

DATE

File reference: SRO Filing number.

NAME OF PROJECT Full Business Case, Category D

Executive Summary

NAME OF PROJECT project will procure a single class of **NUMBER OF** replacement **DELIVERABLES** for the **NAME OF DEPARTMENT**. **NAME OF PROJECT** will provide a solution to meet **NAME OF DEPARTMENT's** enhanced operational objectives, which the current **DELIVERABLE** are no longer capable of supporting. The Outline Business Case (OBC) approved procurement of **NAME OF PROJECT** via competitive tender, representing the best Value of Money (VfM) option to meet **NAME OF DEPARTMENT's** Key User Requirements (KURs). Following receipt of Best and Final Offer (BAFO) submissions in **DATE**, **COMPANY** have been selected as the preferred tenderer. **NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT** Team are therefore seeking approval through Full Business Case (FBC) to award a contract to **COMPANY** at a cost model output of £XXXX (VAT inc) against a Control Total of £XXXX. This represents an efficiency/saving against CT of £XXXX

Issue

1. Approval is required to commence the manufacture phase of the **NAME OF PROJECT** project.
2. The current **DELIVERABLE** utilised by the **NAME OF DEPARTMENT** are reaching or have surpassed their Out of Service Date (OSD) and no longer meet KURs. Procurement of replacement **DELIVERABLES** is essential to ensure operational outputs are maintained.

Timing

3. Routine. FBC Approval is requested by **DATE** to allow Contract Award **DATE**. This is in line with Tenderer's expectations, so meeting this minimises the risk of delay to **DELIVERABLE** delivery if a delayed contract award were to occur.

Recommendation(s)

4. The Approving Authority is invited to **approve**:
 - a. The **NAME OF PROJECT** project proceeding to manufacture phase in order to deliver the KURs at Annex A;
 - b. The Approved Budgetary Level (outturn, inclusive of all non-recoverable VAT) at 50% confidence for the Manufacture phase up until **DATE** is £XXXX

	Confidence Levels (£XXXX)
--	----------------------------------

	Deterministic	10%	50%	90%
CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 1- Total Cost

- c. The confidence levels for key project milestones in Table 2. The contractor build schedule for NAME OF PROJECT is outlined in Annex B:

	Confidence Levels			
	Deterministic	10%	50%	90%
In-Service Date (ISD)	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE
IOC	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE
FOC	DATE	DATE	DATE	DATE

Table 2 – Key Milestones

5. And to note:

- a. Affordability against the approved Control Total across all Financial Years has been confirmed by CUSTOMER.
- b. The VAT treatment has been confirmed as being F1 for the build programme
- c. No Private Sector Support (PSS) is required to support this approval.
- d. There are no Contingent Liabilities associated with any Contract resulting from this approval.
- e. The principal risks to capability delivery at Annex C.
- f. Two contractual options are available to offer flexibility to the Authority, but are excluded from this approval:
 - (1) £XXXX (VAT Inc) for the procurement of up to an additional NUMBER OF Option DELIVERABLE (currently unaffordable);
 - (2) £XXXX (VAT inc) for In-Service Support (ISS) up to DATE
 - (a) ISS is excluded from this approval. Funding provision for NAME OF PROJECT ISS has been accounted for and approved within the Approved Budgetary Level (ABL) of the DELIVERABLEs In-Service Support (ISS) contract. Initial ISS for NAME OF PROJECT, until DATE, will be conducted by either COMPANY (if the option is enacted) or the current ISS provider. Enduring ISS, post DATE, will be conducted by the Future ISS (FISS) contractor following tender outcome. FISS represents the follow-on support contract after expiry of the current arrangements in DATE. All ISS funding for NAME OF PROJECT is approved within ISS/FISS and as such is excluded from this approval.

Case Narrative

Strategic Case

6. The NAME OF PROJECT Project seeks to continue the enduring requirement for NAME OF DEPARTMENT to deliver ongoing waterborne patrol and policing at (LOCATION 1, LOCATION 2, and LOCATION 3). The current suite of DELIVERABLE delivering these operations are progressing to or have surpassed their OSD, and in the majority of cases are no longer suitable for the operations they are used for as a result of changes in user operational objectives and scope growth. This has meant that DELIVERABLE once suitable for operations are now unsuitable. The NAME OF PROJECT project is therefore required to enable users to effectively fulfil their operational tasks including:

- a. REDACTED
- b. REDACTED
- c. REDACTED
- d. REDACTED

7. In order to deliver these requirements, NAME OF DEPARTMENT require DELIVERABLE for the provision of REDACTED. In doing so they provide REDACTED.

8. The project was initially established in DATE, with the scope to deliver DELIVERABLES variants across NUMBER user communities. Due to efforts of rationalisation and a need to reduce complexity, the project was split into two separate projects: Medium and Large DELIVERABLE. The medium requirement is a procurement for NUMBER DELIVERABLEs, however due to both resource and funding constraints this project has been paused; NAME OF PROJECT represents the large variant.

9. The Outline Business Case for NAME OF PROJECT was approved in DATE and approved the commencement of a zero-cost assessment phase to procure NUMBER NAME OF PROJECT (out of a total requirement of NUMBER DELIVERABLEs) at £XXXX. In DATE, a Contract Notice was issued for the procurement of NUMBER NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE. Due to resource constraints and CUSTOMER re-prioritisation, the NAME OF PROJECT tender competition was paused until DATE. In DATE, prior to Contract notice re-release, a review of the project costings suggested that it was possible to purchase NUMBER NAME OF PROJECT for a forecast cost of £XXXX. As such a revised contract notice and PQQ was released in DATE which scoped for the procurement of NUMBER NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE. This revised scope increased the User groups to re-align the scope more closely to the original intent of the NAME OF PROJECT project (to procure DELIVERABLE for multiple users). Following receipt of unaffordable tenders in DATE, the scope was again reduced to procuring NUMBER DELIVERABLES for the sole user group of NAME OF DEPARTMENT, following CUSTOMER approval¹. A summary of the change in DELIVERABLE allocation, including mitigations for users no longer in scope of NAME OF PROJECT, is outlined in Table 3:

REDACTED

Table 3 – NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE Allocation

10. The DELIVERABLE made redundant by the introduction of NAME OF PROJECT (depending on the class and condition) will either be directly disposed of or on occasions where DELIVERABLE may still be operational, will be reallocated to allow disposal or removal from service of other DELIVERABLE. In some instances, DELIVERABLE are likely to fill capability gaps.

Economic Case

11. During OBC approval in YEAR, several options to determine VfM were assessed. The outcome of the OBC Options analysis concluded that Option 4 would provide the best VfM solution, as detailed below:

- a. Option 4 - Competitive tender for build of a single class of replacement DELIVERABLE with potential through-life support arrangements offered following conclusion of VfM exercise post contract award (decision to be made post-contract award whether to transfer the offsite support into the ISS and/or BES contracts).

12. The Procurement and Commercial Strategy recommended that this be achieved through engagement in open competition with industry to select a preferred bidder. This competition has since been completed using the Competitive Negotiated procedure under the Defence and Security Public Contract Regulations (DSPCR 2011) regulations, resulting in the receipt of two tenders.

13. To determine which tender offered the best VfM, the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) was selected using the Value for Money Index methodology. This approach divided the total score of the non-cost (quality) criteria by the tender cost. It was simple to calculate, transparent, and maximised return on investment.

14. In addition to supporting an overall VfM solution, an efficiency will be found by supporting just 1 class of DELIVERABLE, versus the current model where five classes perform these duties. This not only will allow for a more efficient and simplified support regime, but also releases extant DELIVERABLE for use elsewhere, improving overall availability of DELIVERABLE for other users.

- a. Moreover, interoperability efficiencies are gained through use of one class of DELIVERABLE at REDACTED locations. The project will employ technologies being employed in the DELIVERABLE.

15. As previously outlined, ISS is excluded from this approval. This decision was made as learning from experience across the DELIVERABLEs Acquisition and ISS Programme shows that VfM is obtained for non-complex/Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) DELIVERABLEs by purchasing without ISS. To demonstrate and ensure VfM, the award of the ISS element of the project will be competed between the current ISS provider and the DELIVERABLE Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), COMPANY.

Commercial Case

16. This procurement will be awarded using the negotiated procedure under Regulation 18 of the Defence & Security Public Contract Regulations (DSPCR) 2011 (the

“Negotiated Procedure”). This allowed for face-to-face discussions and clarifications of each tenderer’s proposal.

17. In-line with the NAME OF PROJECT Procurement Strategy, the Authority launched a competitive tender in DATE, later re-released in DATE, for the procurement of the NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE. The Preliminary Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) yielded NUMBER OF responses from industry, of which 6 successful potential providers were invited through to the Invitation To Negotiate (ITN) stage, which commenced in DATE. The tender included a Statement of Technical Requirements (SOTR), Contractual Terms & Conditions and a set of Contract Evaluation Criteria that was designed to establish the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) from assessment of bidders’ responses. Following evaluation of the ITN submissions, 2 tenders were received, and both were assessed as compliant in proposing solutions which meet the outlined requirements.

18. In order to best achieve the required capability within funding constraints, the contract contained a well-defined firm requirement for NUMBER OF NAME OF PROJECT, with the option for an additional NUMBER OF NAME OF PROJECT if funding became available. The contract will be awarded using a combination of Firm and Fixed prices. For the requirements subject to a Fixed price, the price will be agreed under a Variation of Price (VOP) clause linked to the HQT1 price index, as agreed with Defence Economics.

19. Payment will be made via Contracting, Purchasing & Finance (CP&F) upon delivery of individual DELIVERABLEs, spares packages and other contractual deliverables. Payments will be made in accordance with the agreed Milestones which have been identified and defined within the contract and will cover work completed to the satisfaction of the NAME OF DEPARTMENT during the design and manufacture phases.

20. Suitable Intellectual Property (IP) DEFCONs have been included in the contract to enable any contractor nominated by the Authority to carry out future support.

21. The contract is DEFCON based with narrative conditions.

22. COMPANY is not a recognised strategic supplier and Defence Equipment & Support (NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT) has partial exemption from the Cabinet Office Spend Control approval, which applies to this procurement as it is under the threshold of £XXXX (ex VAT).

23. There are no Contingent Liabilities associated with any Contract resulting from this approval.

Financial Case

24. The Approved Budgetary Level (ABL) being sought within this approval (outturn, inclusive of all non-recoverable VAT at 50% confidence) for Manufacture consists of:

- a. £XXXX capital expenditure (CDEL);
- b. £XXXX total resource consumption (RDEL).

25. This falls within the current CUSTOMER Control Total approved for this project phase of £XXXX. This represents an efficiency of £XXXX for CUSTOMER.

26. This is in addition to the in-service support provision already approved as part of the ISS MGBC CUSTOMER Allocation (£XXXX CDEL; £XXXX RDEL).

27. The ISS OBC approved in-service support provision until DATE. Approval for NAME OF PROJECT in-service support beyond this date will be incorporated into the approval for FISS.

28. Affordability of the project is demonstrated in Table 4 below (inclusive of Risk), overall affordability within the wider DELIVERABLEs programme can be found at Annex D.

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
FY		YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	
Forecast Cost at 50% Confidence (at P50 value)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Provision (ABC Outcome)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Variance (Negative represents <u>excess</u> in provision)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 4 - NAME OF PROJECT Affordability Table against PCR2-DATE

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
FY		YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	
Forecast Cost at 50% Confidence (at P50 value)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Provision (ABC Outcome)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Variance (Negative represents <u>excess</u> in provision)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 5 - NAME OF PROJECT Affordability Table against PCR2-DATE

29. The project is delivering an overall efficiency of £XXXX against the Near Cash Control Total allocated to it. However, there are affordability challenges in certain Financial Years, resulting from the build programme being accelerated compared to the original assumptions. This acceleration has been agreed with the SRO and ORGANISATION via an Information Note. It also delivers capability to the user more expediently and delivers the cost efficiency by reducing inflation risk in later years.

30. All RDEL costs for ISS are out-of-scope of this approval, as NAME OF PROJECT Support Costs are affordable within the current scope of the ISS contract and approval as demonstrated by the table below. In-service support pr

31. Provision beyond FYYEARS will be included within the FISS approval.

Year		0	1	2	Total (Years 0-5 only)
FY		YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	
NAME OF PROJECT Support Affordability	RDEL Provision (ISS)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Cost Model Output	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Variance	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 6 - Cost and Affordability of NAME OF PROJECT Support Contract

32. It should be noted that the variances in RDEL do not represent an efficiency but will be recycled within the entirety of the ISS portfolio.

33. All costs incurred during this project will be charged to NAME OF DEPARTMENT in Pounds Sterling.

34. The correct VAT and accounting treatment applications have been applied and have been assured.
35. NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT Commercial have confirmed that there are no contingent liabilities.
36. There is no Private Sector Support (PSS) expenditure associated with this approval.
37. Raw Materials and Consumables (RMC) – expenditure will be apportioned from the value approved in the ISS OBC, as these DELIVERABLEs will be directly replacing platforms for which RMC expenditure was included for the full duration of that approval. It is not anticipated that there will be either notable savings or uplift to the planned RMC expenditure compared to the assumptions made under that approval.

Management Case

38. A planning assumption for service entry between DATE and DATE is currently predicted to be met with 50% confidence.
39. The 10/50/90% confidence levels for ISD/IOC/FOC;

FBC Estimate	Confidence Levels		
	10%	50%	90%
ISD	DATE	DATE	DATE
IOC	DATE	DATE	DATE
FOC	DATE	DATE	DATE

Table 7 – Project Milestone Estimates

40. Definitions for ISD, IOC and FOC are defined at Annex E.
- a. Dates presented in Table 7 reflect the output of the Schedule Risk Analysis (SRA) conducted by NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT against COMPANY's proposed DELIVERABLE delivery schedule, hence have an appropriate risk provision included. Table 7 therefore differs from the DELIVERABLE delivery schedule outlined in Annex B which does not have NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT project risks applied but will be the profile used for the purpose of financial forecasting.
41. The NAME OF PROJECT programme is currently fully resourced as it remains one of the higher-priority projects within the DELIVERABLEs Acquisition Programme. Meanwhile, other projects (notably those where procurement action has not yet started, and which are deemed lower priority by the Customer) are not progressing because the team's resource is focussed on these higher-priority projects.
- a. Delivery of NAME OF PROJECT is dependent on the DELIVERABLEs team retaining its current resource which includes both PDP and CDP personnel. If these are lost, there is a risk that NAME OF PROJECT will not be fully resourced as both FISS and acquisition projects will be prioritised.
42. COMPANY is based in LOCATION 10, which is less than 1 day travel from NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT. T&S expenditure associated with visiting this location is therefore anticipated to be negligible. There will be a requirement to visit SUPPLIER manufacturing facility in LOCATION, however travel to this site is considered comparable

in price to UK internal flights or rail travel and is therefore considered to be affordable within the DELIVERABLEs teams OPEX budget.

43. The principal risks at this stage are listed below, with full detail contained in Annex C:

- a. There is a risk that the infrastructure to allow storage and refilling of petrol for DELIVERABLE assigned to LOCATION 1 will not be in place by DATE.
- b. There is a risk that design changes post-Contract Award (due to either a misinterpretation of the requirement, or a change in the User Requirement) will result in cost increases and/or time delays as the contractual requirement is amended.
- c. There is a risk that the project will not have enough resource to deliver its outcome, especially in the engineering and commercial space.
- d. There is a risk that ISS will not be available to meet ISD and DELIVERABLE 1 delivery.

44. NAME OF PROJECT is a majority COTS product which encompasses minor variations in the CAPABILITY system to meet the specific user requirements identified by the NAME OF DEPARTMENT. Given this, it is acknowledged that the risk associated with a new DELIVERABLE manufacture will be reduced as data on the expected performance and previous usage of the COTS DELIVERABLE, forming the basis for NAME OF PROJECT, already exists. In upholding a majority COTS product, this also gives confidence in COMPANY's ability to meet the given requirements as they have already demonstrated their ability to manufacture a DELIVERABLE which has met a significant proportion of these parameters.

- a. DELIVERABLE acceptance will be carried out in accordance with the project ITEAP to ensure performance is verified against the requirements and COMPANY's proposed solution.
- b. The full scope of the NAME OF PROJECT project includes the DELIVERABLE and associated equipment and documentation: Supportability Documentation, Training, Security and NAME OF PROJECT Model.

45. Formal NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT Project Evaluations will be carried out by ORGANISATION DELIVERABLEs team at the following times:

- a. Within one month of acceptance;
- b. Within one month of attaining FOC;
- c. Into the in-service support phase;
- d. Within one month of the project end date.

46. Informal Learning from Experience (LFE) sessions will be held throughout the lifetime of this project, which will be used to manage both this project and other acquisition projects being managed by the Authority.

47. The classification of information and other security risks for this project through assessment and direction are not deemed to be high, security working groups have been held through the process. Security improvement was included as part of the tender

process; bidders were asked to provide information on how they would improve the security of the DELIVERABLE and provide detail of their Security Management Plan, which was assessed by a DELIVERABLEs Team Security specialist. The project is currently working through the new “Secure by Design” process and regular working group meetings will be held throughout the next stage of NAME OF PROJECT.

48. All project DLODs have been identified and have been engaged throughout the life of the project. A series of DLOD Working Groups (e.g. CIWGS, ITEAP WG, TSG) will be established and conducted in-line with an agreed drumbeat, in support of progression to completion of DELIVERABLE first of class and enduring engagement to achieve NAME OF PROJECT IOC and FOC. Additional meetings where required may be organised to discuss specific DLOD issues, with ongoing monitoring via RAG reviews being conducted as per the DELIVERABLEs Team governance process².

Presentation and Handling

49. There are no presentational and handling issues associated with NAME OF PROJECT and COMPANY. COMPANY are a LOCATION -based company and therefore awarding a contract which will be managed from this location supports the government’s “Levelling-Up” agenda. It should be noted however that COMPANY’s production facility is based in LOCATION.

Signature Block:

Prepared by:	NAME
NAME - ORGANISATION DELIVERABLEs NAME OF PROJECT Project Manager	
Date: DATE	

Financial Assurance on behalf of NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT by:	NAME
NAME- ORGANISATION DELIVERABLEs FBP	
Date: 1 st September 23	

Endorsed on behalf of NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT by:	NAME
NAME - DELIVERABLEs Team Leader	
Date: DATE	

Endorsed on behalf of CUSTOMER by:	
NAME	
Date:	

FBC Annexes:

Annex A – NAME OF PROJECT Key User Requirements

Annex B – NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE Delivery Schedule

Annex C – Key Project Risks

Annex D – DELIVERABLEs Programme Affordability

Annex E – IOC & FOC Definitions

Annex F – DELIVERABLE Renders

Annex G – NAME OF PROJECT Project Team Resourcing

Annex A – NAME OF PROJECT Key User Requirements

ID	Description	Measure of Effectiveness		Justification
		Threshold	Objective	
KUR 1	The capability shall...	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
KUR 2	The capability will...	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
KUR 3	The capability shall...	REDACTED		REDACTED
KUR 4	The capability will...	REDACTED		REDACTED

Annex B - NAME OF PROJECT Contractor Delivery Schedule

	YEAR			YEAR												YEAR												YEAR				
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	
NAME OF PROJECT	B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 B6 B7 B8 B9 B10 B12 B13 B15 B16 B17 B18 B19 B20 B21 B22 B23 B24																															
	B11 B14																															

Annex C – Key Project Risks

ID	Title	Description	Owner	Current Severity	Target Severity
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - LOCATION 1 lack of infrastructure for REDACTED	There is a risk that the infrastructure to allow REDACTED will not be in place by YEAR.	NBC LOCATION	Very High (24)	High (23)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Production	There is a risk that there could be additional delays or quality defects on the DELIVERABLEs due to inefficiency in supplier production processes.	NAME	High (21)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Resources Challenges	There is a risk that the project will not have enough resources to deliver its outcome, especially in the engineering and commercial space.	NAME 1	High (21)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - In Service Support solution not in place with delivery of DELIVERABLE 1	There is a risk that in service support will not be available when DELIVERABLE 1 needs to be delivered	NAME	Medium (20)	Medium (19)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Supply Chain (Tolerate)	There is a risk that due to several supply chain issue there may be a delay in production/fitting of the DELIVERABLEs.	NAME	Medium (18)	Medium (18)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Supplier training package not robust enough to meet requirements of both the User's and NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT standards.	There is a risk that the Training offered by the Supplier is not considered robust enough or it does not meet requirements of both the User's and NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT standards.	NAME	Medium (15)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Modifications to DELIVERABLE post 1st DELIVERABLE (Tolerate)	There is a risk that the contractors DELIVERABLE will need to be modified post 1st of Class Acceptance Trials.	NAME	Medium (14)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Failure to meet SOTR line items (Tolerate)	There is a risk that the DELIVERABLE doesn't meet its contractual requirements (SOTR)	NAME	Medium (14)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Post Production Quality Defects	There is a risk that quality defects will be identified which means DELIVERABLE cannot be used	NAME	Medium (14)	Medium (14)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Inadequate government furnished information/equipment (GFI/GFE), will result in delays to delivery	There is a risk that government furnished equipment (Radio) will be provided late and/or require substantial integration work.	NAME	Low (11)	Low (7)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Design changes post Contract Award (Tolerate)	There is a risk that changes to the DELIVERABLE shall be required post Contract Award.	NAME	Low (8)	Low (8)

Annex D – NAME OF PROJECT Affordability within the DELIVERABLEs Programme

CUSTOMER DELIVERABLES ACQUISITION	DEL	STATUS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	TOTAL
Control Total at PCR 2-DATE (from PB&F)	CDEL	N/A	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Consisting of:

CUSTOMER DELIVERABLES ACQUISITION	DEL	STATUS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	TOTAL
Commando Insertion DELIVERABLE (CIC)	CDEL	NOT APPROVED – Awaiting FCR uplift	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Medium RIBs	CDEL	NOT APPROVED	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Intercept and Escort DELIVERABLE (NAME OF PROJECT)	CDEL	THIS APPROVAL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Police Patrol DELIVERABLE (PPC)	CDEL	APPROVED - On Contract	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX			XXXX
PPC Risk Inside Costing	CDEL	APPROVED - On Contract	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX			XXXX
TOTAL	CDEL		XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Variance	CDEL	N/A	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
-----------------	-------------	------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

IMAGE

Annex E – NAME OF PROJECT ISD, IOC & FOC Definitions

ISD			
The ISD is the date when the first DELIVERABLE is delivered, accepted by the relevant SRO and approved by the User, and thus comes into Service.			
IOC			
<u>DLOD</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Responsible</u>	<u>Accountable</u>
Training	Contractor Training the Trainer Course delivered for requisite number of instructors	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF DEPARTMENT Unit
	Training gap identification complete	NAME OF DEPARTMENT training unit	
	Training Material Provided	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	
	2x training DELIVERABLE delivered to allow first deployment of an operational DELIVERABLE whilst retaining a training DELIVERABLE capacity	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	
Equipment	4x DELIVERABLE delivered	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
	DELIVERABLEs operational for a minimum of 3 months at one NAME OF DEPARTMENT location		
	Major warranty defects (those that effect the operation of the DELIVERABLE) identified		
	DELIVERABLE has been tested and accepted against the operational capability (initial ITEAP for one DELIVERABLE)		
	Build of Material (BOM) provided		
Personnel	NAME OF DEPARTMENT have sufficient bearing at each Marine Unit to train on and operate DELIVERABLE once suitably qualified	NAME OF DEPARTMENT	NAME OF DEPARTMENT
Information	SECR endorsed	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
	BR complete		
	DELIVERABLE certification from REDACTED		
Doctrine & Concepts	The Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) will be complete	NAME OF DEPARTMENT	NAME OF DEPARTMENT

	Local Instructions created in relation to specific operational requirements		
Organisation	Contracted maintenance in place	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
Infrastructure	Demonstrate successful CAPABILITY	REDACTED	REDACTED
Logistics	Logistic Support Date (LSD)* has been achieved - LSD shall be the date when all support functions are available in range but not necessarily scale.	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
Interoperability	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOC			
<u>DLOD</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Responsible</u>	<u>Accountable</u>
Training	Steady state training in place and all existing personnel involved in the operation and training of the DELIVERABLE have received the NAME OF DEPARTMENT approved training plan.	NAME OF DEPARTMENT Unit	NAME OF DEPARTMENT Training Unit
	A refresher training programme is in place.		
Equipment	NUMBER x DELIVERABLE delivered	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
	NUMBER x DELIVERABLEs operational for a minimum of NUMBER months at NUMBER NAME OF DEPARTMENT locations		
	Major warranty defects (those that effect the operation of the DELIVERABLE) completed		
	Final DELIVERABLE has been tested and accepted against the operational capability		
Personnel	NAME OF DEPARTMENT have sufficient bearing to train on and operate DELIVERABLE once suitably qualified	NAME OF DEPARTMENT	NAME OF DEPARTMENT
Information	Safety Case and BR complete and baselined, with set reviews managed by the DELIVERABLEs Safety team.	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
	All DELIVERABLE have a valid safety certificate from an approving body		
Doctrine & Concepts	Periodic reviews of undertaken.	NAME OF DEPARTMENT	NAME OF DEPARTMENT
Organisation	Handover of contractual maintenance to FISS	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT

Infrastructure	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
	REDACTED		
Logistics	<p>The DELIVERABLE are fully supportable in range and scale, including;</p> <p>1. Realistic and suitable Service Support Strategies and contracts have been agreed with Contractors and accepted by the PT as affordable.</p> <p>2. The Support Solution Development Tool (SSDT) is complete and all Guiding Policies have been agreed by accountable desk officers.</p> <p>4. Successful Logistics Demonstrations have been held by the Contractors.</p> <p>5. An agreed level of DefCon NUMBER spares has been established and procured</p>	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT	NAME OF OTHER DEAPARTMENT
Interoperability	N/A	N/A	N/A

Annex F – DELIVERABLE Renders

IMAGE

Annex G – NAME OF PROJECT Project Team Resourcing

	Estimated FTE Resourcing for NAME OF PROJECT	
	Pre-IOC (Inc Demonstration, Manufacturing & Acceptance)	IOC-FOC (Manufacturing & In-Service of DATE DELIVERABLE)
Project Manager	0.6	0.5
Commercial	0.5	0.5
Acquisition Engineer	0.7	0.7
Integrated-Logistics Support	0.1	0.1
Operations Manager	-	0.6
In-Service Support Engineer	-	0.2