Ministry of Defence

MOD Integrated Assurance Gate Review
Report

XXXXXX PROGRAMME Gate 0

Version Number:	1.0 FINAL
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	XXXX XXXX
Date of Osmotherly Appointment letter issued to SRO:	XX XXX 22
Has SRO completed the Major Projects Leadership Academy?	No
Programme/Project Director:	XXXX XXXX
TLB, Organisation, Agency or NDPB (if applicable):	TLB NAME
Business Case stage reached:	Full Business Case or equivalent
Decision/approval point this report informs:	Not applicable
Review Dates:	XX XXX 24 – XX XXX 24
Review Team Leader:	XXXX XXXX
Review Team Members:	XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX
Report Distribution	Final report: SRO, AO and standard MOD distribution via the MOD IA Hub
Previous Review:	Gate 0/4 Hybrid XX XXX 23 – XX XXX 23 Delivery Confidence Assessment - Amber
IPA ID Number:	N/A
MOD Review ID Number	XXXX/XXXX

Contents

About this report

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the status of the Project/programme at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent Review Team, based on information evaluated over the review period, and is delivered to the SRO immediately at the conclusion of the review.

This assurance review was arranged and managed by:

MOD Integrated Assurance Hub
Directorate of Acquisition and Project Delivery
Teak Wing 1, #5013
Abbey Wood North
Bristol
BS34 8QW
MOD IA Hub shared mailbox: DAPD-MODIAHub@mod.gov.uk

Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA)

See Annex A for DCA criteria and definition

All Gate Review Guidance and Workbooks can be found here.
https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/infrastructure-and-projects-authorityassurancereview-toolkit

Delivery Confidence Assessment:	**Amber**

The Delivery Confidence Assessment is rated Amber because successful delivery of the programme to time, cost and quality appears to be on track but will have to manage significant risk in the final months. The programme has achieved much success to date in the face of adversity, but as the critical Out of Service Date (OSD) approaches for the extant capability, the ongoing significant challenges of logistics, weather and integration will require constant management attention.

The replacement second-hand EQUIPMENT is scheduled to be shipped by the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), now via the UK, and without a formal FAT on System 1, though the confidence levels of achieving planned installation at LOCATION (System 1 – XXX 24) and LOCATION (System 2 – XXX 25) remain high. System 2 carries more risk, as there is no float in the delivery schedule and the critical path is exposed to multiple risks including weather, logistics, accommodation scarcity, third party contractor (CONTRACTOR NAME) availability on site at the right time with a view to system integration and inter-Programme dependencies (particularly OTHER PROGRAMME NAME). However, significant Learning from Experience is expected to be drawn from the installation of System 1, which will help mitigate the risks to the installation of System 2.

The successful installation of the first TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION at LOCATION has proved the concept and identified a valuable set of lessons. The install and uninstall processes need to be repeated several times ahead of the XXX 25 LEGACY EQUIPMENT OSD. The weather window is relatively short and the weather conditions required for success are sensitive. Efforts are rightly being focused on delivery, though there is a need also to be planning for the post-handover period, and action is now underway to complete the CLS arrangements both for the EQUIPMENT and for the INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Programme continues to be strongly led and the one team ethos supported by the adoption of Psychological Safety principles continues to pay dividends. As the Programme enters its final nine months of delivery, attention to dependency and risk management will be critical; the PMO will need to focus squarely on this.

It is recognised that an Information Note will need to be prepared to bring the delivery and support costs (once known) into a commonly understood picture.

In short, PROGRAMME NAME has encountered not unsurprising difficulties but successfully navigated them to place final completion ahead of LEGACY EQUIPMENT OSD in a feasible position. There is, however, a need to keep a strong grip on delivery control and maintain a common effort and effective communication across all stakeholders to ensure the avoidance of a capability gap. As a fallback, the potential to run on limited LEGACY EQUIPMENT capability for a few weeks is being investigated. That contingency planning is prudent but it should go without saying that there is no appetite to invoke it.

Summary of risks and recommendations

Refer to Annex F for a breakdown of the recommendation classifications and the definitions for Critical, Essential and Recommended.

Priority	Risks* Identified and Recommendations	Classification Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Target Date
1	**Risk:** If Risk, Issue and Dependency Management disciplines in the PMO are not joined up into a single coherent view, then there could catastrophic implications for the critical path given the lack of float and the geography. **<u>Recommendation 2:</u> Reinforce the PMO disciplines in RAIDO (Risks, Assumptions, Issues, Dependencies and Opportunities) Management and ensure that all core Programme Team players are on the same page.**	9. Risk, Issues & Dependency Management	Critical	Aug 24
2	**Risk:** If responsibilities and contracts for CLS are not agreed before completion of the first EQUIPMENT installation, there is a risk that the system cannot be formally handed over to the support contractor and thus accepted into service, resulting in an operational capability gap and a delay to the roll-out of the second EQUIPMENT – incurring consequential additional cost. **<u>Recommendation 3</u>: Prioritise programme management effort into the planning for and delivery of CLS contract(s) and communicate the agreed responsibilities to all parties.**	7. Commercial Strategy & Management	Critical	Aug 24
3	**Risk:** If sufficient detailed planning is not carried out, then the integration work will take longer that the critical path for replacing the EQUIPMENT by their OSD. **<u>Recommendation 1:</u> Co-ordinate the disparate supplier teams to ensure their availability and all the correct CONTRACTOR NAME is present at LOCATION for system integration activities.**	10. Resource & Skills Management	Essential	Aug 24

**Risk denotes risks, issues, concerns and key dependencies*

Comments from the SRO

I am particularly grateful to the Review Team for conducting such a thorough review in just a few days. Their insights are invaluable and reinforce key points for focus as we advance into the circa final third of the XXXXXX (Phase 1) programme. The report inspires helpful thought and offers much utility across the whole team; it will be circulated widely once finalised.

Review Team findings and recommendations

1. Context & Technical Solution

Three LEGACY EQUIPMENT EQUIPMENT at LOCATION, LOCATION and LOCATION provide a capability as part of the LOCATION TLB NAME Defence (XX) system. These will reach their Out of Service Date (OSD) in Apr 2025. There is a clear Strategic policy need for LOCATION XXXX operations to continue beyond 2025.

Phase 1 (the Programme of record, as approved) is the procurement of two used EQUIPMENT via FMS, providing similar coverage to the existing LEGACY EQUIPMENT, maintaining existing capability and avoiding a capability gap at the LEGACY EQUIPMENT OSD in XXX 2025. The replacement second-hand EQUIPMENT are expected to have a residual life expectancy of approx. 10 years, which would require an OSD extension or replacement around the mid-2030s. That timeframe fits well with the expected re-capitalisation of the UK TLB NAME Defence EQUIPMENT and supports the decision to adopt the FMS procurement and deployment of the refurbished assets to avoid a capability gap.

The condition of the two EQUIPMENT is sound and they will have significantly better capability and availability than the current in-service EQUIPMENT. The EQUIPMENT are unique examples of their specific type, but other similar EQUIPMENT from the same OEM are already in service with the UK.

OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT produced a Proposal to procure four TLB NAME Supported PRODUCT (XXX) on behalf of the TLB NAME and in support of the programme, from the sole supplier (at the time) SUPPLIER NAME, and carry out associated infrastructure works.

The installation of new TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTIONs has begun, with the first U installed successfully at LOCATION in XXX 24. Installation of the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTIONs at LOCATION and LOCATION is due to take place in XXX 24 and XXX 25 respectively. TLB NAME-SUPPORTEDCONSTRUCTION installation includes the fitting of all associated mechanical and electrical components, as well as the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTIONs themselves.

Since the original procurement, the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION element of the SUPPLIER NAME business has been transferred to COMPANY NAME. The Review Team heard that the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION is a well-established solution, has been deployed in similarly adverse weather, and that the design used for all three TLB NAME-SUPPORTEDCONSTRUCTIONs in LOCATION is a standard arrangement, with no significant modifications to usual practice.

2. Delivery Partners

OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT are responsible for the delivery of the infrastructure for the XXXXXX programme in the LOCATION, including the provision and installation of the INFRASTRUCTURE within which the EQUIPMENT will be housed. OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT were employed on this programme as a result of their successful work undertaken on the 'OTHER PROGRAMMEs NAME', which modernised infrastructure at four UK CAPABILITY SITES. The OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT team has integrated well with other key partners and there is a strong delivery ethos being demonstrated. The Review Team heard of the potential for this high performing OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT team to be re-deployed to other types of work as a result of OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT corporate direction; this seems odd to the Review Team, who would have expected the momentum of success of such a team to be maintained, grown and exploited on similar future programmes.

TLB NAME (XXXX) and their FM contractor CONTRACTOR NAME will need to be appropriately committed to a smooth handover from OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT upon completion of each major element of the infrastructure works.

The DELIVERY TEAM and DELIVERY TEAM (XXXXXX) in TLB NAME is responsible for the delivery and integration of the replacement EQUIPMENT systems; it is not responsible for the infrastructure installation. The CONTRACTOR NAME is now on contract for all aspects of EQUIPMENT delivery, including via their partner COMPANY AME . The Review Team heard a spread of opinion surrounding the stance of DELIVERY TEAM in engaging with the Programme; some evidence of innovative and proactive thinking, and some of inertia and difficult engagement. The adoption of Psychological Safety throughout the wider XXXXXX team is proving positive but there are clearly pockets of teamworking that require continued attention.

DELIVERY ORGANISATION will become an increasingly prominent partner in the maintenance of all LOCATION Capability, particularly in the replacement of the CONTRACT NAME. Technical Integration of the components of XXXXXX PROGRAMME is within the scope of the Programme, but integration with other elements and systems (e.g. OTHER PROGRAMME NAMES) requires interProgramme coordination.

3. Progress

The programme team have impressively delivered against their first milestone – the installation of the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION at LOCATION in XXX 2024 – in extremely challenging circumstances due to climactic conditions, other projects competing for accommodation and logistics, and operating some XXX miles away from the UK at the top of a mountain.

A few snags are being investigated with the LOCATION TLB NAME-SUPPORTEDCONSTRUCTION whilst OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT infrastructure work continues to enlarge and upgrade the site at LOCATION. This is estimated to be 8090% complete. The build of a completely new facility at LOCATION is underway.
The TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION for LOCATION arrived on site on XX XXX 24, with the fourth (spare TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION) on LOCATION and awaiting transportation to the LOCATION Complex for safe, secure and dry long-term storage.

The existing LEGACY EQUIPMENT EQUIPMENT at LOCATION remains in use, but with its old fibreglass INFRASTRUCTURE dismantled under cover of the new TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION.

Technical work to refurbish, upgrade and install new software on the two EQUIPMENT systems has largely been completed by the OEM. Recent delays to completion of the first EQUIPMENT have led to a change of shipping arrangements and the curtailment of its Factory Acceptance Testing (FAT). The first EQUIPMENT unit is now expected to ship via the UK, to arrive on site in XXX 24. The LOCATION CAPABILITY will be used to transfer the EQUIPMENT from the UK to the LOCATION, a journey of approximately xx days. This has necessitated significant replanning activity within the Equipment DLOD.

The second EQUIPMENT will undergo a full FAT and be used for training ahead of its shipment to the UK in XXX. It is expected on site in the LOCATION in early 2025. Installation is scheduled for XXX 25, when weather conditions are expected to be favourable for installation of the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION above it.
Two sets of mains frequency converter units for the EQUIPMENT have been procured by the OEM and will ship separately to the LOCATION.

4. Technical Integration, Testing & Next Stage Plan

The two OEM EQUIPMENT to be installed at LOCATION and LOCATION are identical and appear to be well understood by the technical teams involved. Coupled with the successful TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION installation at LOCATION, there is a great deal of confidence amongst the programme team members interviewed that the remaining works can be completed to schedule.

The next major milestone will be the delivery to site and installation of the first EQUIPMENT at LOCATION in XXX 24. This involves the removal and replacement of the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION, which is rightly recognised by the programme team as the critical path and is beholden to favourable weather

conditions. At the same time, multiple contractors will be on site competing for resources, removing the old and installing the new equipment. This will require a continued focus on detailed planning.

With the FAT of the first EQUIPMENT curtailed (post a successful OEM Test and Readiness Review) in order to achieve planned delivery dates, the Review Team heard of a small risk that technical faults becoming apparent on site may need remedial work by COMPANY NAME (or potentially OEM) contractors in the LOCATION. This might be logistically challenging and introduce delays. There was some uncertainty amongst interviewees regarding liability for any costs incurred as a result. The current plan allows for issues during EQUIPMENT two FAT to be remediated and retrofitted to EQUIPMENT one on site.

The second EQUIPMENT installation, at LOCATION, is planned for XXX 25. The programme team anticipate that lessons learned during the LOCATION EQUIPMENT installation will further improve the likelihood of a successful and timely outcome at LOCATION and enable a refined timeline for the second EQUIPMENT installation. These dates still represent challenging timelines, given weather dependencies. The programme is working to a complicated critical path with minimal contingency and complexities outside of its direct control.

A number of interviewees stressed the challenges involved in integration, by separate prime contractors and project teams, of the new EQUIPMENT components with OTHER PROGRAMMEs NAMES. Others took a more confident view that both elements have been de-risked to a certain extent and do not represent a major technical hurdle, but perhaps a scheduling or resourcing one. This split of opinion might be a symptom of the fact that the plans for the integration and for end-to-end user testing of the complete system appear not to have been well circulated and reviewed. The XXXXXX PROGRAMME final planning conference is due to take place on XX XXX 24.

Risk: If sufficient detailed planning is not carried out, then the integration work will take longer that the critical path for replacing the EQUIPMENT by their OSD.

<u>Recommendation 1:</u> Co-ordinate the disparate supplier teams to ensure their availability and all the correct CONTRACTOR NAME is present at LOCATION for system integration activities. (Essential – Do By System 1 arrival)

5. Dependency Management

The Review Team heard that successful XXXXXX PROGRAMME delivery was dependent on several large complex programmes for key integration of system

elements, including OTHER PROGRAMMEs NAMES. It appears this this is being well coordinated using governance mechanisms such as monthly Steering Group meetings, 6-weekly CIWGs and DLOD Working Groups.

XXXXXX PROGRAMME is moving at pace to meet the LEGACY EQUIPMENT OSD, so these more frequent meetings are necessary to achieve the swift communication flow needed to ensure that all parties are on the same page.

Page

The Review Team heard that there was a dependency on OTHER PROGRAMME NAME regarding the integration of the XXXXXX to meet a fixed ten-day window in XXX 24. Mitigations were being put in place to reduce the impact should the required EQUIPMENT not be immediately available.

It was not clear to the Review Team how formally the dependencies were being levied on the other programmes and tracked by the XXXXXX PROGRAMME PMO.

6. Programme Management, Resourcing & Planning

The Review Team heard that it was necessary for highly detailed (daily) planning because of logistical challenges and the operational environment. The successful TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION installation was a testament to this prior work. As the time erodes and the float disappears, the schedule will need to go 'green lights all the way': so, everyone needs to be on the same page.

Recognising that PMO capacity had been heavily consumed recently by a number of unplanned tasks, not least in taking the lead on capability delivery matters beyond the immediate scope of XXXXXX PROGRAMME but in the interests of the wider CAPABILITY portfolio and LOCATION (in accordance with TLB NAME SENIOR STAKEHOLDERS' intent), the Review Team felt that there could be more emphasis on joining up dependency planning and risk management using established PMO tools and techniques across the wider team.

Risk: If Risk, Issue and Dependency Management disciplines in the PMO are not joined up into a single coherent view, then there could catastrophic implications for the critical path given the lack of float and the geography.

<u>Recommendation 2:</u> Reinforce the PMO disciplines in RAIDO (Risks, Assumptions, Issues, Dependencies and Opportunities) Management and ensure that all core Programme Team players are on the same page. (Critical – Do Now)

7. Governance

The Programme continues to be governed by monthly Steering Group meetings under the direction of the SRO. The continuity of the SRO in role is seen as a strength, as is the continuation in appointment of the Programme Director, who has significant experience in the sector and topic.

As the tempo of the Programme continues and delivery enters its final months, there will be a need to keep a firm grip on decision-making; indications are that the SRO has this under control.

The Capability Integration Working Group (CIWG) has been reintroduced and will be an increasingly important means to ensure dependencies are managed and that the implications of any DLOD mismatch are escalated to the Steering Group for resolution. In all probability, a pragmatic approach will be adopted, with the Programme Director and SRO being fairly 'hands on' in between formal Steering Group meetings.

8. Psychological Safety

In a quest to solidify the 'one team ethos' as seen on OTHER PROGRAMME NAME; the SRO instigated the adoption of Psychological Safety principles for XXXXXX PROGRAMME. A Consultancy specialising in Psychological Safety (CONTRACTOR NAME) was contracted via OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT to facilitate strong working relationships across the boundaries of the teams within the wider Programme and to ensure an environment where all colleagues felt safe to address their concerns. This approach has fostered confidence and trust, and enabled difficulties to be dealt with effectively, in a timely manner, and in a way that ensured that staff health and wellbeing was at the centre of Programme success.

The development of the XXXXXX PROGRAMME Charter appears to be the bedrock of teamworking and is not seen as 'shelfware' by interviewees. Interviewees from across the stakeholder spectrum spoke positively about the level of teamworking achieved. Whilst it was acknowledged that there are elements of MOD that are culturally averse to 'sharing bad news early', the adoption of Psychological Safety principles has helped to overcome this tendency, not only to address problems but also to celebrate success and build a wave of momentum.

In the current fiscal environment, there is growing self-imposed restraint when organising Psychological Safety events; whether they be overnight teambuilding gatherings or site visits. These all come at a financial cost and there is leadership concern about perceptions of 'having a jolly' being developed by those outside the Programme. The Review Team understands these perceptions but also reinforces the need to demonstrate the value created. Otherwise, there is the potential for externals to 'understand the cost of everything but the value of nothing'. Psychological Safety has been seen to be a key element of risk reduction and successful delivery (and therefore cost avoidance), and it needs to be seen as such. Care needs to be taken to ensure that the application of Psychological Safety principles to the Programme is sustained in a way that continues to address the root cause of any source of intra-team friction.

9. Readiness for Introduction Into Service

The current plan for the project is to declare the new capability operational at LOCATION by XXX 24. Following this, operations at LOCATION are scheduled to commence by the end of XXX 25. This timeline is taut as the Out of Service Date (OSD) for the existing EQUIPMENT is set for XXX XXX 25.

A significant proportion of the delivery float, estimated by interviewees to be 80-90% of the contingency, has already been used. The Review Team acknowledges that the programme is significantly advanced towards completion, however, this extensive use of contingency places substantial pressure on robust risk management, dependency coordination, and the collaboration of delivery partners. The overall risk is increased by factors outside the team's control, such as adverse weather conditions.

Given that the majority of the contingency has been utilised, the cooperation among the various contractors is critical to meet the OSD deadline. Ensuring clear dependencies and responsibility assignments, conducting thorough risk reviews looking forward over the next 9 months, and implementing risk mitigation plans are all essential. Continued short-term horizon planning, which has been crucial thus far, will remain vital, particularly given the ongoing logistical challenges.

Applying the lessons learnt from installing the EQUIPMENT at LOCATION will be vital to mitigating the risks of installation at LOCATION for those elements within the control of the programme team. These lessons will provide the opportunity to optimise processes and potentially enable a more streamlined schedule for the second installation. The risk of poor weather towards the start of the austral winter coupled with the tight OSD presents a significant residual risk.

From interviewees, the Review Team understands that extensions to limited LEGACY EQUIPMENT capability, in 6-week increments, are being investigated as a risk mitigation measure in case of further delays but that these extensions would incur costs only if needed. As the installation at LOCATION coincides with autumn, there is a chance that any delay may result in activities needing to be conducted in the more unpredictable and challenging winter season.

Ensuring that trained and qualified contractors are utilised is critical for the success of the programme and early discussion and engagement should be considered as part of a risk mitigation plan along with detailed user acceptance planning to ensure a smooth transition of the XXXXXX PROGRAMME system into service. It would be prudent for the Steering Group to formally review the availability of CONTRACTOR NAME from all third-party contractors (external to XXXXXX PROGRAMME *per se*) to ensure maintenance of the critical path.

10. Support Arrangements

Whilst the focus has been operationalising the EQUIPMENT there is currently no support contract in place. The Review Team has not seen a clearly articulated plan for negotiating and agreeing on one or more CLS (Contractor Logistic Support) contracts for the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION, EQUIPMENT system, non-EQUIPMENT technical support, and non-technical support. The Review Team is aware of the proposed CLS++ approach, which will aim to consolidate multiple enablers under an amended contract with COMPANY NAME, but currently this approach is not yet well defined, and interviewees had mixed understandings about expectations of what this would entail. It is uncertain if the broader team, including commercial stakeholders, is aligned with this approach. The full requirements, including additional services like snow clearance and duty personnel, need to be defined by TLB NAME in consultation with LOCATION MANAGEMENT. While the budget implications of increasing the CLS scope are likely low, this needs confirmation.

The timing of CLS re-competition in relation to the wider CONTRACTOR NAME EQUIPMENT support contract re-competition for the period XXX 27 to XXX 32 is under consideration. There is an opportunity to combine both support contracts into one, and benefit from the associated economies of scale through reduced whole-life costs

The Review Team heard that the TLB NAME (XXXX) has previously shown reluctance to accept handover from OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT. Concerns were expressed by interviewees, including whether TLB NAME had the necessary skills and resource.

The Review Team understands that support contracts for both the EQUIPMENT and the INFRASTRUCTURE are not yet in place. It is unclear what call-off arrangements have been agreed with COMPANY NAME for maintenance and dome removal/refit as necessary beyond the implementation phase nor who would be liable for costs.

It will be crucial to evaluate support function and contractor readiness, break down any barriers to quality assurance preparation, and clearly define boundaries of responsibility. This process is likely to be impacted by the rotational nature of staffing, which is yet to be defined. Consideration could be given to extending the psychological safety approach successfully deployed within the programme to the support arrangements.

Operator training responsibilities are also unclear. Determining the DLOD lead for training is necessary to ensure effective preparation and support for operators.

Risk: If responsibilities and contracts for CLS are not agreed before completion of the first EQUIPMENT installation, there is a risk that the system cannot be formally handed over to the support contractor and thus accepted into service, resulting in an operational capability gap and a delay to the roll-out of the second EQUIPMENT – incurring consequential additional cost.

Recommendation 3: Prioritise programme management effort into the planning for and delivery of CLS contract(s) and communicate the agreed responsibilities to all parties.
(Critical – Do Now)

11. Business Case Update

The OBC for XXXXXX PROGRAMME was submitted in XXX 21. The FBC for Phase 1 (the scope of this Review) was approved in XXX 22 to facilitate contract placement with the OEM with subsequent contract signature achieved XX XXX 23. As the OEM did not submit final costings in time, the FBC approval was given on the basis of costings included at the OBC stage. The FBC approval sits at £XXX, almost in line with the forecast ABL (£XXX) in the SOC but below the ABL requested by the FBC of £XXX.XXXm.

The Review Team was told with confidence that there is zero prospect of XXXXXX PROGRAMME breaching its ABL within the first CLS term (up to 31 XXX 27). There are, however, varying levels of understanding amongst interviewees about total Programme costs and what those costs cover (implementation plus CLS). The Review Team heard numbers ranging from £XXX to £XXX, but without commonly understood clarity about what those numbers mean or the period they covered. This should be a simple clarification and communication activity to ‘get everyone on the same page’.

The CLS for the EQUIPMENT, the CLS for the TLB NAME-SUPPORTED CONSTRUCTION, the potential for emergency run-on of the LEGACY EQUIPMENTs, and any costs exceeding the risk budget (approx. £XXX remaining) need to be explained and documented.

The SRO is firm that the ABL position is secure; and that therefore an Information Note (IN) is appropriate. The Review Team encourages that IN to be compiled as soon as practicable (once CLS costs are known) and that it be used to ensure uniformity of understanding amongst the wider Programme team and the authorising environment.

Acknowledgement

The Review Team would like to thank all participants for their contribution to the Review.

Next Assurance Review

The Next Assurance Review should be conducted in **XXX 25**, immediately following the LEGACY EQUIPMENT OSD (and planned date of XXXXXX PROGRAMME IOC) and circa 6 months ahead of XXXXXX PROGRAMME Phase 1 FOC – in XXX 25. Clarity on a potential XXXXXX PROGRAMME Phase 2 should also have been achieved in this timeframe.

ANNEX A DCA Descriptions

From 1 April 2021, the IPA has moved to a 3-tier RAG status (Red, Amber, Green). The Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA) RAG status should use the definitions below.

Colour	Criteria Description
Green	Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery. *Recommendation: The programme/project is ready to proceed to the next stage*.
Amber	Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and, if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun. *Recommendation: This programme/project can proceed to the next stage with conditions, but the programme/project must report back to the IPA and HMT on the satisfaction of each time bound condition within an agreed timeframe.*
Red	Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme/project may need re-baselining and/or its overall viability re-assessed. *Recommendation: This programme/project should not proceed to the next phase until these major issues are managed to an acceptable level of risk and the viability of the project/programme has been re-confirmed.*

ANNEX B – Terms of Reference for Review

This is a Gate 0 review.

The standard terms of reference for all Guidance and Workbooks can be found here and does not need to be included within the body of the report UNLESS any amendments have been made to the original Terms of Reference.

SRO Areas for focus

- Continued application of **Psychological Safety** to enhance collective XXXXXX PROGRAMME team performance and resilience.
- OTHER PROGRAMME NAME (EQUIPMENT) – dependency and potential mitigations
- Cultural and other significant issues within **OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT corporate *enablers*** hindering core OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT OF THE XXXXXX PROGRAMME Delivery Team

ANNEX C Project/Programme Background

[completed by the programme team]

The aims of the programme / the driving force for the programme / the policy intent the programme is delivering to:	The current LOCATION (XXXX) capability is enabled by 3 EQUIPMENT located at remote sites selected to provide the optimal CAPABILITY. The TLB NAME CAPABILITY system comprises a combined Primary EQUIPMENT and a Secondary EQUIPMENT enabling the CAPABILITY. The current EQUIPMENT will reach their OSD in XXX 25. In line UK Defence Policy there is a Strategic need to 'defend and deter threats' and as such the need for Pg XXXXXX is directly linked to the requirement to provide appropriate XXXX to link into the network and XXXX system within the LOCATION. It has been directed that the Programme must ensure that there is no capability gap in the LOCATION and therefore any SOLUTION must be in place by the OSD of 2025.
The impact if the programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on civilians/citizens:	If the Programme fails to deliver the required SOLUTION to fulfil the XXXX task by XXX 2025 there will be a capability gap in the LOCATION. This could leave the LOCATION vulnerable to threats and incursions from an adversarial Nation.
Project/programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies:	Programme is being undertaken in line with Defence Strategic Directives, TLB NAME XXXXX Plan and TLB NAME XXXXX Plan
Projects or programme interdependencies [if applicable]:	The Programme has dependencies on other Programmes within the TLB NAME Capability domain, OTHER PROGRAMMEs. Additionally, there are multiple interdependencies with OTHER PROGRAMMEs.

Has the SRO's Osmotherly letter (letter of appointment) been approved at the appropriate levels?	Yes
The procurement / delivery status:	DELIVERY TEAM XX are on contract for Statement of Work (SOW) 2 (EQUIPMENT transportation and installation). DELIVERY TEAM XX are currently in final stages for contracts around the CLS SOW3, this should have been on contract by XX XXX 24, which was delayed to XX XXX 24; however, the proposed date is now end of XXX 24. OTHER GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT are on course for delivering the infrastructure and security improvements for CAPABILITY sites, with the first site LOCATION undertaking handover in XXX 24. LOCATION is 5 weeks ahead of schedule and we anticipate handover in XXX/XXX 24.
Funding / business case:	The Programme has an approved FBC with a requirement to provide an Information/Review note to include refined costs once the SOW3 (CLS) costs are confirmed. The ABL still remains at £XXX, which is sufficient for the installation and support activity out to Yr 6.
Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP):	There is an approved IAAP in place. The IAAP is still being used but will be amended to reflect any changes in plan as required.
Project plan:	There is a level 0 schedule approved by the Pg Dir and SRO. A further level 1 plan has been produced by the PMO. Schedule documentation from LM and COMPANY NAME is also available for EQUIPMENT transportation and installation. The TLB NAME-SUPPORTED-CONSTRUCTION detailed plans have been completed to a 90% development level; we are awaiting confirmation of XXXXXX (ANOTHER TLB-SUPPORTED CONSTRUCTION XXX) support to be on contract.

Current position regarding previous IPA assurance reviews:	This will be the 3rd review for Pg XXXXXX. All previous actions have been completed from the last assurance review.

ANNEX D Progress against previous assurance review

XX XXX 23 – XX XXX 23

Problem or blocker identified	Progress/Status
Risk: If relationship degradation is not resolved there is a direct risk to critical information sharing, which could lead to key programme outputs being at best delayed or, at worst, information being provided too late to enable a correction to be made without damaging the Programme schedule. **<u>Recommendation 3</u>: Resolve panteam relationships to support 'one team' principles to ensure successful and collaborative delivery of the programme.**	Actioned

Risk: If there are not commonly referenced documents for both system design and integration, agreed by the relevant parties then there is a high likelihood of different interpretations and even gaps in the technical definition and planned work. Opportunities to spot risks early and for delivery areas to lean in and offer support across the Programme may be missed and consequently unnecessary delays incurred, potentially jeopardising IOC/FOC dates. **<u>Recommendation 2</u>: Document both the complete system design and the integration logic, covering internal XXXXXX PROGRAMME and external dependencies in a form that is understood by all relevant parties within, and connected to, the XXXXXX Programme.**	Actioned
Risk: If an integrated and resourced delivery plan encapsulating all phases of the programme, including	Actioned
dependencies and contract milestones, is not in place then it may become difficult to track and forecast progress. This increases the risk to delivery performance and the likelihood of failure to achieve milestones, ultimately threatening completion of the Programme to meet the out of service date of the current capability in 2025. **Recommendation 4: Ensure that a fully integrated and resourced pan-DLOD delivery plan is in place.**	

Risk: If the new EQUIPMENT capabilities fail to integrate effectively with the LOCATION CAPABILITY Infrastructure then exploitation of the capabilities would be compromised **Recommendation 1: Continue to escalate the dependency upon, and requirement for resolution of, the OTHER PROGRAMME NAME support and integration requirements.**	Actioned

ANNEX E List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

Name	Organisation and role
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX

XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX

XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX
XXXX XXXX	XXXX XXXX

*Unable to connect

ANNEX F Recommendation Classifications and Priority

There are 13 classifications in the classification set, Review Teams are asked to record the classification reference number of each recommendation as per the table below.

#	Classification	Definition
1	Governance	Recommendations related to the oversight, structure and decision making of a project/ programme. This theme also includes recommendations relating to alignment with pan-government priorities, strategies, and controls.
2	Stakeholder Management	Recommendations related to relationships with all parties with an interest in the outcome of the project/programme, whether internal to the agency, internal to government or external.
3	Programme and Project Management	Recommendations related to all aspects of project, programme and portfolio management, but excludes recommendations on Risk, Issues and Dependency Management (Theme 9) and Resource Management (Theme 10)
4	Change Management & Transition	Recommendations related to the Management of Business Change – all the work required with and in the business and with the customer to make ready for the initiative, in terms of changes to business processes including: business continuity planning, changes to work processes and resourcing, changes to organisational structures and staffing to support transformational or process changes to business delivery to ensure a smooth transition to BAU It does not include Technology Readiness for Service (Theme 12).
5	Financial Planning and Management	Recommendations related to financial planning, organising, directing and controlling of financial activities.
6	Benefits Management & Realisation	Recommendations related to the identification, ownership, measurement and realisation of benefits and dis-benefits. Benefits can be either financial or non-financial.
7	Commercial Strategy & Management	Recommendations related to the end-to-end procurement process including: Procurement strategy and planning, Approaches to the market, Contract negotiation and Contract management.
8	Context, Aim & Scope	Recommendations that are aimed at the clarity of the change to be implemented. It covers alignment to vision, strategy, and policy; the purpose, objectives, justification and description of the change; and the determination of success and the necessary environment to ensure success.
9	Risk, Issues & Dependency Management	Recommendations related to the identification, analysis, impact assessment, response and the on-going review and management of Risks, Issues and Dependencies (i.e. outputs that are required by a project to succeed, but which will be delivered by parties not under the direct control of the project).

10	Resource & Skills Management	Recommendations related to all aspects of the identification, supply, optimisation, prioritisation and maintenance of resources and appropriate skills.
11	Knowledge Management	Recommendations related to the process of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organizational knowledge. It includes sharing knowledge and experiences or Lessons Learnt.
12	Technology	Recommendations related to all technology issues, including the alignment of the technology solution to the technology and business strategy, the integration of one or more technology solutions, the operational readiness of the solution (including testing of the solution), and all aspects of security relating to the technology solution.
13	Other	To be used only when other classifications do not apply.

Each risk-based recommendation will be recorded as Critical / Essential or Recommended:

- **Critical (Do Now):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately.
- **Essential (Do By):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future.
- **Recommended:** The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.