

Swansea Bay City Deal Gateway Assurance Framework



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Document Control	
Date:	August 2022
Version:	2.3
Author:	Ian Williams
Owner:	Wendy Walters/Rob Stewart

Contents

- 1. Purpose..... 1
- 2. Background..... 1
 - 2.1 Assurance and Gateway Reviews..... 1
 - 2.2 SBCD Portfolio, Programmes and Projects 3
 - 2.3 Previous Assurance Arrangements..... 4
 - 2.4 SBCD Assurance Context and Issues..... 6
- 3. Delivery of SBCD Assurance Arrangements 7
- 4. Management of Reviews..... 11
- 5. Governance and Oversight 17
- 6. Development and Review 18

Appendices..... 18

- 1. City and Growth Deal Governance and Assurance Framework... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
- 2. Portfolio IAAP 18
- 3. Annual Schedule of Gateway Reviews..... 18
- 4. RPA Form Template 18
- 5. SBCD Assurance Panel – Draft Terms of Reference 18

1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide a framework for the management, resourcing and governance of Gateway assurance arrangements for the Swansea Bay City Deal (SBCD) Portfolio and its constituent programmes, projects and workstreams. The framework provides clarity for programme and project Senior Responsible Owners (SROs) and their teams, Welsh and UK governments and partner organisations on the assurance arrangements that will apply to the SBCD Portfolio. It also provides a framework that meets the requirements and expectations of both governments for the external assurance of the portfolio.

The establishment and application of independent assurance arrangements are an essential and integral part of ensuring successful delivery of portfolios, programmes and projects, and the realisation of their benefits. Due to the high value, risk rating, complexity and the significant number of discrete project elements within the SBCD Portfolio, it is essential that the assurance arrangements are effective and practical. It is also important that clarity is provided to all stakeholders on assurance requirements, the process involved and their respective roles and responsibilities to ensure the effectiveness of the assurance arrangements.

The framework supports the Portfolio Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP) which provides a tool for the management of assurance activity associated with the development, delivery and operational phases of the programmes and projects.

This framework has been produced jointly by the SBCD Portfolio Management Office (PoMO) and Welsh Government Integrated Assurance Hub (IAH) and describes the arrangements for the SBCD Portfolio which are aligned to best practice, and are proportionate, practicable and fit for purpose.

2. Background

2.1 Assurance and Gateway Reviews

The HM Treasury Guidance for Better Business Cases highlights the importance of integrating effective assurance arrangements in the development, delivery and evaluation of projects and programmes. Assurance provides independent and impartial confirmation that a programme / project and its various activities are on track and that the spending objectives can be delivered successfully. It also improves the prospects of achieving the intended outcomes and benefits.

The Better Business Case guidance for developing programme and project business cases aligns with the Cabinet Office Gateway Review assurance process and the Welsh Government Assurance Process. This process examines projects at key decision points in their lifecycle and looks ahead to provide assurance that they can progress successfully to the next stage. OGC Gateway Reviews are regarded as best practice in central civil government throughout the UK and are applicable to a wide range of programmes and projects. The Gateway Reviews deliver a 'peer review', in

which independent practitioners from outside the programme/project use their experience and expertise to examine the progress and likelihood of successful delivery of the portfolio, programme or project. They are used to provide a valuable additional perspective on the issues facing the project team, and an external challenge to the robustness of plans and processes.

It is designed to provide independent guidance to SROs, programme and project teams and to the departments who commission their work, on how best to ensure that their programmes and projects are successful. Essentially, the Gateway review Process provides support to SROs in the discharge of their responsibilities for the delivery of the programme or project and to achieve their business aims, by helping the SRO to ensure:

- the best available skills and experience are deployed on the programme/project
- all the stakeholders covered by the programme/project fully understand the programme/project status and the issues involved
- there is assurance that the programme/project can progress to the next stage of development or implementation and that any procurement is well managed in order to provide value for money on a whole life basis achievement of more realistic time and cost targets for programmes and projects
- improvement of knowledge and skills among government staff through participation in Reviews
- Provision of advice and guidance to programme and project teams by fellow practitioners
- Provision of assurance to the SRO that the programme / project will deliver its aims and objectives.

Portfolio and Programme Reviews are carried out under OGC Gateway™ Review 0: Strategic assessment.

Project Reviews are carried out under OGC Gateway Reviews 1 - 5; and can undergo up to five Reviews during its lifecycle – three before commitment to invest, and two looking at service implementation and confirmation of the operational benefits. Project Reviews may be repeated as necessary depending on the size, scope and complexity of the project.

The Gateway process identifies the following key stage decision points:

- Gateway 0 – Strategic Assessment for Portfolios / Programmes
- Gateway 1 – Business Justification
- Gateway 2 – Delivery Strategy
- Gateway 3 – Investment Decision
- Gateway 4 – Readiness for Service
- Gateway 5 – Operations Review and Benefits

Additional 'products' available for SROs include Project Validation Reviews (PVR), Project Assessment Reviews (PAR) and Critical Friend Review (CFR). In addition, in circumstances where a Review returns a Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) of either Amber/Red or Red, an Assurance of Action Plan (AAP) Review is invoked. PARs tailored to specific terms of reference have been made use of by a

number of City Deal projects.

The standard format for a Gateway Review involves the formation of a Review Team consisting of a paid independent consultant as the Review Team Leader (RTL) and two supporting Review Team Members (RTMs) from the public sector. This Team undertakes a series of interviews with selected stakeholders over a 2-day period and produce a report to the SRO on the third day which includes a Delivery Confidence Assessment (Green / Amber Green / Amber / Amber Red / Red) together with recommendations to support the delivery of the programme or project going forward. For more complex projects and programmes with many stakeholders, a 5-day review can be undertaken.

2.2 SBCD Portfolio, Programmes and Projects

The SBCD has a current portfolio investment of £1.3bn, funded by the UK Government, the Welsh Government, public sector bodies and the private sector. This investment will improve regional infrastructure in high value sectors, attract inward investment from businesses and create good job opportunities. It is a partnership of eight regional organisations made up of local authorities, universities and health boards.

The portfolio is to be delivered over a 15-year period 2017-2033 and with the following investment objectives:

1. **Jobs** - To create over 9,000 skilled jobs aligned to economic acceleration, energy, life sciences and smart manufacturing across the region within 15 years (2017-33).
2. **GVA** - To contribute £1.8-2.4 billion GVA to the Swansea Bay City Region by 2033 and contribute to the region achieving 90% of UK productivity levels by 2033.
3. **Investment** - To deliver a total investment in the region of £1.15-1.3 billion in the South West Wales Regional economy by 2033.

These investment objectives will be realised through the successful delivery of 9 headline programmes and projects each of which has developed a programme or project business case aligned to the Better Business Case guidance.

Responsibility for the delivery of the programmes and projects lies with the identified lead authority / lead delivery organisation.

The SBCD structural diagram below shows the organisational responsibility for the delivery of each element of the portfolio and demonstrates the complexity and magnitude of projects and workstreams incorporated within the headline programmes and projects. All nine of the headline business cases have received regional and Government approval and the SBCD Portfolio is now in full delivery.


The diagram below illustrates that the component activities of the SBCD fall within one of the following levels:

Level 1 - SBCD Portfolio (1).

Level 2 – Headline Programme and Project Business Cases (9). Led by a SBCD local authority and delivered by either a lead authority or SBCD partner organisation.

Level 3 – Projects and Workstreams (35). Delivered either by a SBCD local authority or partner organisation

All the headline business cases (Level 2) within the SBCD portfolio have been approved both regionally and by Governments and the portfolio is in full delivery. The constituent projects and workstreams (Level 3) are at various stages of development and delivery.



2.3 Previous Assurance Arrangements

The SBCD Assurance Framework is aligned to the assurance arrangements that already exist for Welsh City and Growth Deals. These arrangements have been developed in the context of the City and Growth Deal Governance and Assurance Framework. This Framework outlines the appropriate and proportionate application of

best practice governance, assurance and Programme & Project Management (PPM), underpinned by an Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP).

The WG Governance and Assurance Framework specifies that programme / project lead organisations must commission Gateway assurance for Portfolios, Programmes and Projects for the SBCD portfolio and set these out within its IAAP. Assurance reports must be shared with the WCGIB as part of assurance oversight. Portfolio/Programme and Project flowchart process maps have been developed and are intended to aid the development of the IAAP. The flowcharts set out an indicative process including planned and potential consequential assurance, key regional delivery partner and Government approval points from discovery through business case development and on into the delivery phase.

It is acknowledged that the Gateway review process supports a rigorous governance framework to manage key processes including business planning, investment appraisal and business case management (including benefits management), programme and project portfolio management, risk management, procurement/acquisition, and service and contract management. It is also recognised that partner delivery organisations will have individual assurance arrangements and obligations that will be fulfilled in programme and project delivery.

Working closely with the Welsh Government's Integrated Assurance Hub, the SBCD PoMO has established a Portfolio IAAP, to ensure that the planning, coordination and provision of assurance activities and approval points throughout the City Deal portfolio are undertaken and are proportionate to levels of cost and risk. An IAAP has been established for all SBCD Programmes / Projects, which are live documents and are regularly updated and shared with the appropriate governance structures at programme / project and portfolio levels. Portfolio and programme / project level IAAPs are updated by programme / project teams and reported through the SBCD governance on a quarterly basis. The IAAPs provide details on the nature and timing of assurance arrangements at all levels including:

- Governance groups reporting
- Key documentation review and approvals
- Internal functional assurance
- Independent assurance (inc. Gateway Reviews)
- Internal and external audit

The current Portfolio IAAP and project template is attached at Appendix 1. The annual schedule of Gateway reviews for the portfolio, programmes and projects within the current financial year is included in Appendix 2.

Gateway Reviews are required and undertaken at both a Portfolio business case level and at the 9 headline Programme or Project business case level as shown in the table below. Reviews are administered by the Welsh Government Assurance Hub, under accreditation by the Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA), to coincide with key decision points in the delivery of a programme / project at the request of the SRO. There is a 10-12 week lead in time for a review and a cost of approximately £6,500 to the commissioning organisation for a typical 3-day review. The SBCD PoMO facilitate the process and support the SRO and project team through the scoping, interview and

feedback sessions. The PoMO also track the scheduling of reviews through the project IAAPs.

Within the headline business cases for the programmes and projects there are many constituent projects and workstreams. Some of these are of a high value and risk and are crucial to the success of the headline programme / project and consequently to the success of the Portfolio overall. Previously, there has been no systematic Gateway assurance arrangements at this level across the SBCD Portfolio. It is acknowledged however that evaluations / reviews, such as WEFO related projects, may be required by other funding sponsors. The SBCD assurance arrangements would seek to supplement these existing arrangements and not to replace or duplicate.

Level	Assurance Arrangements
Level 1: Portfolio (1)	Gateway 0 - annual
Level 2: Headline Programme and Project Business Cases (9)	Gateway 0 / PARs – Reviews undertaken predominantly as part of the defined business case approval process
Level 3: Projects and Workstreams (35)	No current systematic Gateway assurance arrangements across the SBCD Portfolio.

2.4 SBCD Assurance Context and Issues

HM Treasury advice on Better Business Cases Guidance assurance arrangements indicates that there should be independent assurance throughout the lower level of SBCD projects and workstreams (Level 3). Some of these projects are high value / high risk projects that could have significant consequences for the success of their headline programme / project and the overarching SBCD portfolio. It is acknowledged by SBCD, its partner organisations and Welsh and UK Government sponsors that appropriate assurance arrangements need to be in place across the whole of the portfolio.

It is recognised that appropriate and effective assurance is required at all levels within the SBCD Portfolio. It is also acknowledged that there would be considerable practical issues with undertaking the full suite of Gateway reviews at Level 3 through the defined Gateway Review process using external Review teams. With the portfolio now being in full delivery there is a requirement for rigorous, effective and frequent assurance activity to ensure that the portfolio has the best opportunity to deliver its defined benefits to the region.

The main challenge to assuring all Level 3 projects is the number of reviews that would need to be completed which would cause significant issues for both the delivery organisations and the IAH relating to:

Programme / Project resource

There is already pressure on some programme and project teams to provide resource to undertake Reviews in terms of organisation, administration and providing support

to the review team. These pressures are likely to become more significant as an increased number of projects and workstreams progress through delivery.

Stakeholder commitment

The programmes and projects have many common stakeholder organisations / individuals that would be involved in a Review. To follow the prescribed arrangements at all levels of the Portfolio would lead to unmanageable time pressures on senior officers in the partner organisations in attending and managing reviews.

Management

The need for a 10-12 week lead-in time for Gateway reviews is acknowledged and are scheduled in the IAAP to coincide with key decision points. However, as programmes and projects are proceeding at pace through delivery, it will become difficult to manage and capture all key decision points for the component projects and workstreams and avoid delays to delivery. Under the current arrangements there have been instances where project reviews have not been undertaken at the most opportune time.

Assurance community resource

The ability of the assurance community to provide this level of resource placing significant pressure on the existing WG assurance community for RTLs/RTMs.

In consideration of the above, there is an identified need to establish Gateway assurance arrangements which address these challenges whilst ensuring that assurance is comprehensive, practical, proportional, fit for purpose and robust.

3. Delivery of SBCD Assurance Arrangements

3.1 Principles and Approach

The management and delivery of this Framework and the undertaking of reviews will align to the following guiding principles:



The Gateway assurance arrangements for the SBCD have been developed jointly between the SBCD PoMO and the Welsh Government Integrated Assurance Hub (IAH). A series of meetings and workshops have been held to discuss the most appropriate response to the challenges identified in implementing an effective Gateway assurance process throughout all Levels of the portfolio.

The table below summarises the agreed approach to assurance arrangements for each level of the Portfolio.

Level	Assurance Arrangements
Level 1: Portfolio (1)	Gateway 0 – annual review
Level 2: Headline Programme and Project Business Cases (9)	Gateway 0 / Gateways 1-5 / PARs – periodic reviews with the option of undertaking Gateway 1-5 to incorporate key decision points of component projects and workstreams
Level 3: Projects and Workstreams (35)	Gateway 1-5 / PARs for high risk / value projects to be undertaken at agreed decision points based on an assessment of the Risk Potential Assessment (RPA) form for the headline programme / project

Programme / project RPAs will be used as a key assessment tool for the WG IAH to determine the appropriate form and level of assurance. When considering projects / workstreams at Level 3, the WG IAH, in discussion with the SRO and PoMO, will recommend what decision points could be blended together in a review e.g. a Gateway 0 for the headline programme blended with a Gateway 3 for a component project. The WG IAH would also recommend which project / workstreams should be

subject to a separate Gateway process and at what decision points a review is undertaken.

This approach will be supplemented by the activities of the PoMO in supporting and reviewing business case development and programme / project delivery throughout the process. For example, based upon a review of a current RPA, the WG IAH may recommend that separate Gateway 3 and 5 reviews are undertaken on a component project at Level 3. The PoMO will then work with the programme / project SRO to ensure that there is robust business case development up to the Gateway 3 stage and that delivery is in accordance with the approved project plan up to the Gateway 5 stage. The SRO will ensure that there is a robust business case and any appropriate amendments are completed in preparation for the Gateway review and that delivery is in accordance with the approved project plan.

The approach outlined represents a robust, workable and proportionate application of formal assurance arrangements for the portfolio.

3.2 Roles and Responsibilities

The table below details the key individuals and groups involved in the operation of the SBCD Assurance Framework and their main roles and responsibilities in the process.

<p>Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversight of SBCD Gateway assurance arrangements • Review and development of the assurance process
<p>WG Integrated Assurance Hub</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of the WG IAH assurance community • Management of OGC Gateway Process for the SBCD Portfolio (Levels 1-3) • Provision of training and accreditation for SROs, RTLs, RTMs • Identification and provision of RTLs / RTMs • Review of RPA forms and assessment of assurance needs • Specialist advice on the management of reviews • Responsibility for the Gateway products and how they are administered • Quality assurance of reviews, processes and documentation • Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel representative
<p>SBCD Portfolio SRO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall responsibility for the establishment of robust Gateway assurance arrangements for the SBCD following WG IAH standards

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiation of reviews for Level 1 • Ownership of Portfolio business case
SBCD Portfolio Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct responsibility for the establishment and co-management (with WG IAH) of effective assurance arrangements for the SBCD • Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel representative
SBCD PoMO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for the establishment and management of the SBCD assurance arrangements • Advice on the management of reviews • Implementation of the Portfolio IAAP • Review of RPA forms prior to submission to WG IAH • Updating of Portfolio business case • Advice on, and review of, business case development • Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel representative
Programme / Project SROs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for the establishment of robust Gateway assurance arrangements for programmes / projects and workstreams • Initiation of reviews for Levels 2 and 3 • Completion and updating of RPA forms • Ownership and updating of programme / project business cases • Completion of Gateway Review action plan • Implementation of the programme / project IAAP • Financial arrangements for the costs associated with undertaking a review
SBCD Partner Organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing and hosting of reviews • Participation in reviews for Levels 1-3
WG / UKG City Deal Leads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel representatives • Conduit to the Welsh City and Growth Deals Implementation Board (WCGIB)

4. Management of Reviews

4.1 Review Process

Reviews will be coordinated by the Welsh Government IAH through the established OGC Gateway process and will follow the agreed process as shown below.

The Portfolio IAAP is the key document for the scheduling of Gateways reviews across the programmes and projects of the portfolio. This document will need to be kept up to date by the SRO and their teams, reported through the established monitoring process and implemented according to the agreed timescales.

The SRO should ensure that the business case is updated prior to a Gateway Review, in accordance with the Better Business Case 5 Case model, to ensure that information is current and sufficient for an effective review to be undertaken.

Initiation of Review

A milestone review of the IAAP for programmes and projects will be the main prompt for the initiation of a review and the type of review to be undertaken. Reviews can be initiated by the programme / project SRO, SBCD PoMO or WG/UKG. The RPA form is the key document for detailing the various risks associated with the programme / project and needs to be completed / updated thoroughly and objectively prior to a review. The SRO will be responsible for the completion and updating of the RPA for submission for initial appraisal by the PoMO and then for assessment by WG IAH. The RPA form template is attached at Appendix 3.

The initiation process should be undertaken at least 12 weeks prior to a scheduled review.

Assessment Meeting

On receipt of updated RPA form, an Assessment Meeting will be arranged by the WG IAH with the programme / project SRO and PoMO to determine the appropriate timing, scope and type of review to be undertaken. The SRO will be briefed on the Gateway Review process and provided with the Assurance Pre-Planning Pack to assist with the preparation for the review. The Assessment Meeting will need to be undertaken 10-12 weeks prior to a scheduled review. During this meeting, the SRO will be advised of the need to produce a Terms of Reference (ToR) for each review. This does not need to be comprehensive, but simply a paragraph that describes the main focus for the review. This will avoid any ambiguity and ensure that both the Review Team and SRO fully understand the parameters of the review. Finally, the SRO will be advised to provide the RTL with any reading material appropriate for the portfolio/programme/project and the ToR, 2 weeks in advance of the Planning Meeting.

Appointment of Review Team

The WG IAH will be responsible for the selection and appointment of the RTL and RTMs for reviews based on the discussion at the Assessment Meeting.

Planning Meeting

A Planning Meeting will be held approximately 2 weeks prior to the review in order for the review team to meet with the programme / project SRO and team members. The SRO will brief the review team on the current status of the programme / project and any specific issues from the terms of reference for the team to consider. The SRO will present the interview schedule for key stakeholders to be agreed / amended with the review team. The review team will also finalise the key documentation required prior to undertaken the review.

Gateway Review

The review team will undertake the review and feedback to the SRO at the Emerging Finding meeting at the end of each day. A draft review report including a Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) and review recommendations will be provided to the SRO at the Review Draft Report Feedback Meeting at the end of the review. The SRO will have the opportunity to correct any factual inaccuracies in the report prior to final report being issued. The PoMO and WG IAH will be in attendance at the Feedback Meeting. A final Review Report will be shared with the PoMO and WG IAH.


Post Review

Following the review, a 360-degree assessment will be undertaken for the RTL and RTMs and feedback sought from the SRO. The SRO will produce an action plan for completing the review recommendations. These will be presented the Joint SBCD / WG / UKG Assurance Panel.

The timescale from the Assessment Meeting to the Gateway Review being undertaken is commonly 10-12 weeks.

DOCUMENTATION

REVIEW PROCESS



4.2 Format and Scope of Reviews

The Welsh Government IAH Gateway Assurance Guidance document provides guidance on the structure of each OGC Gateway Review 'product', and the areas of investigation to be addressed by the Review Team, together with examples of the evidence which would demonstrate to the Review Team the satisfactory nature of responses to the various topics.

These topics and the examples of evidence are indicative and not prescriptive; within the overall objectives of each Review stage. The Review Team will consider whether additional or different topics need to be addressed, and the evidence to be sought. Approaches may vary according to the context of the programme or project – for example, IT-enabled business change, property/construction, or policy development/implementation.

All reviews will be undertaken according to the format and scope described by this guidance and tailored to the specific needs of each programme / project. Central to the process is the undertaking of 'conversations' with key stakeholders around the specified / agreed areas of review. These will be undertaken according to the establish OGC Gateway Review Code of Conduct and will include the following key principles:

- ‘conversations’ are conducted in an impartial and constructive manner
- ‘conversations’ are confidential and non-attributable
- the Review Team will seek to triangulate any themes/comments or evidence heard across several conversations to ensure that they have a solid basis for any observations/recommendations that are contained in the review report
- documentation supplied to the Review Team will be treated with the strictest confidentiality and destroyed at the end of the review.

Reviews will normally be undertaken over a three-day period with two days dedicated to conversations with key stakeholders and third day for report writing and reporting back on the findings to the SRO. The timeframes for a review can be extended for complex programmes / projects with many stakeholders.

4.3 Review Team Arrangements

The Welsh Government IAH will be responsible for the selection and appointment of RTLs and RTMs for reviews from within the established assurance community and through their existing arrangements.

RTL and RTM selection will be informed by the specific nature and scope of review and the essential skills identified for review team members in the assessment stage of the review. All potential RTLs and RTMs will complete a Gateway Reviewer Application to identify an individual’s skill sets and experience.

The Welsh Government IAH will provide the appropriate training and accreditation for all RTLs and RTMs through their existing training modules and specified accreditation requirements.

RTMs will require authorisation for release to undertake reviews by their line manager. RTLs and RTMs will need to sign the Contract of Engagement prior to undertaking the review.

4.4 Standards and Quality

Reviews will be undertaken according to the 14 Gateway Assurance Principles set by OGC™

Communications & Leadership

1. The Senior Executive is committed to the OGC Gateway process & brand
2. The SRO is the client for the OGC Gateway Review and is responsible for the effective implementation of recommendations
3. OGC Gateway is part of a planned and integrated assurance regime for supporting the effective delivery of programmes and projects

Delivery and Best Practice

4. OGC Gateway Reviews are prioritised and resourced commensurate with inherent risk, complexity and priority
5. OGC Gateway Reviews are carried out at appropriate points throughout the entire lifecycle of programmes and projects
6. The OGC Gateway process is applied to preparing and undertaking Reviews
7. Lessons learned from OGC Gateway Reviews are to be shared across the PPM community at national, strategic and local levels
8. The OGC Gateway Review Team must be independent of the programme/project, its management and associated support activities and is responsible for the content of the final report
9. OGC Gateway Reviews are undertaken by a team of accredited peers, with the requisite skills, knowledge and experience, that are drawn from an effectively managed reviewer pool
10. The Review will be short, focused and forward looking, delivering a report to the SRO on the final day of the review
11. OGC Gateway recommendations will be candid & practical, based on best practice & evidence and prioritised for urgency of implementation

Style

12. The process will be open with access to all stakeholders & documentation
13. The OGC Gateway Review process will be undertaken in a confidential manner, with a non-attributable report
14. A 'peer to peer' coaching style will be adopted, with a no 'no surprises' approach

The Welsh Government IAH, whilst adhering to the OGC Gateway Assurance Principles, have its own set of standards and quality that the Team and Reviewer community adhere to. These will be applied to all Levels of review for the SBCD Portfolio.

Flexible – The IAH will, where possible, take a flexible approach to Gateway Assurance Reviews, managing the SRO's requirements and expectations.

Honesty and integrity – The IAH maintains an honest approach to Gateway Assurance Reviews and will provide recommendations for Gateway Reviews if they are applicable at the time. We maintain an open and honest approach with our Reviewer Community and will provide feedback when required

Helpful not a Hindrance – The IAH will support Programmes and Projects through the Gateway Assurance Process, and will provide advice and guidance, ensuring that the Assurance Process is a helpful one and not a hindrance to the Programme/Project.

Feedback – The Hub provides feedback to both the SRO and Reviewer Community, where required, the Hub in return will also gather feedback on the IAH team performance to support and maintain the standards of delivery

Trend Analysis – The Hub provides Trend Analysis that supports future Programmes and Projects, supports learning and development and supports the Organisation development.

Quality – The Hub expects and maintains a high quality of delivery and will provide the highest quality of Reviewers to each review. We conduct 360-degree feedback to help develop all our reviewer community. We provide open and honest feedback within the Team to maintain a high level of delivery.

4.5 Financial Arrangements

The programme / project SRO will be responsible for financing the costs incurred in undertaking the Gateway Review through their organisational or project budgets.

This will include the consultant fee for the RTL and the travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the RTL. The WG IAH expenses form will be used to claim back expenses relating to the review.

Any accommodation and hospitality costs for RTMs will also be borne by the programme / project SRO.

4.6 Documentation

The following documentation will be utilised by the WG IAH in the management and delivery of assurance reviews.

Assessment and Planning

Risk Potential Assessment Form (IAH-RPA)

Assurance Pre-Planning Pack

- Welsh Government Gateway Assurance Guidance
- SRO Briefing Note (IBN002)
- Assurance Process Checklist
- Assurance Review Schedule
- Interviewee Briefing Note (IBN001)
- Welsh Government Assurance Reviews – Customer ‘tips’

Review and Review Team

RTL / RTM Reviewer Contract of Engagement

- Travel and Subsistence Policy
- Expenses and claims forms

OGC Gateway Review Report Templates

Post Review

360-degree assessment form

Action plan template

5. Governance and Oversight


5.1 Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel

Oversight of the development and implementation of the SBCD Assurance Framework will be undertaken by the Joint SBCD/WG/UKG Assurance Panel. The Panel will be chaired by Welsh Government Head of Integrated Assurance with representation from the SBCD PoMO, the Welsh Government and UK Governments leads for City and Growth Deals.

Draft terms of reference are attached at Appendix 4. Main duties and responsibilities of the Assurance Panel will be:

- Ensure that appropriate assurance arrangements are in place for the delivery of the SBCD portfolio of programmes, projects and workstreams
- Identify the appropriate level of reviews to be undertaken for programmes and projects
- Ensure the specified standards are met in the management and delivery of reviews
- Ensure that the quality of the OGC Gateway process and products are maintained in the delivery of reviews
- Oversee the assessment, scheduling and delivery of reviews
- Monitor and assess the progress of programme / project action plans in relation to review recommendations
- Assessment, identification and facilitation of training needs to ensure the successful operation of the SBCD Assurance Framework
- Ongoing review and development of the SBCD Assurance Framework
- Provide reports to SBCD governance groups on the delivery of the independent assurance arrangements for the portfolio

The Panel will report on a quarterly basis via the Portfolio Management Office into the formal governance arrangements for the SBCD as shown below:



6. Development and Review

The SBCD assurance arrangements as described in this Framework will be further developed as the process is implemented.

The Framework will also be formally reviewed by the Joint Assurance Panel on a six-monthly basis.

It is acknowledged that the OGC Gateway Review process will be revised with the introduction of the Get to Green proposals. Further advice will be provided by the WG Assurance Hub on the implications for Gateway Reviews in Wales and the process described in this Framework.

Appendices

1. Portfolio IAAP
2. Annual Schedule of Gateway Reviews
3. RPA Form Template
4. SBCD Assurance Panel – Draft Terms of Reference