

DATE

Ref: NAME OF PROJECT FBC

NAME OF PROJECT – FULL BUSINESS CASE (CATEGORY C)

Executive Summary

1. This Business Case seeks approval to enter the Demonstration and Manufacture phases of the NAME OF PROJECT project with the preferred tenderer, selected as a result of a competition held to the Competitive Negotiated procedure within Defence and Security Public Contract Negotiation (DSPCR) following Initial Gate Business Case (IGBC) approval in DATE¹.
2. The project will replace REDACTED with DELIVERABLES. These will fully meet the User Requirements and therefore enable CUSTOMER to continue to provide REDACTED around LOCATIONS thus delivering Defence Tasks. The replacement will consist of NUMBER OF replacement DELIVERABLES in UK LOCATIONS (including NUMBER as a funded contractual option) and NUMBER replacement DELIVERABLES for LOCATION.
3. The Project Cost of £XXXX is considered to offer Value for Money, demonstrated by the successful conclusion of the competition resulting in the selection of a Preferred Tenderer in accordance with the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) criteria.
4. The procurement strategy does not include Resource Delivery (RDEL) in-service support; instead support will be provided via the extant DELIVERABLES In-Service Support (ISS) contract and follow-on contracts.
5. DELIVERABLE 1 is due to be accepted off contract by DATE, contributing to the declaration of an Initial Operational Capability (IOC) by DATE. DELIVERABLE NUMBER is due to be accepted off contract by DATE, with Full Operational Capability (FOC) being achieved by DATE.

Issue

6. This Full Business Case seeks approval from the ORGANISATION Approvals Committee to award a contract to the Preferred Tenderer in order to commence the Demonstration and Manufacture phase of the Police Patrol DELIVERABLE project.

Timing

7. Routine. FBC Approval is requested by DATE to allow Contract Award by DATE, which is in-line with Tenderer's expectations and hence minimises the risk of delay to DELIVERABLE delivery which could be caused by a delay to Contract Award.

Recommendation

8. The Approving Authority is invited to approve:
 - a. The NAME OF PROJECT project proceeding to the Demonstration and Manufacture phases with COMPANY;
 - b. The Key User Requirements (KURs) at Annex A;
-

- c. The Approved Budgetary Level (outturn, inclusive of all non-recoverable VAT) at 50% confidence for the Demonstration and Manufacture phases of £XXXX consisting of:

Contract Total (£)	CDEL	RDEL	RMC	Total
CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 1- Total Cost

- d. An Equipment Delivery Date (EDD) of DATE for DELIVERABLE #1; declaration of IOC in DATE and FOC in DATE at 50% confidence³;
- e. Spend Management System (SMS). Approval of the SMS is requested within the NCAC Outletter.

9. And to note:

- a. The 10%, 50% and 90% confidence levels for the cost of the project phases are as follows:

Project Phase		Direct Resource Cost (£M)			Capital Cost (£M)		
		10%	50%	90%	10%	50%	90%
Demonstration & Manufacture	IG Estimate				XXXX		
	FBC Estimate				XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
In-Service	IG Estimate						
	FBC Estimate				XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Total Cost	Total D, M & ISS					XXXX	

Table 2 – 3 Point Estimation of Costs

- b. Affordability against the approved Control Total across all Financial Years has been confirmed by NAME OF FLC Command.
- c. NAME OF PROJECT IGBC approved a Nil Cost Assessment phase of no more than NUMBER OF DELIVERABLE. Due to a change in scope, the Intercept and Escort DELIVERABLE (IEC) project was removed and is going through a separate procurement and approval.
- d. £XXXX CDEL, which is required for Capital Spares and Initial Provisioning, has been costed within Acquisition Support, further detail on affordability at Annex C, Table C- 2.
- e. In-Service Support (ESP RDEL) budget has been approved within the Future DELIVERABLE Support Main Gate Business Case, valued at approximately £XXXX. This value covers the support for NAME OF PROJECT up until the expiry of the DELIVERABLES In-Service Support (ISS) contracts on DATE. Support after this point will be included in follow-on support contract approvals. In addition to this, £XXXX (ESP CDEL) has been included within the FBC estimate. This value covers the Capital Spares and Initial Provisioning of the NAME OF PROJECT DELIVERABLE.
- f. Delivery of Full Operating Capability (FOC) in DATE at 50% confidence, and the 10%, 50% and 90% DELIVERABLE 1 Acceptance Off Contract (AOC) confidence levels of:

AOC	Confidence Levels		
	10%	50%	90%
FBC Estimate	DATE	DATE	DATE

Table 3 - 3PE of AOC

- e. The procurement and commercial strategies, summarised in Paragraphs 36 to 40 below.
- f. The principal risks to capability delivery at Annex B;
- g. The VAT treatment has been confirmed by the FBP team as being zero rated/F0 @ 0% for the build programme.
- h. No Private Sector Support (PSS) is required to support this approval.
- i. It has been confirmed by DELIVERABLES PT Commercial that there are no Contingent Liabilities associated with any Contract resulting from this approval².

Presentation and Handling

10. The DELIVERABLES PT are working with the NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT Corporate Communications Team to develop a Press and Publicity Strategy which will be in place by Contract Award. There is not expected to be significant interest in the contract announcement outside specialist press and local media in LOCATION.

11. The preferred Tenderer is a small to medium enterprise (SME) based in LOCATION, and has sub-contract relationships with other UK-based suppliers including COMPANIES. Therefore the majority of the work to be conducted via this contract award will be retained within the UK.

Case Narrative - Strategic Case

12. The NAME OF PROJECT Project seeks to continue the enduring requirement for NAME OF DEPARTMENT to deliver ongoing CAPABILITY at the NUMBER UK LOCATIONS (LOCATION, LOCATION 1 and LOCATION 2), LOCATION and NAME OF COUNTRY Sovereign Base Area (SBA).³ This requirement directly derives from the Defence Task to REDACTED.

13. In addition, NAME OF DEPARTMENT have an enduring requirement to provide REDACTED.

14. Finally, NAME OF DEPARTMENT are also responsible to REDACTED.

15. In order to deliver these requirements, NAME OF DEPARTMENT require for the provision of REDACTED.

16. The requirement is currently delivered by REDACTED, of which NUMBER were originally built between YEAR– YEAR and NUMBER between YEAR – YEAR. Therefore these NUMBER DELIVERABLES are all, despite successful mid-life upgrades, either at or beyond the end of their useful service life.

17. In order to ensure unbroken delivery of the capability requirement, the NAME OF PROJECT project will deliver:

- a. NUMBER replacement DELIVERABLES for NAME OF DEPARTMENT in UK LOCATIONS (including NUMBER as a funded contractual option);
- b. NUMBER replacement DELIVERABLES for LOCATION (funded contractual option);

18. The contractual option for NUMBER DELIVERABLES exists because those DELIVERABLES were not funded at the time the competition was started. As funding for those DELIVERABLES has now been secured (through re-profiling of the entire DELIVERABLES Acquisition portfolio), uptake of the option is expected soon after commencement of the contract.

19. There remains an additional contract option for NUMBER replacement DELIVERABLES for COUNTRY. These DELIVERABLES are currently unfunded and as such do not form part of this approval. However, previous discussions have suggested that NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT 2 have aspirations to upgrade CAPABILITY of COUNTRY in a similar manner to LOCATION; these contractual options allow those aspirations to be realised without undertaking additional procurement action should appropriate direction and funding be forthcoming. Further approval will be sought via a Review Note to this approval should consideration be given to taking up this option in future.

Case Narrative - Economic Case

20. The IGBC concluded that the option which would be most likely to provide Value for Money was to "replace with new DELIVERABLE". This decision was taken as it:

"allows for new DELIVERABLE to be purchased, allowing the current aged and already extended DELIVERABLE to be removed from service. It will meet the user's tasking and will provide the more efficient through life maintenance by reducing variants."

21. 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 henceforth been completed using the Competitive Negotiated procedure under the DSPCR YEAR regulations, resulting in the receipt of 2 tenders.

22. In order to ensure the selection of the tender which offered the greatest Value for Money, the Most Economically Advantageous (MEAT) evaluation methodology was followed with the following weightings assigned:

- a. Technical (55.5%);
- b. Cost (40%);
- c. Supportability (4.5%).

The NAME OF TEAM Team, following consultation with CAAS, consider that the MEAT approach used to assess returned tenders is largely analogous to establishing Value for Money.

23. It should be noted that in-service support funding is not included within the scope of this procurement (except the £XXXX, referred to in Para 9d, which is forms part of this approval); instead support will be provided via the extant ISS contracts and follow-on contracts. This decision was made as learning from experience across the DELIVERABLES Acquisition and In-Service Support Programme shows that Value for Money is obtained for non-complex DELIVERABLES to a commercial design by purchasing without ISS. This allows specialist in-service support providers to provide a more focussed support solution, including avoiding the duplication of on-site support provision for 1st and 2nd level maintenance which will be conducted by the support contractor on behalf of NAME OF DEPARTMENT for all their DELIVERABLES. It

24. In addition, a VfM opportunity has been taken prior to FBC endorsement. The project was initially seeking to combine multiple DELIVERABLE variants in to one; through Requirements reviews and industry engagement, doubt was expressed that this strategy would deliver VfM. By splitting the project into two variants a lower average unit cost was achieved. As a result, a portion of the initial project funding was reallocated to the DELIVERABLE project, and further efficiencies were reallocated across the DELIVERABLES Acquisition programme.

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

26. This is in addition to the in-service support provision approved as part of the ISS MGBC ORGANISATION Allocation (£XXXX RDEL; £XXXX CDEL and £XXXX RMC). Of this approval, approximately £XXXX was allocated to NAME OF PROJECT within the Cost Models.

28. Affordability of the project is demonstrated in the table below, overall affordability within the wider DELIVERABLES programme can be found at Annex C:

[illegible]

Provision (ABC Outcome)	CDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	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
	RDEL	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Total	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 4 - Cost and Affordability Table

29. The project is affordable in Near Cash terms. There are minor discrepancies in DEL provision during FY YEARS and YEARS, primarily caused by the preferred tenderer front-loading design and tooling costs onto the UPC of DELIVERABLE 1. Despite the existence of a net-present value calculation in the tender, the outcome of the competition was not affected by this position. FY YEARS shows a variance, prior to the RDEL transfer, of £XXXX and FY YEARS shows a variance, prior to the RDEL transfer of £XXXX. This affordability issued will be addressed through a RDEL to CDEL transfer, which will be actioned within PCR DATE costing.

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 provision beyond FY YEARS (italicised and marked with an asterisk in the table) will be included within the approval for follow-on support contracts.

Affordability All Values in £XXXX									
Year		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total (Years 0-5 only)
FY		YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	YEARS	
NAME OF PROJECT Support Affordability	RDEL Provision (ISS)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Cost Model Output	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
	Variance	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table 5 - Cost and Affordability of NAME OF PROJECT Support Contract

31. All costs incurred during this project will be charged to NAME OF DEPARTMENT in Pounds Sterling.
32. The correct VAT and accounting treatment applications have been applied and have been assured by REDACTED.
33. NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT have confirmed that there are no contingent liabilities.
34. There is no Private Sector Support (PSS) expenditure associated with this approval.
35. Raw Materials and Consumables (RMC) expenditure will be apportioned from the value approved in the ISS MGBC, 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.

Case Narrative - Commercial Case

36. This procurement fell within the scope of the Defence & Security Public Contracts Regulations YEAR (DSPCR YEAR). To allow for face to face discussions and clarifications of each tenderer's proposal, the Competitive Negotiated procedure (under DSPCR YEAR) was utilised.
37. In order to best achieve the required capability within funding constraints, the contract contained a well-defined firm requirement for NUMBER NAME OF PROJECT plus a further NUMBER option DELIVERABLES. It is the DELIVERABLES Team's intention to take up the option for the first NUMBER additional DELIVERABLE soon after commencement of the contract. The contract will be awarded on a Firm Price basis for all requirements due for delivery in Years YEAR - YEAR of the contract (FY YEARS until FY YEARS), with requirements in subsequent years subject to a Fixed Price with a Variation of Price (VOP) clause linked to the K8ZU price index, as agreed with Defence Economics.
38. Payment will be made via Contracting, Purchasing & Finance (CP&F) upon delivery of individual DELIVERABLES, spares packages and other contractual deliverables. Milestone payments will also be defined within the contract and will be made to cover work completed to the satisfaction of the MOD during the design and manufacture phases.
39. Suitable Intellectual Property (IP) DEFCONs have been included in the contract to enable any contractor nominated by the Authority to carry out future support.
40. The contract is DEFCON based with narrative conditions.
41. The Contractor is not classified as Strategic Supplier; therefore the Cabinet Office Commercial spend process is not required to be followed.

Case Narrative - Management Case

42. The following key milestones are to be achieved by this project:

FBC Estimate	Confidence Levels		
	10%	50%	90%
Delivery of First DELIVERABLE	DATE	DATE	DATE
IOC	DATE	DATE	DATE
Delivery of First NUMBER DELIVERABLES (Delivery to LOCATION 1 complete)	DATE	DATE	DATE

Delivery of First NUMBER DELIVERABLES (Delivery to LOCATION 2 complete)	DATE	DATE	DATE
Delivery of First NUMBER DELIVERABLES (Firm order DELIVERABLES complete; delivery to LOCATION 3 complete)	DATE	DATE	DATE
Delivery of all NUMBER DELIVERABLES	DATE	DATE	DATE
FOC	DATE	DATE	DATE

Table 6 – 3 Point Estimation of NAME OF PROJECT Milestones

43. IOC and FOC are defined at Annex D.

44. 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.

45. The principal risks to delivery are outlined below, with further detail at Annex B:

- a. 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. As always, these changes have the least impact early in the design phase but are still likely to have some financial implications. The risk will be mitigated by regular engagement with CUSTOMER stakeholders including Design Workshops post-Contract Award, ensuring 'buy-in' of stakeholders.
- b. There is a risk that it is not possible to agree a price with the support contractor. When negotiating with the support contractor the principles of NAPNOC (No Acceptable Price, No Contract) will apply in order to ensure VfM is obtained and that the proposal is commercially acceptable. In addition to this, we will seek a price for the support of NAME OF PROJECT from both the ISS Lot 3 (CUSTOMER) and Lot 1 (Overseas) contractors, COMPANY and COMPANY respectively, which will allow comparative price analysis to be completed and further support negotiations. If it is not possible to reach agreement on the pricing of the support contract, then fallback arrangements will be enacted. This could involve either the placing of in-service support with another of the ISS contractors or holding a further competition specifically for the in-service support of these DELIVERABLES. The risk will be mitigated by ensuring that sufficient time is allowed in the negotiation schedule to allow t fallback plans to be enacted should the need arise.

NAME
NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT
NAME OF TEAM Team Leader
ADDRESS

Endorsed on behalf of NAME OF OTHER DEPARTMENT by:	
--	--

NAME	
NAME OF TEAM Team Leader	
Date: DATE	

Approved for Submission by:	SIGNATURE
NAME	
NAME	
Date: DATE	

Annexes:

- A. Key User Requirements
- B. Project Risks
- C. Affordability Data
- D. IOC and FOC Definition

Enclosures:

Key User Requirements

ID	User Requirement	UR
KUR1	The user shall be able to ...	
KUR2	The user shall be able to ...	
KUR3	The user shall be able to ...	
KUR4	The user shall be able to ...	
KUR5	The user shall be able to ...	
KUR6	The user shall be able to ...	

**ANNEX B to
NAME OF PROJECT FBC
Dated DATE**

Project Risks

ID	Risk Title	Current	Target
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Design changes post Contract Award	Very High (24)	Medium (20)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] -Unable to agree price with Support Contractor - TOLERATE	Medium (18)	Medium (18)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Ambiguities in Requirements Post Contract Award	Medium (14)	Low (11)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - In-service - Extended Supply Chain delays - TOLERATE	Low (8)	Low (8)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] - Evidence provided for previous approvals process is no longer extant or relevant.	Low (7)	Very Low (4)
	[NAME OF PROJECT] Misalignment of Delivery Schedule	Low (5)	Very Low (3)

Affordability Data

Table C1 shows the overall affordability of NAME OF PROJECT against the P9 line, within the wider DELIVERABLES programme, data from DELIVERABLES Funding Breakdown PCR DATE V1.

NAME OF PROJECT P9 Affordability (All costs in £XXXX)								
	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	Total Cost
P9 Line CT	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
NAME OF PROJECT Planned Expenditure	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Other Acquisition Projects	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Variance	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table C1 - Overarching NAME OF PROJECT Affordability within DELIVERABLES Programme

Table C2 shows the overall affordability of the S9 line, within the wider DELIVERABLES programme.

NAME OF PROJECT S9 Affordability (All costs in £M)							
	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	FY YEARS	Total Cost
S9 Line CT	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
DELIVERABLES In - Service Support (Includes NAME OF PROJECT)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
DELIVERABLES Engine Support	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Acquisition Support (includes NAME OF PROJECT ESP CDEL*)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
In Service Support (Outside ISS)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Efficiency	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Uncommitted Spend Review	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

Table C2 - Overarching NAME OF PROJECT Affordability within DELIVERABLES Programme

IOC and FOC Definition

NAME OF PROJECT IOC is defined to be the stage at which delivery has been received of the following components that allow for the safe operation of the capability in role:

DLOD	Maturity
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A training solution has been identified and a repeatable, cost effective, safe plan has been identified issue to all personnel involved in the operation of the DELIVERABLE. - CUSTOMER has all available documentation. - CUSTOMER instructors to have received a train the trainer course from the manufacture. - NUMBER OF DELIVERABLES have been delivered to one unit to allow for the first deployment of an operational DELIVERABLE whilst retaining a training DELIVERABLE capacity.
Equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The NUMBER OF DELIVERABLES have been delivered with initial spares package and has been operational for a minimum of X months at one of the CUSTOMER locations. - Early design issues have been rectified. - DELIVERABLE has been tested and accepted against the operational capability (initial ITEAP for one DELIVERABLE) - List of parts
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within current resources and operational profiles personnel and HR will not impact on either the IOC or FOC.
Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The safety Case and BR will be complete and baselined. - The DELIVERABLE shall have in date safety certificate from an approving body such as REDACTED.
Doctrine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) will be complete - Local Instructions created in relation to specific operational requirements
Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DELIVERABLES In Service Support (ISS) contractor has taken on the new DELIVERABLE - Successful delivery of 1st and 2nd line maintenance throughout the first NUMBER OF months of the first DELIVERABLEs operation at any unit.
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the DELIVERABLE was successfully REDACTED
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 PROJECT FOC is defined to be the stage at which delivery has been received of the following components that allow for the safe operation of the full capability in role against the KUR's:

DLOD	Maturity
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A repeatable training solution is in operation and all existing personnel involved in the operation and training of the DELIVERABLE have received the CUSTOMER approved training plan. - A refresher training programme is in place.
Equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The last DELIVERABLE has been delivered with initial spares package and has been operational for a minimum of NUMBER OF months and has been accepted. - ITEAP fully signed off
Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within current resources and operational profiles personnel and HR will not impact on either the IOC or FOC.
Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The safety Case and BR are complete and baselined, with set reviews managed by the DELIVERABLES Safety team. - All DELIVERABLE have a valid safety certificate from an approving body such as REDACTED
Doctrine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Periodic reviews undertaken.
Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Established working relationship between CUSTOMER, ORGANISATION CSS-DELIVERABLES in-service manager and the maintenance contractor. (Tasking and KPI's are being tracked and managed)
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DELIVERABLE can be REDACTED -
Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The DELIVERABLE are fully supportable in range and scale, including; 1. Realistic and suitable Service Support Strategies and contracts have been agreed with Contractors and accepted by the PT as affordable. 2. The Support Solution Development Tool (SSDT) is complete and all Guiding Policies have been agreed by accountable desk officers. 3. All training and technical documentation has been produced to a mature standard acceptable to both the PT and the User community. 4. Successful Logistics Demonstrations have been held by the Contractors. 5. An agreed level of spares has been established and procured

*LSD is defined as:

1. Support solution in place with an appropriate range and scale to support the initial delivery of NAME OF PROJECT Capability, and a plan in place to meet the roll out of Capability.
2. Demonstration of Support Maturity Level (SML) NUMBER as described by Defence Logistics Framework, Integrated Logistic Support Guidance v1.0

And will be evidenced by the following documents;

1. 1 Support Solution Development Tool (SSDT)
2. 2 ILS Management Plan and supporting documentation
3. 3 In Service Support Solution Maturity Assessment