



Ministry
of Defence

MOD Integrated Assurance Gate Review Report
XXXXXX Programme
Stage Gate 0/3

Template Version Number	v3.0 2021
Version Number:	Final v1.0
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	XXXX XXXX
Date of Osmotherly Appointment letter issued to SRO:	-
Has SRO completed the Major Projects Leadership Academy?	Yes, SRO has completed the MPLA
Programme/Project Director:	XXXX XXXX
TLB, Organisation, Agency or NDPB (if applicable):	MOD / TLB NAME
Business Case stage reached:	Full Business Case or equivalent
Decision/approval point this report informs:	Departmental decision/approval point
Review Dates:	Review Start Date: XX XXX 24 Review End Date: XX XX 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:	XXX 23 AAP: AMBER XXX 22 AAP: RED XXX 22 Gateway 0/3: RED
IPA ID Number:	MOD_XXXX_XXXX-X
Review ID Number (For MOD IA Hub use only)	XXXX/XXXX

Contents

Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA)	3
Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations	5
Blockers to delivery	7
Areas of good practice	8
Comments from the SRO	9
Review Team findings and recommendations	10
Acknowledgement	11
Next Assurance Review	18
ANNEX A – DCA Descriptions	19
ANNEX B – Bespoke Terms of Reference for Hybrid Review	20
ANNEX C – Project/Programme Background	23
ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review	26
ANNEX E – List of Interviewees	30
ANNEX F – Recommendation Classifications and Priority	32

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)

Delivery Confidence Assessment:	Amber
<p>The XXXXXX programme is a complex and demanding programme which will build, equip, commission and initially operate a joint UK/PARTNER NATION SCIENCE facility in LOCATION, PARTNER NATION. The programme also intends to build, equip, commission and operate a complementary facility at LOCATION that will be used by the UK alone.</p> <p>The Review Team (RT) noted that the Programme has delivered a substantial contribution to the LOCATION facility and jointly operated that facility with the PARTNER NATION to deliver XXX DELIVERABLES to date. Regrettably, whilst the UK contribution to the joint facility has made significant progress, the UK delivery elements are well short of the anticipated schedule.</p> <p>There have been a wide range of delays that previous Reviews have identified and offered a range of recommendations to improve delivery. Despite some progress, the UK XXXXXX programme is essentially a foundering programme which needs considerable focus to arrest the delays and place the Programme on a much firmer basis. The constant delays have eroded PARTNER NATION confidence in the UK's commitment to the Programme.</p> <p>Additionally, the PARTNER NATION programme is gaining considerable experience in conducting DELIVERABLES and the UK is starting to appear like a junior partner rather than an equal partner.</p> <p>The RT noted that considerable progress has been made in recent months following the appointment of a new Programme Director and an interim "deputy SRO". This combination has proved to be particularly effective in stabilising the Programme schedule and if it can be sustained, bodes well for the future. However, there are a range of issues that require urgent attention if these changes are to gain momentum and produce the sustained changes that will be essential to secure the critical UK capability that XXXXXX can deliver.</p> <p>The details are below, but the key highlights include: addressing a range of resource issues; improving contract and supplier management; tackling the morale and sustainability of the LOCATION-based workforce; driving a through life capability management (TLCM), to include Phase 3 and the transition to BAU; and improving the understanding of what decisions can be delegated and when they need to be escalated.</p> <p>Additionally, the RT believes that there are considerable opportunities to learn from the PARTNER NATION approach and experience in the building, commissioning, and operating of the LOCATION facility to date. There is also a pressing need to instil in the XXXXXX team a need for "right to left" thinking to understand what needs to happen to meet a particular delivery date, rather than what appears to be an endemic approach of "it will be delivered when it is delivered" or "left to right" thinking. If XXXXXX is to deliver the required capability when it is needed these changes will be crucial elements in driving the required paradigm shift.</p>	

The RT considered that given the wide range of issues that have contributed to the current state of XXXXXX it could warrant a Delivery Confidence Assessment of RED. We were told that there are a range of initiatives to address those issues. With these in mind, and in anticipation that these will be carried through, we believe that the XXXXXX programme just warrants an **AMBER** rating, however if the initiatives are not carried through it is likely to revert to RED in very short order.

Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations

Priority	Risks* Identified with Evidence and Recommendations	Classification Insert Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Target Date
1	Recommendation 1: That Phase 3 and BAU requirements and delivery plans are finalised and socialised. See 5.1.3 3	3. Programme & Project Management	Critical	
2	Recommendation 6: That the multiple resource issues, including resource shortfalls/vulnerabilities and enhancement of the support to the LOCATION team, are resolved. See 5.2.7 - 5.2.11	10. Resource & Skills Management	Critical	
3	Recommendation 4: That decision-making delegations and escalation points are reviewed and socialised. See 5.2.4 1	1. Governance	Essential	By XX XXX 2024
4	Recommendation 5: That the "XXXXXX SCS1 Deputy Director" contract is extended by 6-12 months. See 5.2.6	10. Resource & Skills Management	Essential	By XX XXX 2024
5	Recommendation 7: That a commercial and procurement strategy for the future of XXXXXX is developed. See 5.4.5	7. Commercial Strategy & Management	Essential	By XX XXX 2024
6	Recommendation 2: That work continues on the positive development of the programme artefacts, in particular focusing on the long-term TLM elements. See 5.2.1	3. Programme & Project Management	Recommended	By XX XXX 2024

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

7	Recommendation 3: That the constitution and operation of the Programme Board be reviewed to optimise its effectiveness. See 5.2.2 1: Governance Recommended	1. Governance	Recommended	By XX XXX 2024
---	--	---------------	-------------	----------------

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

Blockers to delivery

Ref No	Blocker	Describe specific nature of blocker	Consequence to programme if not resolved
	Nil	-	-

Areas of good practice

In addition to sharing findings and recommendations, we suggest you add specific detail on what is being delivered successfully and the areas that you commend the team on. Please add detail to the below table where delivery is successfully taking place.

Commending delivery of...	Describe specific details of successful delivery
1. Governance	<p>Programme Leadership</p> <p>The newly appointed SCS1 XXXXXX Deputy Director or “deputy SRO” and Programme Director have made immediate and tangibly positive impacts on the Programme and the Programme Team. If this can be sustained, and spread across the whole XXXXXX Programme, there is considerable hope for future success.</p>

Comments from the SRO

I would like to thank the Review Team for a committed and considered review of the XXXXXX Programme. While the Programme continues to have significant challenges, physical and cultural change is now evident in parts of the programme. Significant senior focus both directly into the Programme, but as importantly into the functions critical to supporting the programme, alongside a deliberate move to a more streamlined and fully integrated team approach (including an ALB NAME employee as the Programme Director) is beginning to see a change in performance. While several improvements were described in last year's Review and Report, these were insufficient and ultimately led to the more fundamental reset of the team and the programme in the late Summer / Autumn of 2023.

As indicated by the Review Team, these actions are by no means complete which is well understood across the Programme leadership. Similarly, while the attention is drawn by the urgent and important in terms of EQUIPMENT completion, considerable effort is required to truly understand the totality of the programme and ensure the Through Lifecycle Management is properly considered in as timely a manner as possible, recognising that some risk balance decisions may need to be taken. I have aligned specific support from within the CAPABILITY International Relations team to support the Programme Team in developing their skills in cross-government liaison and engagement.

As recognised in the recommendations, planning for future phases and operational transitions is required now, which was recognised in the selection of the new leadership team and can be seen in their past skills and experience.

I believe XXXXXX represents a significant lead and learn opportunity for the broader ALB NAME transformation with the opportunity to learn from the PARTNER NATION experience in delivering their early DELIVERABLES and reinvigorate core capabilities in support of the current and future CAPABILITY Programmes.

We are very grateful for the Report and its recommendations and the opportunity to reflect on performance and forward plans and have action already continuing or in train against the recommendations.

Review Team findings and recommendations

5.1. Context and Scope

5.1.1. XXXXXX is a strategic enabler for the current and future CAPABILITY with much of the work being managed by ALB NAME. XXXXXX is run jointly between the UK and PARTNER NATION and aims to build, equip, commission and then operate a joint SCIENCE test facility in LOCATION, PARTNER NATION. It is essential to the current and future CAPABILITY for both nations. Against this backdrop, and the technical challenges of the facility, XXXXXX is being delivered in an extremely demanding environment.

5.1.2. To date XXXXXX has been late in delivery and, as a consequence, there is a perceived lack of UK commitment by the International partners. The recent change in programme leadership has provided a much-needed stimulus to arrest the slippage and restore confidence. This will need to be sustained over the coming months to maintain momentum.

5.1.3. The RT heard that the majority of stakeholders understand the scope of the Programme which reflects the work completed since the last Review. However, there remains a lack of clarity with regard to the route to Final Operating Capability (FOC), known as Phase 3, and into BAU. This lack of clarity needs to be addressed urgently for two reasons: firstly, it will be needed to plan, resource and finance the required work packages. Secondly, we heard that the PARTNER NATION are well advanced in their plans for their Phase 3 and BAU, so if the UK does not engage quickly and effectively in this area it will emphasise the perception that the UK is not committed to LOCATION. As a consequence, the PARTNER NATION will dominate, or even dictate, what happens for the future and the UK will be left as a junior partner at best.

Recommendation 1: That Phase 3 and BAU requirements and delivery plans are finalised and socialised.

5.2. Programme Management

5.2.1. The XXXXXX Programme appears to have made good progress in developing a suite of artefacts and beginning to inject rigour into the overall project management methodology and enable the team to address specific challenges across the Programme. It was also noted that whilst many of the programme artefacts have been developed since the last IPA Review in XXX 23, many of these remain transactional and functionally driven, and do not yet appear to be synthesised to articulate insights for the Programme team. In particular, the management of risks and opportunities to support the Programme's aspirations for delivery to time, cost and quality. However, further work is required to improve the overall programme management elements and ensure that a longer-term focus is maintained on realising the desired benefits for both customers: the WIDER CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO and ALB NAME test programme. Moreover, recent work has been focused on the near-term firefighting to stabilise the delivery schedule. Now that this work is starting to pay dividends more focus should be applied on the through life capability management (TLCM) of what will be a world-beating capability in due course.

Recommendation 2: That work continues on the positive development of the programme artefacts, in particular focusing on the long-term TLCM elements.

5.2.2. The RT observed that the XXXXXX governance has improved, particularly with the re-establishment of the XXXXXX Programme Board. However it is noted that the number of Programme Board members is significant (c24), and the attendance has been haphazard. We were also told that the Programme Board is often a "talking shop" rather than a decision-making forum, which suggest that this is more a stakeholder engagement forum than a Board supporting the SRO and making delivery decisions. Whilst the stakeholder engagement element is needed, this is not necessarily the best use of limited management time in a decision-making forum.

Recommendation 3: That the constitution and operation of the Programme Board be reviewed to optimise its effectiveness.

5.2.3. Clarity on the XXXXXX programme outcomes and benefits has significantly improved, with initial definitions now in place for IOC and FOC, and an initial Master Data and Assumptions List (MDAL) has been developed to underpin the key assumptions. However, many of the strategic assumptions on which the Programme is developed appear to have a low level of maturity and require accelerated refinement to ensure the right decisions can be made at the right point in time (e.g. Phase 3 definition, PROCESS management and PROCESS challenges). Risk-based decision making will be key, and whilst this appears to be acknowledged by all stakeholders, the time-critical challenges for the programme should not be underestimated. The RT have noted that compromises may be required for the Programme, and therefore the Programme should endeavour to help decision makers understand the options and risks for the enterprise.

5.2.4. The RT observed that there is sometimes confusion on delegated authority for decision-making in respect of the Programme, particularly in relation to the interdependent programmes. With such a complex Programme it is essential that appropriate delegation and empowered staff are able, and feel able, to drive forward to achieve success. The importance of appropriate delegation and empowerment and ensuring that decisions are triaged and made in a timely manner cannot be over-stated. The need for escalation to the Programme Director, or beyond, only if progress has stalled or if senior engagement is needed, should be revisited and endorsed as necessary.

Recommendation 4: That decision-making delegations and escalation points are reviewed and socialised.

5.2.5. We believe that the transition to being an ALB NAME-led programme has been a success which bodes well for the future. However, this change is still not fully and widely embedded. A genuine collegiate approach, rather than the extant transactional approach, would have seen an urgent dialogue to tackle the issues impacting the Programme. As recommended above, there is a pressing need to pursue the definition of requirements for Phase 3 at the earliest opportunity to influence and negotiate with our PARTNER NATION colleagues, who are perceived to be well advanced in understanding their requirements. Whilst the scope of the specific requirements may be immature, it is an imperative that ALB NAME and TLB NAME work in partnership with uncertain scope to inject pace into this element of the Programme.

5.2.6. The RT saw considerable consensus amongst almost all interviewees that there is a need for a 'right to left' view of the programme, which has been absent to date, with a focus on the overall outcomes for the UK and the through-life capability management. The RT recognise that the arrival of the new SRO will augment the existing SCS1 Deputy Director who is acting as a "deputy SRO" (currently on a fixed-term contract due to expire in XXX 24) and Programme Director arrangements and will likely provide extra leadership capacity to enable a more outcome focused approach. However, the RT believe that it is imperative that the deputy SRO and Programme Director continue with their excellent efforts for improving delivery focus

in the short-medium term.

Recommendation 5: That the “XXXXXX SCS 1 Deputy Director” contract is extended by 6-12 months.

5.2.7. The time-critical nature of the XXXXXX scope, and impacts to broader programmes, is compounded by the systemic resourcing issues facing the Programme. Whilst the current team have managed to turn-around the project, it is not feasible for them to endure persistent capability and capacity deficits across key components of the programme and expect successful delivery. We were told that here are significant resource shortfalls (cXX FTE) across the XXXXXX programme. Whilst addressing the skills gap is a national and international issue for the sector, it is the opinion of the RT that this programme is too important for the UK’s CAPABILITY enterprise to endure this situation and senior intervention is required. This observation was made at the last IPA Review and there has only been limited evidence of the issue being addressed effectively.

5.2.8. It should also be noted that the RT recognise the XXXXXX Programme has multiple ‘single points of failure’ from a capability and capacity perspective and there is limited resilience within the team. The Programme Director should consider, where appropriate, a more detailed skills analysis to understand how the overall team can be developed. This should include reviewing any vulnerability to ‘single point failures’ and develop appropriate mitigation approaches.

5.2.9. We were also told that there are a range of issues for XXXXXX staff working in LOCATION. These include inter alia:

- the perceived lack of appreciation of the importance of the work;
- frustration of the operational staff due to the continued delays in starting DELIVERABLES;
- disenchantment at the “pay and rations” element;
- frustration at the differences of working in LOCATION rather than at ALB NAME in the UK;
- concern over the longevity of the detachment due to tax/NI restrictions after 5-8 years;
- frustration and uncertainty of repatriation by ALB NAME;
- challenges of working in a foreign country;
- the challenges of commuting on a weekly/fortnightly basis; and
- a feeling that UK-based colleagues see working at LOCATION as being a holiday.

In isolation none of these issues would normally be a major problem, but collectively they present a real threat to the maintenance of the in-place workforce and the development of a long-term sustainable capability.

5.2.10. We were told that in practice this frustration manifests itself by a generally disgruntled workforce, some people simply leaving and returning to the UK and some adopting a very flexible approach to on-site working. We were told that action has been in hand to address this range of issues for some time with limited progress. We were also told that ALB NAME's CEO has just visited the site and agreed to look into the issues on his return to the UK. We believe that these issues must be addressed before they have a material impact on the motivation and sustainment of the LOCATION-based workforce.

5.2.11. The RT have noted unanimous alignment across all stakeholders for the need for intervention on the topic of resourcing and that the importance of this extends beyond programme delivery into BAU. Ensuring the UK is visibly present at LOCATION, and contributing emotional, physically, and intellectually can only offer benefits for the broader UK-PARTNER NATION relationship.

Recommendation 6: That the multiple resource issues, including resource shortfalls/vulnerabilities and enhancement of the support to the LOCATION team, are resolved.

5.3. Stakeholder Management

5.3.1. Regarding stakeholders, we saw evidence of the programme mapping stakeholders and completing a RACI (Responsible, Accountable, Consult and Inform) assessment. But we also noted that work has yet to commence to develop a stakeholder management plan. We consider this to be necessary as it will outline how the Programme plans to manage the needs and expectations of all stakeholders during the programme lifecycle.

5.3.2. We heard that stakeholders are kept informed through multiple channels such as interface reporting, the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and various boards such as the Joint Management Board and the XXXXXX Programme Board. Several interviewees commented on the recent improvement in communication from the Programme. For example, we heard comments to the effect that communication was focused, measured and clear. In addition, we heard the science community feels well connected to the programme and that they have a voice.

5.3.3. We have noted above that the Programme Board is not well attended. For example, only 8 people attended the XXX 2024 meeting with 16 apologies - this appears to have been a feature of previous meetings. We address elsewhere the need to determine attendees for this meeting, but it begs the question whether there is need for a separate stakeholder forum? We are aware that the Programme runs multiple boards so adding another would not necessarily help in that regard, although there is more that the Programme can do to engage stakeholders.

5.3.4. We heard that work is underway to develop a communications plan. In advance of this, the programme has pressed ahead with its communications activity with ALB NAME staff and has made several inroads. For example, there is a weekly email, monthly brief/newsletter to all ALB NAME staff and there was a Town Hall/all hands brief

in XXX 2024. We also heard that members of the SLT are visible at both LOCATION and LOCATION. This is illustrative of the programme working towards a “One-Team” approach with the desire to create an environment where all team members feel valued. The RT therefore encourages the Programme to complete the task to develop and introduce a communications plan.

5.3.5. The focus has been on behavioural change although we heard there are some individuals failing to take personal responsibility within their authority. The RT explored why the Programme has not gone down the route of a formal change management approach to changing the XXXXXX team paradigm. It was explained that given the current environment; a more iterative approach has greater chance of success given the timescales needed to bring about the necessary change. The RT supports this approach.

5.4. Finance and Approvals

5.4.1. We read that the programme is currently tracking below the 2023 Review Note Approved Budget Limit (ABL) of £XXXm. The gap between forecast expenditure and ABL is largest in the current FY23/24 where the programme is underspent against budget profile by c£XXXm. We learnt that some of this is where risks, accounted for within the costings, has not been realised. The ALB NAME budget potentially holds more contingency than expected. In addition, costs may have moved to the right given the programme is under resourced and under delivering at the moment.

5.4.2. Given this, the programme appears to have sufficient budget to cover its costs and, based on the current run rate of £XXX-£XXXm per year, is forecast to reach ABL by the end of XXX 25.

5.4.3. We understand that a Review Note (RN) is currently planned to be submitted in the summer 2024 to: include additional funding to deliver IOC (which is potentially c12 months late); to fund project activity in Phase 2 post IOC; and to fund the delivery of Phase 3 activities (containing 5 work packages). The challenge to the programme is that the scope for Phase 3 has yet to be fully defined and agreed with the PARTNER NATION, which would be needed before the Programme can proceed and release the RN as currently envisaged. It appears that a RN is not needed until mid-2025 unless it becomes clear that the IOC is undeliverable in XXX 25.

5.4.4. Regarding agreed final costs to deliver EQUIPMENT, we heard that the PARTNER NATION would seek to place a cap on their contribution (given the number of delays to this project). We were unable to determine what the cap is likely to be nor what the impact would be on the cost share agreement. We understand that negotiation is on-going with the PARTNER NATION. With respect to SUB-PROJECT, which has been a UK-PARTNER NATION issue for some years, we heard the PARTNER NATION have now agreed to walk away from this project with a settlement payment of circa £XXXm being made by the PARTNER NATION towards the costs.

5.4.5. We heard that ALB NAME manages over 25 live contracts in support of the programme. The largest of which being CONTRACTOR (c£XXXm), two contracts

with CONTRACTOR (c£XXXm for delivery and installation of the EQUIPMENT) and CONTRACTOR

CONTRACTOR (CONTRACTOR- cXXXm). There is a now high-level contract register in place as well as a very limited commercial strategy. We heard that work will start in XXX 2024 to develop a commercial strategy for Phase 3. Given the challenges now seen as a result of a lack of a commercial/procurement strategy at the inception of XXXXXX, this is an essential element for forward planning. The RT believes that extra commercial resources will be needed for this work.

Recommendation 7: That a commercial and procurement strategy for the future of XXXXXX is developed.

5.4.6. We learned there are legacy contracts let on XXX Option A (and to a considerable extent), Option E terms. Option E is a purely cost reimbursable type contract where the Contractor is paid on an actual cost basis plus their fee and where the client is prepared to carry most of the financial risk. With Option E, given that they are reimbursed on Time and Materials (T&M) there is no incentive for the supplier to deliver. Contracts with CONTRACTOR were let based on Option E which, along with scope creep and ALB NAME requirement changes, has led to many of the current issues faced by the Programme.

5.4.7. The delivery and installation of the EQUIPMENT by CONTRACTOR has been unsatisfactory. Their plan was over-optimistic, and the schedule lacked credibility. Recent senior management engagement with relevant counterparts in CONTRACTOR expressing displeasure with EQUIPMENT delivery time resulted in the contract entering 'Code Blue' status recently which required immediate action to be taken by all parties. The outcome is that a revised schedule has now been produced, although it is not mature.

5.4.8. In addition, a Deed of Variation has been placed on the CONTRACTOR contract to enable installation and completion and handover to commissioning EQUIPMENT. The contract change includes a revised payment structure with incentives and stage payments. Whilst this has arrested the current situation, it has had the effect of the supplier, becoming more contractual, for example by raising several Compensation Events. This situation also raises questions regarding the standard of contract management by XXXXXX' staff given that the supplier was not held responsible for their poor performance over a number of years. Reputationally this has been damaging for the Programme.

5.4.9. Despite the issues raised, we were reassured that the Programme is taking steps to remedy the situation. For example, three contracts are being transferred over to ALB NAME from TLB NAME. These contracts have been extended to XXX 2024 and ALB NAME need to consider what contracting options they have. To ensure continuity of supply, and given the short timescales, ALB NAME is reduced to undertaking single source action to retain existing contractors say for a further 18 to 24 months. This would seem appropriate and necessary given the commercial risk.

5.4.10. We were made aware of an issue with CONTRACTOR. We heard that CONTRACTOR are struggling to manage its sub-contractors, delivering sub-systems, components and services, as they do not appear to have the requisite skills. The issue is that they are the prime contractor and, as such, are contractually bound to hold the interface with its supply chain. We suggest that ALB NAME commercial works closely with CONTRACTOR to fully understand the issue and the wider XXXXXX and ALB NAME teams work collaboratively with CONTRACTOR to address the capability gaps.

5.4.11. In the case of the CONTRACTOR contract, the Programme will seek to introduce a service culture with the introduction of key performance indicators. We heard there was reluctance to impose contractual levers on suppliers given the need to deliver the programme and that it may be too late to change existing contracts. We were assured that going forward the Programme will use whatever contractual levers are available to address supplier performance. The commercial team will also take the opportunity to review the requirements and contractual arrangements.

5.4.12. Given the historical standard of contract management, the RT explored whether project managers and contract managers within the programme have benefited from the Government Commercial Functions Contract Management training and accreditation programme. We were told that one member of the SLT has recently enrolled on the programme to assess the potential benefits for the wider team. This is progress, but the RT feel there is an opportunity, perhaps following a Training Needs Analysis, to promote the GCF programme wider and to encourage practitioners to sign-up.

5.5. UK-PARTNER NATION Relationship

5.5.1. We were told by some interviewees that whilst the overall aim is well understood by all stakeholders, there is a difference in the national approach: the UK sees this as a joint facility in PARTNER NATION, whilst PARTNER NATION views this as a PARTNER NATION facility that the UK will use when required and by agreement.

5.5.2. During the Review it became clear that although there is some frustration involved in working in LOCATION rather than at ALB NAME, the UK has much to learn from the PARTNER NATION approach. Given that to date the PARTNER NATION have conducted XXX DELIVERABLES and the UK has conducted none, it would be sensible to understand and learn from the PARTNER NATION experience in building, commissioning and using the LOCATION facility rather than simply try to force the “ALB NAME” or “UK” way on our element of XXXXXX.

5.5.3. We gained the impression that the PARTNER NATION may hold the belief that the programme is not be fully committed to deliver its commitments to LOCATION. We gained this impression from interviewees based on the lateness of the UK parts of XXXXXX overall; the delays to EQUIPMENT; and the resource issues faced by the programme at LOCATION. Interviewees expressed the concern that there is a risk of the UK Programme becoming the poor relation to the

PARTNER NATION Programme. From a stakeholder perspective, the Programme needs to carefully manage the relationship and build confidence through operational delivery and work hard to meet joint commitments. We take the view that this attitude/approach should be reflected at all levels within the programme. Failure to do so will see the UK becoming a junior partner at best, and a tolerated guest at worst, in a world-beating facility for which the UK is paying a very substantial price over a 50-year period. Conversely, if we can restore confidence in the Programme and start to use the facility as it is intended, we can be effective partners with all the technical and political benefits that it would bring.

Acknowledgement

The Review Team would like to thank all interviewees for their open, candid and engaged contribution which contributed to our understanding of the Programme and the outcome of this Review. We would also like to thank the Programme team, and in particular XXXX XXXX, for all their efforts in planning and running the Review.

Next Assurance Review

Given the fragility of the recent changes, and the need for urgent follow-on work, we recommend that an AAP Review is convened in XXX/XXX 2024 to verify and validate progress.

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	<p>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.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: The programme/project is ready to proceed to the next stage.</i></p>
Amber	<p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
Red	<p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

ANNEX B – Bespoke Terms of Reference for Hybrid Review

The purpose of the Gateway 0 Review is to:

- Review the outcomes and objectives for the programme (and the way they fit together) and confirm that they make the necessary contribution to the overall strategy of the organisation and its senior management;
- Ensure that the programme is supported by key stakeholders;
- Confirm that the programme's potential to succeed has been considered in the wider context of Government policy and procurement objectives, the organisation's delivery plans and change programmes, and any interdependencies with other programmes or projects in the organisation's portfolio and, where relevant, those of other organisations;
- Review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the programme as a whole and the links to individual parts of it (e.g. to any existing projects in the programme's portfolio);
- Review the arrangements for identifying and managing the main programme risks (and the individual project risks), including external risks such as changing business priorities;
- Check that provision for financial and other resources have been made for the programme (initially identified at programme initiation and committed later) and that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised;
- Check that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcomes;
- Where relevant, check that the programme takes account of joining up with other programmes, internal and external; and
- Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability.

The Purpose of the Gate 3 Review is to:

- Confirm that the FBC and Benefits Plan now has the relevant information, confirmed by the potential suppliers and/or delivery partners and benefit owners, including that the project has the necessary funds and authority to proceed;

- Confirm that the objectives and desired outputs of the project are still aligned with the programme to which it contributes and/or the wider organisation's business strategy;
 - Check that all the necessary statutory and procedural requirements were followed throughout the procurement/evaluation process;
 - Confirm that the recommended contract decision or procurement execution decision, if properly executed within a standard lawful agreement (where appropriate), is likely to deliver the specified outputs/outcomes on time, within budget, to quality and provide value for money;
 - Ensure that management controls are in place to manage the project through to completion, including contract management aspects;
 - Ensure there is continuing support for the project;
 - Confirm that the approved delivery strategy has been followed;
 - Confirm that the development and implementation plans of both the client and the supplier or partner are sound and achievable;
 - Check that the business has prepared for the development (where there are new processes), implementation, transition and operation of new services/facilities, and that all relevant staff are being (or will be) prepared for the business change involved;
 - Confirm that there are plans for risk management, issue management and change management (technical and business), and that these plans are shared with suppliers and/or delivery partners;
 - Confirm the project is delivering a Net Zero outcome – or explains why not;
 - Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability;
 - Confirm that the project has considered lessons learned not just within the organisation, but more broadly through engagement with others who have done similar projects;
 - Confirm that the technical implications, such as 'buildability' for construction projects; and for IT-enabled projects, information assurance and security, the impact of e-government frameworks (such as e-GIF, e-business and external infrastructure) have been addressed;
- and
- For construction projects, confirm the project is using modern methods of construction that drive efficiency.

ANNEX C – Project/Programme Background

<p>The aims of the programme / the driving force for the programme / the policy intent the programme is delivering to:</p>	<p>The aim of the programme is to provide a critical component of the UK's SCIENCE capability.</p> <p>This will assure the performance and safety of our current and future CAPABILITY.</p> <p>The latest refurbishment was undertaken in the early 2010s to extend the life of the facility until the XXXXXX programme enabled the future capability. This refurbishment was performed under the assumption that initial XXXXXX capability would be established in 2017, with full operating capability to follow. Ensuring that the SCIENCE capability is delivered as quickly as practicable is therefore a high priority.</p>
<p>The impact if the programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on civilians/citizens:</p>	<p>Should the Programme fail to deliver it could damage international relations with our PARTNER NATION counterparts, drive increased costs into the Programme, and potentially challenge future planning assumptions for CAPABILITY management. Any alternate UK-only sovereign option, or 'change of course' at this point would require significant additional investment by the UK, and also result in the UK continuing to be liable for the remaining years of construction costs.</p>
<p>Project/programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies:</p>	<p>XXXXXX is a significant deliverable within the WIDER CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO, giving the UK the ability to assure with confidence, the viability of both the current and future CAPABILITY. The sustainment of a minimum, credible, CAPABILITY has been a long-term strategic defence posture pursued by multiple governments.</p>
<p>Projects or programme interdependencies [if applicable]:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The XXXXXX Programme replaced OTHER PROJECT, which planned to develop SCIENCE capability as a sovereign UK capability;

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This includes assurance of the UK's next generation CAPABILITY programme;• XXXXXX is also dependent on the wider TLB NAME PROCESS plan to facilitate reuse of the XXXXXX EQUIPMENT in the long term.
Has the SRO's Osmotherly letter (letter of appointment) been approved at the appropriate levels?	No, but a new Osmotherley letter has been drafted for the recently appointed SRO to take over in the coming weeks.
The procurement / delivery status:	<p>Projected Interim Operating Capability in 2026. Full operating capability in 2028.</p> <p>Supplier performance (in terms of cost forecasting and delivery) continues to cause concerns and deliverability concerns, both with UK and PARTNER NATION suppliers. The interactions with the PARTNER NATION's Administrative Authority continue to provide challenges in getting timely detailed management information. There remains a critical shortage of skills (both capacity and capability) in the supply chain.</p> <p>The appointment of a new Programme Manager, and Capability Lead provides the foundation to begin to alleviate and ultimately resolve the ongoing constraints on the programme.</p>
Funding / business case:	<p>The Main Gate Business Case (MGBC) for XXXXXX was submitted to the IAC in XXX 2013 and received final approval from HMT in XXX 2014, within a cost envelope of £XXXM.</p> <p>The last Review Note in XXX 2023 raised the XXXXXX ABL by £XXXM to a new total of £XXXM with a requirement for IOC (deliver a first UK experiment, in a UK-manufactured EQUIPMENT) in XXX 2025.</p>

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP):	Not seen.
Project plan:	Yes. Supplied.
Current position regarding previous IPA assurance reviews:	A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous assurance review can be found in Annex D .

ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review

No.	Problem or blocker identified	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Progress/Status
Gateway Review 0/3 Recommendations XXX 22			
1	That the scope of all phases of the programme are reviewed and agreed amongst key stakeholders including confirmation of what is out of scope and funded elsewhere.	Critical	Completed GREEN
2	The Programme Manager to produce and own a set of standard programme artefacts (e.g., systems picture, high-level plan, top planning assumptions etc) to move to a more top-down programme management and share these with the programme team.	Essential by 1 XXX 22	Completed GREEN
3	DG to ensure the PD and PM are 100% on XXXXXX and the SRO at least 50% with up to 100% at key inflection points.	Essential by 1 XXX 22	Completed GREEN Short term deputy SRO support established to ensure greater than 50% cover.
4	The Programme Manager to draft a clear set of roles and responsibilities for the programme team and communicate to the whole programme.	Critical	AMBER. Roles and responsibilities established and communicated. In the process of roles being transferred to ALB NAME, pending whole programme communication. Post AC36.
5	SRO to ensure the new XXXXXX Programme Board has the right external stakeholder membership and to consider the use of a critical friend.	Essential by 1 XXX 22	Complete GREEN

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

6	The SRO should develop a stakeholder map and a stakeholder management plan which should include a plan for communication with other parts of the WIDER CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO	Essential by 1 XXX 22	Partially complete: AMBER. Stakeholder management plan being developed.
7	That effective P3M processes, with TLB NAME programme team and ALB NAME processes effectively integrated as far as possible, are used to drive programme planning and delivery	Essential by 1 XXX 22	Complete led by ALB NAME: GREEN
8	That rigour is applied to identifying the critical resource gaps in the team and appropriately defined and clear job descriptions/terms of reference that meet the TLB NAME recruiting process requirements are created. This should be kept under constant review to minimise delay in resourcing the team effectively, with a weekly update to the DG until resolved.	Critical	Ongoing. AMBER. Collective ALB NAME/TLB NAME strategies being utilised to address resource gaps. ALB NAME functional teams. MOD EDP framework. Report on resources monthly through the people committee.
9	That the SRO in partnership with the finance director ensure that a joint resourcing plan, committed to by TLB NAME and ALB NAME senior leadership, is developed and implemented as a matter of urgency.	Critical	Partially Complete: AMBER. Joint organisational structure implemented, aligned to ENTERPRISE PORTFOLIO one team/best athlete principles
AAP1 Review XXX 22			
1	Document Phase 2 and Phase 3 deliverables, identifying where costs will be split 50/50 with International partners, or are solely UK funded. Deliverables should be matched against end user requirements	Critical	Cost share with PARTNER NATION agreed. Phase 2 complete. Phase 3 joint UK/PARTNER NATION

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

	both technically and in terms of timescales and all interim and final capabilities (IOC and FOC) identified. It will need Portfolio Direction Board approval before being socialised among all key stakeholders.		requirements agreed. Pending JSC 6 XXX sign off. GREEN
2	Ensure that a governance chart is created that shows how the Programme Board and the new SSG will dock into the new CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO governance arrangements, and that ToRs for both XXXXXX PB and XXXXXX SSG are produced.	Essential by 31 XXX 2022	GREEN. Completed
3	An overall plan to include delivery, transition into operations and operational trials should be developed to allow a fully integrated understanding of the capability requirements over time.	Essential by XX XXX 2022	Work in progress. AMBER. BAU with a dedicated transition to Ops PM being recruited.
4	The SRO and Commercial Lead should discuss and agree with ALB NAME with future contracting of EQUIPMENT and agree more broadly who is responsible for all future contracts.	Essential by XX XXX 2022	GREEN. All EQUIPMENT contracts now placed with CONTRACTOR. Additional EQUIPMENT also placed with CONTRACTOR, in line with requirements. All future contract responsibility to be let through ALB NAME
5	Target Operating Models, including the delivery team functions, size, shape and constitution should be developed for each of the phases of the programme and set against a short-term (18 months) and a longer term (3 to 5 years) timescale.	Critical	Work in progress, BAU: AMBER
6	That the suitable resources are added to the	Critical	N/A : AMBER

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

	XXXXXX team as a matter of urgency and not be held up in the resourcing pipeline that has already caused unacceptable delay.		Resource and contracts transferred to ALB NAME for delivery. Pipeline still an issue, work in progress.
7	Establish a knowledge management capability to ensure all relevant formally approved documents are stored safely and made available to relevant stakeholders and regarded as live documents by programme team members (both TLB NAME and ALB NAME).	Essential by XX XXX 23	Complete. GREEN A dedicated Business Management Senior Specialist has joined the team, they have collated, and is responsible for a single document repository for the programme
AAP2 Review XXX 23			
1	Further improvements could be made in communication, specifically noting greater visibility of TLB NAME leadership to ALB NAME IPTs.		A weekly email is now circulated. A monthly newsletter, A monthly all hands brief with TLB NAME, ALB NAME, and contractors all present. And a monthly wider programme update is circulated. Complete. GREEN
2	Raise the profile currently attached to SUB-PROJECT and SUB-PROJECT. Align views, and gain clarity on the requirements for SUB-PROJECT, in particular the WIDER CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO and develop a coherent delivery programme.		The Profile of SUB-PROJECT and SUB-PROJECT has been raised to XXXX, Min DP, SOS, and MOD NED. As a result a decision has been reached to remove SUB-PROJECT from the XXXXXX programme. A decision has also been approved to remove SUB-PROJECT from UK / PARTNER NATION cost share, and making SUB-PROJECT a UK only

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

			capability. Complete. GREEN
3	The RT believes that external stakeholder management could be improved further. In particular, the RT believes the programme needs to increase the level of interaction with HMT.		Regular engagement with DPAS to submit quarterly GMPP's and Annual Information Notes on the XXXXXX programme keeps HMT updated on programme progress. Informal touchpoints will be established with key stakeholders from XXX 2024. Ongoing. AMBER
4	The development of an IMS is a critical PPM artefact which will allow the programme to Work with both internal and external stakeholders to assess, prioritise and align critical milestones for XXXXXX against wider TLB NAME programme requirements.		A clear IMS is now regularly updated and communicated to the programme and wider TLB NAME through the XXXXXX Programme Board, and the wider construct. Complete. GREEN

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

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

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

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.

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

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. [Note to review teams – whenever possible Essential risk-based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]
- **Recommended:** The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation. [Note to review teams – if possible Recommended risk-based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]