**4**	0.6
2. Document Quality and Control	2	1	2	1	8	0	**14**	2.0
3. Financial Issues	8	7	1	8	7	0	**31**	4.5
4. Business Case	18	78	5	3	5	0	**109**	15.7
5. Stakeholder Communication	8	8	1	6	3	0	**26**	3.7
6. Project Resources	11	8	6	14	7	0	**46**	6.6
7. Project Outcomes	17	11	4	10	39	2	**83**	12.0
8. Procurement Strategy	10	9	21	14	1	0	**55**	7.9
9. Governance	22	22	17	9	14	1	**85**	12.2
10. Risk Management	15	24	16	23	24	0	**102**	14.7
11. Project Management	32	20	19	29	38	1	**139**	20.0
Total	**144**	**190**	**92**	**118**	**146**	**4**	**694**	100.0
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 2018 Review 2018	**8.3**	**11.3**	**22.0**	**11.4**	**9.2**	**7.6**	**10.9**	

Table 14 indicates that the number of recommendations in each Lessons Learned Category show a decreasing trend across all Gates (except for Project Outcomes and Risk Management) whilst Project Management as a Lessons Learned Category is generally stable throughout the three years.

The increasing trend in the number of recommendations for Lessons Learned in Project Outcomes and Risk Management indicates that Lessons Learned in these disciplines may not be sufficiently addressed as projects progress into subsequent phases.

The average number of recommendations across Gates 1 to 5 inclusive are consistent indicating that no single Gate is asymmetrically more problematic than any other. Overall, the average number of recommendations per review are marginally less than the 2018 Review.

The increased number of Lessons Learned recommendations pertaining to the Project Outcomes Lessons Learned category has doubled over the six Gates indicating that benefits management is not being addressed as the project progresses vis a vis other Lessons Learned Categories and thereby not in accord with the intent of the Gateway™ assurance framework (refer also to Refer Table 6 commentary).

Analysis by Lessons Learned Categories by Project Type

Table 15: Lessons Learned by Project Type

	Rating	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total 2021			Total 2018		
		Infra	ICT	Servi ces	Infra	ICT	Servi ces	Infra	ICT	Ser vic es	Infra	ICT	Servi ces	Infra	ICT	Servi ces
1.	Strategic Alignment	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3	3
2.	Document Quality and Control	1	3	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	1	13	0	1	2	0
3.	Financial Issues	3	9	0	3	8	0	5	3	0	11	20	0	11	13	1
4.	Business Case	15	39	0	25	19	0	5	6	0	45	64	0	7	26	1
5.	Stakeholder Comms	6	7	0	3	5	0	3	2	0	12	14	0	7	14	6
6.	Project Resources	8	12	0	9	2	0	7	7	1	24	21	1	18	19	2
7.	Project Outcomes	8	15	0	16	25	0	2	16	1	26	56	1	15	17	7
8.	Procurement Strategy	10	7	0	8	7	0	5	18	0	23	32	0	19	25	0
9.	Governance	16	8	0	11	17	0	6	26	1	33	51	1	22	24	3
10	Risk Management	14	20	0	20	21	0	13	14	0	47	55	0	40	38	5
11	Project Mgt - Processes	17	24	0	11	36	0	6	24	3	34	84	3	69	82	13
	Project Mgt - Issues	3	7	0	1	2	0	3	2	0	7	11	0	5	2	2
	Total	102	152	0	107	149	0	55	123	6	264	424	6	217	265	43

Table 15 indicates that, by Lessons Learned category, ICT projects had a disproportionately (refer Table 7) higher number of recommendations than Infrastructure projects for Project

Outcomes, Project Management, Document Quality and Financial Issues indicating areas for capability building for ICT project capability.

4: Analysis by Themes and by Lessons Learned Category

1. Strategic Alignment

Four recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 0.6% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 16: Strategic Alignment

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
1. Strategic Alignment	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Sub Total	2			2			0			4		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%

A common theme in the recommendations 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.

A common theme for recommendations for ICT projects to align their project with whole of government policies both initially and on an ongoing basis.

The relatively small sample size limits the extent to which definitive conclusions cab be drawn.

2. Document Quality and Control

Fourteen recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 2.0% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 17: Document Quality Control

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
2. Document Quality and Control	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	5	0	2	9	3
Sub-total	4			5			5			14		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%	14.3%	64.3%	21.4%

Thirteen of the fourteen recommendation in this Lesson Learned category were for ICT projects.

A common theme in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category was the need for project teams to develop a document management system with authorship, version

control and approval status. Document Quality and Control issues did not materially improve across Gates 1 to 5. (refer Table 13) which indicates that ICT project teams, systemically, do not consider quality documentation as key feature of project management and delivery.

This Lessons Learned Category recorded a lower severity rating (i.e. fewer Red-rated recommendations) than the Benchmark Average.

3. Financial Issues

Thirty-one recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 4.5% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 11: Financial Issues

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
3. Financial Issues	5	5	2	1	6	4	2	4	2	8	15	8
Sub Total	**12**			**11**			**8**			**31**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	41.7%	41.7%	16.7%	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%

Financial Issues recorded a similar profile of severity than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category, applicable proportionately to both ICT and Infrastructure projects, were:

- The absence of:
  - a Total Cost of Ownership financial model which included modelling assumptions and operational costs.
  - Linking the approved budget to a robust cost plan;
  - Details of how the contingency allowances were arrived at and their management.
- robust financial monitoring and reporting for projects and
- clearly identifying sources of funding.

Similar themes were identified in the 2018 Review indicating a need for project teams to focus more intensively on improvement in this area of their project management.

4. Business Case

One hundred and nine recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category (15.7%) across all Lessons Learned categories over the review period.

Table 19: Business Case

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
4. Business Case	17	5	32	19	17	8	2	7	2	38	29	42
Sub Total	**54**			**44**			**11**			**109**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	31.5%	9.3%	59.3%	43.2%	38.6%	18.2%	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	34.9%	26.6%	38.5%

Business Case concerns recorded a higher proportion of Red and Green ratings than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category, for both ICT and Infrastructure projects, were:

- absence of a formal good practice approach to developing a business case;
- absence of evidential support for key decisions;
- enhancing the analytical rigour and transparency in the options analysis;
- improving the quality and clarity of key elements of the business case, particularly scope definition and assumptions (their identification and verification).

A key theme identified in this Lessons Learned category, specific to ICT projects, was the need for projects to develop more rigour in aligning the technical solution to business outcomes and applying a clear and objective framework to options evaluation. The absence of a clear, concise understandable narrative outlining the project and its outcomes was also a recurring theme as was the need to apply an Investment Logic Map process to more clearly articulate the problems the investment is attempting to address.

5. Stakeholder Communication

Twenty-six recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 3.7% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 20: Stakeholder Communication

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
5. Stakeholder Communication	0	9	4	3	3	2	1	2	2	4	14	8
Sub Total	13			8			5			26		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	0.0%	69.2%	30.8%	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%

Stakeholder Communications concerns recorded a lesser severity than the Benchmark Average.

The key theme in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category, applying to both ICT and Infrastructure projects, was the recognised inadequacy or the non-existence of a communications plan to inform stakeholder engagement activities.

Recommendations in this category tended to stipulate the basic requirements of what a Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Plan should include i.e. a 'how to' explanation typically focussing on mapping stakeholders, their interest and the proposed means of engagement indicating a lack of maturity in this area of project delivery.

A similar theme was identified in the 2018 Review.

6. Project Resources

Forty-six recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 6.6% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 21: Project Resources

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
6. Project Resources	8	9	3	4	4	3	3	4	8	15	17	14
Sub Total	**20**			**11**			**15**			**46**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	20.0%	26.7%	53.3%	32.6%	37.0%	30.4%

Project Resource concerns were consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category, for both ICT and Infrastructure projects, were:

- procuring specialist expertise for the current phase of the project, particularly project director, probity, project manager and contract manager and
- resource planning for future stages of the project to take account of the organisational impacts of the project, particularly transition into service and specialist training and benefits management.

These themes are consistent with those identified in the Lessons Learned category in the 2018 Review.

A key theme identified in this Lessons Learned category, specific to ICT projects, was the need for projects to adequately resource evaluation teams with business category specialists and to actively manage the Business As Usual resourcing. A clear need was identified for ICT projects to manage Transition activities as a discrete project management process.

7. Project Outcomes

Eighty-three recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 12.0% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 12: Project Outcomes

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
7. Project Outcomes	3	12	8	6	25	10	3	12	4	12	49	22
Sub Total	**23**			**41**			**19**			**83**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	13.0%	52.2%	34.8%	14.6%	61.0%	24.4%	15.8%	63.2%	21.1%	14.5%	59.0%	26.5%

Project Outcomes recorded a lower severity than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category were:

- developing a formal benefits realisation strategy and plan;
- developing key metrics in support of these plans and
- developing benefit realisation reporting protocols.

Recommendations 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.

These themes were identical to those themes identified in this category in 2018 reflecting a continuing absence of benefits management regimen being applied consistently within the Gateway Framework. ICT projects recorded proportionately twice as many recommendations in this Category than Infrastructure projects.

In addition to the above themes, key themes for ICT projects expressed the need to link the business outcomes (benefits) to the solution as a means to formally identify a Value for Money proposition.

This Lessons Learned category recorded more than a 100% increase in recommendations over the review period which was disproportionately focussed on ICT projects. Between the 2018 and this 2021 Review, this Lessons Learned category was the worst performed in terms of issues identified and the worst performed in terms of the rate of deterioration.

8. Procurement Strategy

Fifty-five recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 7.9% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 23: Procurement Strategy

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
8. Procurement Strategy	11	4	2	3	6	6	13	6	4	27	16	12
Sub Total	17			15			23			55		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	64.7%	23.5%	11.8%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	56.5%	26.1%	17.4%	49.1%	29.1%	21.8%

Procurement Strategy concerns recorded a higher severity than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category were:

- improving procurement planning regarding formal plans for evaluation, negotiations and scheduling which consider the end-to-end tender process;
- increasing the rigour and clarity of the meaning and measurement of Value for Money including risk and tendered pricing.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned category identified, specific to ICT projects, were the need to develop more detailed Procurement Plans that included probity, contract management and transition arrangements. A theme for ICT project procurement was the

lack of a clear link to business outcomes but instead to view ICT procurement as an acquisition of a technical solution.

9. Governance

Eighty-five recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 12.2% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 24: Governance

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
9. Governance	7	15	2	12	8	8	14	15	4	33	38	14
Sub Total	24			28			33			85		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	29.2%	62.5%	8.3%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	42.4%	45.5%	12.1%	38.8%	44.7%	16.5%

Recommendations in this Lessons Learned category have a higher severity than the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category were:

- improving governance arrangements with an emphasis on:
    - ensuring clarity of roles;
    - assigning responsibilities;
    - formalising delegated authorities and levels of decision making and
    - establishing clear and succinct reporting.
- ensuring governance arrangements are reviewed and updated as the project moves into subsequent phases.

These themes were similar to those identified in 2018.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned category identified, specific to ICT projects, consistently identified the lack of a fit for purpose governance structure which included specific skills for that particular stage of the project specifically enterprise architect and business/services expertise at the commencement of the project.

Governance lack-of-effectiveness for ICT project was identified as disproportionately more than for Infrastructure whilst governance issues vis a vis Infrastructure projects has deteriorated markedly since the 2018 Review.

10. Risk Management

One hundred and two recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing 14.7% of all recommendations over the review period.

Table 25: Risk Management

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
10. Risk Management	10	16	8	6	27	8	6	15	6	22	58	22
Sub Total	34			41			27			102		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	29.4%	47.1%	23.5%	14.6%	65.9%	19.5%	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%	21.6%	56.9%	21.6%

Recommendation severity in this Lessons Learned category are consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations 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 workshops;
- incorporating a broader range of risks into the risk register (i.e. pre and post implementation) and
- formal issues management was largely absent from projects.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned category identified, specific to ICT projects, was an absence of establishing *and applying* the three interdependent project artefacts of: risk management plan, risk register and issues register.

11. Project Management (Issues and Processes Combined)

One hundred and thirty-nine recommendations were recorded in this Lessons Learned category representing the highest proportion (20.0%) across all Lessons Learned categories over the review period.

Table 13: Project Management

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Category												
11. Project Management	18	23	10	12	25	13	16	12	10	46	60	33
Sub Total	51			50			38			139		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	35.3%	45.1%	19.6%	24.0%	50.0%	26.0%	42.1%	31.6%	26.3%	33.1%	43.2%	23.7%

Recommendations in this Lessons Learned category are consistent with the Benchmark Average.

Key themes in the recommendations for this Lessons Learned category were:

- developing and implementing integrated project scheduling which covers all stages of the project;
- appointing specialist contract management capabilities;
- clarifying project roles, responsibilities and reporting;
- improving status reporting to project governance bodies particularly baseline reporting for schedule, risks, budget (costs) and benefits;
- applying industry standard project management disciplines particularly to scheduling and risk management and an absence of key project artefacts, particularly organisational change management, lessons learned, contract management, transition plans for the next and subsequent phases.

Key themes in this Lessons Learned category, specific to ICT projects, were to rigorously manage business change requirements as well as utilising all other project artefacts such as scheduling, benefits, risks, budget and scope as part of the suite of applied project , management disciplines.

There was a disproportionate increase in this category for ICT projects compared to the 2018 Review.

Appendix 1: First Lessons Learned Report 2018

Summary of Findings

The summary findings from the analysis in 2018 were 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 projects 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: Ratings by Gate for each year under review.

Table 27: Ratings by Gate

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Gate 1: Strategic Assessment												
Rating per Year (by no.)	21	14	8	8	32	4	28	21	8	57	67	20
Sub-total All Gate 1 Recs by year	**43**			**44**			**57**			**144**		
% of Gate 1 Recs per Year	48.8%	32.6%	18.6%	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%	49.1%	36.8%	14.0%	39.6%	46.5%	13.9%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	25.6%	14.0%	11.1%	12.1%	25.8%	6.1%	46.7%	25.6%	19.0%	27.4%	21.9%	11.1%
% of Total Recs per Year	8.3%	5.5%	3.1%	3.1%	12.5%	1.6%	15.2%	11.4%	4.3%	8.2%	9.7%	2.9%
% of Total Recs for all Years	3.0%	2.0%	1.2%	1.2%	4.6%	0.6%	4.0%	3.0%	1.2%	8.2%	9.7%	2.9%
Gate 2: Business Case												
Rating per Year (by no.)	27	37	49	31	30	16	0	0	0	58	67	65
Sub-total All Gate 2 Recs by year	**113**			**77**			**0**			**190**		
% of Gate 2 Recs per Year	23.9%	32.7%	43.4%	40.3%	39.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.5%	35.3%	34.2%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	32.9%	37.0%	68.1%	47.0%	24.2%	24.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.9%	21.9%	36.1%
% of Total Recs per Year	10.6%	14.6%	19.3%	12.1%	11.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	9.7%	9.4%
% of Total Recs for all Years	3.9%	5.3%	7.1%	4.5%	4.3%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	9.7%	9.4%
Gate 3: Readiness for Market												
Rating per Year (by no.)	8	15	1	4	6	1	22	28	7	34	49	9
Sub-total All Gate 3 Recs by year	**24**			**11**			**57**			**92**		
% of Gate 3 Recs per Year	33.3%	62.5%	4.2%	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	38.6%	49.1%	12.3%	37.0%	53.3%	9.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	9.8%	15.0%	1.4%	6.1%	4.8%	1.5%	36.7%	34.1%	16.7%	16.3%	16.0%	5.0%
% of Total Recs per Year	3.1%	5.9%	0.4%	1.6%	2.3%	0.4%	12.0%	15.2%	3.8%	4.9%	7.1%	1.3%
% of Total Recs for all Years	1.2%	2.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.9%	0.1%	3.2%	4.0%	1.0%	4.9%	7.1%	1.3%
Gate 4: Tender Decision												
Rating per Year (by no.)	15	23	9	8	21	16	8	10	8	31	54	33
Sub-total All Gate 4 Recs by year	**47**			**45**			**26**			**118**		
% of Gate 4 Recs per Year	31.9%	48.9%	19.1%	17.8%	46.7%	35.6%	30.8%	38.5%	30.8%	26.3%	45.8%	28.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	18.3%	23.0%	12.5%	12.1%	16.9%	24.2%	13.3%	12.2%	19.0%	14.9%	17.6%	18.3%
% of Total Recs per Year	5.9%	9.1%	3.5%	3.1%	8.2%	6.3%	4.3%	5.4%	4.3%	4.5%	7.8%	4.8%
% of Total Recs for all Years	2.2%	3.3%	1.3%	1.2%	3.0%	2.3%	1.2%	1.4%	1.2%	4.5%	7.8%	4.8%
Gate 5: Readiness for Service												
Rating per Year (by no.)	11	8	4	15	35	29	2	23	19	28	66	52
Sub-total All Gate 5 Recs by year	**23**			**79**			**44**			**146**		
% of Gate 5 Recs per Year	47.8%	34.8%	17.4%	19.0%	44.3%	36.7%	4.5%	52.3%	43.2%	19.2%	45.2%	35.6%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	13.4%	8.0%	5.6%	22.7%	28.2%	43.9%	3.3%	28.0%	45.2%	13.5%	21.6%	28.9%
% of Total Recs per Year	4.3%	3.1%	1.6%	5.9%	13.7%	11.3%	1.1%	12.5%	10.3%	4.0%	9.5%	7.5%
% of Total Recs for all Years	1.6%	1.2%	0.6%	2.2%	5.0%	4.2%	0.3%	3.3%	2.7%	4.0%	9.5%	7.5%

Gate 6: Benefits Evaluation												
Rating per Year (by no.)	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Sub-total All Gate 6 Recs by year	**4**			**0**			**0**			**4**		
% of Gate 6 Recs per Year	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	3.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.6%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.0%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Ratings by Year All Gates	82	100	72	66	124	66	60	82	42	208	306	180
Total All Ratings by Year	**254**			**256**			**184**			**694**		
% for Year All Gates	32.3%	39.4%	28.3%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%	32.6%	44.6%	22.8%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%
% per Year All Recs	11.8%	14.4%	10.4%	9.5%	17.9%	9.5%	8.6%	11.8%	6.1%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%

Appendix 3: Ratings by Project Type for each year under review.

Table 14: Ratings by Project Type

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure												
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	5	2	1	6	20	0	1	5	6	12	27	7
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	12	19	5	12	16	8	0	0	0	24	35	13
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	8	15	1	4	6	1	3	8	0	15	29	2
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	13	15	2	4	13	1	8	10	8	25	38	11
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	0	0	0	3	6	7	0	4	2	3	10	9
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Sub-Total (by no.)	38	54	10	29	61	17	12	27	16	79	142	43
Sub-total all Infrastructure per Year	**102**			**107**			**55**			**264**		
% of Infrastructure Projects by Rating	37.3%	52.9%	9.8%	27.1%	57.0%	15.9%	21.8%	49.1%	29.1%	29.9%	53.8%	16.3%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	46.3%	54.0%	13.9%	43.9%	49.2%	25.8%	20.0%	32.9%	38.1%	38.0%	46.4%	23.9%
% of Total Recs per Year	15.0%	21.3%	3.9%	11.3%	23.8%	6.6%	6.5%	14.7%	8.7%	11.4%	20.5%	6.2%
% of Total Recs for all Years	5.5%	7.8%	1.4%	4.2%	8.8%	2.4%	1.7%	3.9%	2.3%	11.4%	20.5%	6.2%
Project Type 2: ICT												
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	16	12	7	2	12	4	25	13	1	43	37	12
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	15	18	44	19	14	8	0	0	0	34	32	52
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	7	19	20	7
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	2	8	7	4	8	15	0	0	0	6	16	22
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	11	8	4	12	29	22	2	19	17	25	56	43
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total (by no.)	44	46	62	37	63	49	46	52	25	127	161	136
Sub-total all ICT per Year	**152**			**149**			**123**			**424**		
% of ICT Projects by Rating	28.9%	30.3%	40.8%	24.8%	42.3%	32.9%	37.4%	42.3%	20.3%	30.0%	38.0%	32.1%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	53.7%	46.0%	86.1%	56.1%	50.8%	74.2%	76.7%	63.4%	59.5%	61.1%	52.6%	75.6%
% of Total Recs per Year	17.3%	18.1%	24.4%	14.5%	24.6%	19.1%	25.0%	28.3%	13.6%	18.3%	23.2%	19.6%
% of Total Recs for all Years	6.3%	6.6%	8.9%	5.3%	9.1%	7.1%	6.6%	7.5%	3.6%	18.3%	23.2%	19.6%
Project Type 3: Services												
Ratings Gate 1 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	3	1
Ratings Gate 2 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 3 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 4 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 5 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ratings Gate 6 (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	3	1
Sub-total all Services per Year	**0**			**0**			**6**			**6**		
% of Services Projects by Rating	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.7%	2.4%	1.0%	1.0%	0.6%
% of Total Recs per Year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%
% of Total Recs for all Years	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%
Total	82	100	72	66	124	66	60	82	42	208	306	180
Sub-total per Year	**254**			**256**			**184**			**694**		
% for Year All Gates	32.3%	39.4%	28.3%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%	32.6%	44.6%	22.8%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%
% per year all recs	11.8%	14.4%	10.4%	9.5%	17.9%	9.5%	8.6%	11.8%	6.1%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%

Appendix 4: Ratings by Lessons Learned Category for each year under review

Table 15: Ratings by Lessons Learned

Category	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
1. Strategic Alignment	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Sub Total	**2**			**2**			**0**			**4**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	1.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	1.1%
% of all recs for year	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
% of total recs	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
2. Document Quality and Control	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	5	0	2	9	3
Sub-total	**4**			**5**			**5**			**14**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	14.3%	64.3%	21.4%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	2.4%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	4.5%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	1.0%	2.9%	1.7%
% of all recs for year	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	0.4%
% of total recs	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	0.4%
3. Financial Issues	5	5	2	1	6	4	2	4	2	8	15	8
Sub Total	**12**			**11**			**8**			**31**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	41.7%	41.7%	16.7%	9.1%	54.4%	36.4%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	6.1%	5.0%	2.8%	1.5%	4.8%	6.1%	3.3%	4.9%	4.8%	3.8%	4.9%	4.4%
% of all recs for year	2.0%	2.0%	0.8%	0.4%	2.3%	1.6%	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%	1.2%	2.2%	1.2%
% of total recs	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	1.2%	2.2%	1.2%
4.Business Case	17	5	32	19	17	8	2	7	2	38	29	42
Sub Total	**54**			**44**			**11**			**109**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	31.5%	9.3%	59.3%	43.2%	38.6%	18.2%	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	34.9%	26.6%	38.5%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	20.7%	5.0%	44.4%	28.8%	13.7%	12.1%	3.3%	8.5%	4.8%	18.3%	9.5%	23.3%
% of all recs for year	6.7%	2.0%	12.6%	7.4%	6.6%	3.1%	1.1%	3.8%	1.1%	5.5%	4.2%	6.1%
% of total recs	2.4%	0.7%	4.6%	2.7%	2.4%	1.2%	0.3%	1.0%	0.3%	5.5%	4.2%	6.1%
5. Stakeholder Communication	0	9	4	3	3	2	1	2	2	4	14	8
Sub Total	**13**			**8**			**5**			**26**		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	0.0%	69.2%	30.8%	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	0.0%	9.0%	5.6%	4.5%	2.4%	3.0%	1.7%	2.4%	4.8%	1.9%	4.6%	4.4%
% of all recs for year	0.0%	3.5%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.6%	2.0%	1.2%
% of total recs	0.0%	1.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	2.0%	1.2%

6. Project Resources	8	9	3	4	4	3	3	4	8	15	17	14
Sub Total	20			11			15			46		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	20.0%	26.7%	53.3%	32.6%	37.0%	30.4%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	9.8%	9.0%	4.2%	6.1%	3.2%	4.5%	5.0%	4.9%	19.0%	7.2%	5.6%	7.8%
% of all recs for year	3.1%	3.5%	1.2%	1.6%	1.6%	1.2%	1.6%	2.2%	4.3%	2.2%	2.4%	2.0%
% of total recs	1.2%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	1.2%	2.2%	2.4%	2.0%
7. Project Outcomes	3	12	8	6	25	10	3	12	4	12	49	22
Sub Total	23			41			19			83		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	13.0%	52.2%	34.8%	14.6%	61.0%	24.4%	15.8%	63.2%	21.1%	14.5%	59.0%	26.5%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	3.7%	12.0%	11.1%	9.1%	20.0%	15.2%	5.0%	14.6%	9.5%	5.8%	16.0%	12.2%
% of all recs for year	1.2%	4.7%	3.1%	2.3%	9.8%	3.9%	1.6%	6.5%	2.2%	1.7%	7.1%	3.2%
% of total recs	0.4%	1.7%	1.2%	0.9%	3.6%	1.4%	0.4%	1.7%	0.6%	1.7%	7.1%	3.2%
8. Procurement Strategy	11	4	2	3	6	6	13	6	4	27	16	12
Sub Total	17			15			23			55		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	64.7%	23.5%	11.8%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	56.5%	26.1%	17.4%	49.1%	29.1%	21.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	13.4%	4.0%	2.8%	4.5%	4.8%	9.1%	21.7%	7.3%	9.5%	13.0%	5.2%	6.7%
% of all recs for year	4.3%	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%	2.3%	2.3%	7.1%	3.3%	2.2%	3.9%	2.3%	1.7%
% of total recs	1.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	0.9%	1.9%	0.9%	0.6%	3.9%	2.3%	1.7%
9. Governance	7	15	2	12	8	8	14	15	4	33	38	14
Sub Total	24			28			33			85		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	29.2%	62.5%	8.3%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	42.4%	45.5%	12.1%	38.8%	44.7%	16.5%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	8.5%	15.0%	2.8%	18.2%	6.5%	12.1%	23.3%	18.3%	9.5%	15.9%	12.4%	7.8%
% of all recs for year	2.8%	5.9%	0.8%	4.7%	3.1%	3.1%	7.6%	8.2%	2.2%	4.8%	5.5%	2.0%
% of total recs	1.0%	2.2%	0.3%	1.7%	1.2%	1.2%	2.0%	2.2%	0.6%	4.8%	5.5%	2.0%
10. Risk Management	10	16	8	6	27	8	6	15	6	22	58	22
Sub Total	34			41			27			102		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	29.4%	47.1%	23.5%	14.6%	65.9%	19.5%	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%	21.6%	56.9%	21.6%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	12.2%	16.0%	11.1%	9.1%	21.8%	12.1%	10.0%	18.3%	14.3%	10.6%	19.0%	12.2%
% of all recs for year	3.9%	6.3%	3.1%	2.3%	10.5%	3.1%	3.3%	8.2%	3.3%	3.2%	8.4%	3.2%
% of total recs	1.4%	2.3%	1.2%	0.9%	3.9%	1.2%	0.9%	2.2%	0.9%	3.2%	8.4%	3.2%

11. Project Management - Processes	15	20	6	12	23	12	13	10	10	40	53	28
Sub Total	41			47			33			121		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	36.6%	48.8%	14.6%	25.5%	48.9%	25.5%	39.4%	30.3%	30.3%	33.1%	43.8%	23.1%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	18.3%	20.0%	8.3%	18.2%	18.5%	18.2%	21.7%	12.2%	23.8%	19.2%	17.3%	15.6%
% of all recs for year	5.9%	7.9%	2.4%	4.7%	9.0%	4.7%	7.1%	5.4%	5.4%	5.8%	7.6%	4.0%
% of total recs	2.2%	2.9%	0.9%	1.7%	3.0%	1.7%	1.9%	1.4%	1.4%	5.8%	7.6%	4.0%
Project Management - Issues	3	3	4	0	2	1	3	2	0	6	7	5
Sub Total	10			3			5			18		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	30.0%	30.0%	40.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	33.3%	38.9%	27.8%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	3.7%	3.0%	5.6%	0.0%	1.6%	1.5%	5.0%	2.4%	0.0%	2.9%	2.3%	2.8%
% of all recs for year	1.2%	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	1.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%
% of total recs	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%
Combined	18	23	10	12	25	13	16	12	10	46	60	33
Sub Total	51			50			38			139		
% of Lessons Learned Category by Rating	35.3%	45.1%	19.6%	24.0%	50.0%	26.0%	42.1%	31.6%	26.3%	33.1%	43.2%	23.7%
% of Respective Total Colour Rating per Year	22.0%	23.0%	13.9%	18.2%	20.2%	19.7%	26.7%	14.6%	23.8%	22.1%	19.6%	18.3%
% of all recs for year	7.1%	9.1%	3.9%	4.7%	9.8%	5.1%	8.7%	6.5%	5.4%	6.6%	8.6%	4.8%
% of total recs	2.6%	3.3%	1.4%	1.7%	3.6%	1.9%	2.3%	1.7%	1.4%	6.6%	8.6%	4.8%
Total All Categories	82	100	72	66	124	66	60	82	42	208	306	180

Appendix 5: Project Type by recommendation severity for each year under review

Table 30: Projects Type by Severity

	Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Total		
Project Type 1: Infrastructure												
Sub-Total (by no.)	38	54	10	29	61	17	12	27	16	79	142	43
Sub-total all Infrastructure per Year	102			107			55			264		
% of Infrastructure Projects by Rating	37.3%	52.9%	9.8%	27.1%	57.0%	15.9%	21.8%	49.1%	29.1%	29.9%	53.8%	16.3%
Project Type 2: ICT												
Sub-Total (by no.)	44	46	62	37	63	49	46	52	25	127	161	136
Sub-total all ICT per Year	152			149			123			424		
% of ICT Projects by Rating	28.9%	30.3%	40.8%	24.8%	42.3%	32.9%	37.4%	42.3%	20.3%	30.0%	38.0%	32.1%
Project Type 3: Services												
Sub-Total (by no.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	3	1
Sub-total all Services per Year	0			0			6			6		
% of Services Projects by Rating	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
Total	82	100	72	66	124	66	60	82	42	208	306	180
Total per Year	254			256			184			694		
% for Year All Gates	32.3%	39.4%	28.3%	25.8%	48.4%	25.8%	32.6%	44.6%	22.8%	30.0%	44.1%	25.9%