



MPRG Project Assessment Review

XXXXXX

Report Version:	Draft for SRO comment
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	XXXXXX
Date of Osmotherley Appointment letter issued to SRO:	XX XXX 23
Programme or Project Title	XXXXXX
Does this review cover the entire Project / Programme?	Primarily providing assurance on OBC and commercial products that will enable ITN release
Department/Organisation of the programme/project	ORGANISATION
Programme Director:	XXXXXX
Business Case stage reached:	OBC approval
Decision/approval point this report informs:	MPRG in XX XXX 2024
Review Start Date:	XX XXX 23
Review End Date:	X XXX 23
Review Team Leader:	XXXXXX
Review Team Members:	XXXXXX
Report Distribution	SRO
Previous Review:	DCA: XXXXXX
IPA ID Number:	XXXX
GMPP ID Number	

Contents

1. Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)	3
2. Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations	5
3. Blockers to delivery	6
4. Comments from the SRO	7
5. Review Team findings and recommendations	7
5.1 Programme changes since XX XXX 23 PAR	7
5.2 Progress against recommendations from XX XXX PAR	9
5.3 Commercial readiness	13
6. Areas of good practice	15
7. Acknowledgement	16
8. Next Assurance Review	16
9. Additional Information for the MPRG panel	16
ANNEX A – Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) Descriptions	19
ANNEX B - Terms of Reference for Review	20
ANNEX C - Background	22
ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review	25
ANNEX E – List of Interviewees	26
ANNEX F – Recommendation Classifications and Priority Order	27

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programme's/project's status 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:

Infrastructure and Projects Authority
HM Treasury Building
1 Horse Guards Road
London
SW1A 2HQ

Gateway helpdesk: gateway.helpdesk@ipa.gov.uk

More information about the Infrastructure and Projects Authority and guidance for central government bodies on the requirements for integrated assurance and approvals is available from:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/infrastructure-and-projects-authority>

1. Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)

Delivery Confidence Assessment

Green

This review has re-evaluated the SGA provided by the XX XXX 23 PAR and improved confidence to Green. This means “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.”

The Programme is ready to proceed to the next stage, OBC approval and ITN release. Mindful that the Fall-Back Options for Programme Failure are defined as “limited” in the OBC, it is a priority for ORGANISATION to progress this Programme and try to recover the negative impact on ORGANISATION Outputs that recent delays of XXXXXX will have caused.

There has been a fundamental change in the Programme since the last review, and that is the decision to proceed with a weighted evaluation approach (termed Approach 2 in the OBC and deemed Amber in the XX XXX 23 PAR), it is also noted that this approach whilst listed as Approach 2 was viewed as the preferred option by the Programme Team and ORGANISATION’s IAC.

Adopting this evaluation approach has removed the main blocker identified by the previous review(s) and enabled the Programme team to complete commercial documents for ITN and preparations for the next phase. At the time of this Review, most of the contract and schedules were finalised within the Programme Team, with all outstanding artefacts scheduled for finalisation by XX XXX 15th. These are now in a more mature state than at the XXX 23 PAR and in the view of this RT, are ready to be submitted for final review in TLB NAME and scrutiny by the ORGANISATION 2.

Full strategies and plans for the upcoming evaluation and negotiation phases have already been prepared. Although these will continue to be refined as the procurement progresses, they are well advanced, and this Programme is ready for ITN release.

Detailed work has been finalised to set the criteria, weighting and thresholds for the evaluation. This is underpinned by detailed modelling and incentivises the bidders to maximise the number of platforms with the budget, and within the profile defined by ABC22.

Programme leadership has proactively tackled all recommendations from the XXX 23 PAR. In terms of Programme Management recommendations, it has not been able to close all the gaps in P3M capability or move to a position where SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME use common programme management tooling. It has however developed mitigations to reduce the risk of these realities. The one team approach that is practiced by this Programme has been instrumental in keeping the Programme team together with all its stakeholder and it should not be underestimated how much a healthy culture will help team resilience, performance and confidence as it enters into the competition phase. There are still gaps in resources, but Programme leadership deem these are manageable. They have successfully negotiated exceptions from civil service controls and are replacing contractors with civil servants. It remains challenging to access sufficient P3M experts in SERVICE Headquarters and this Programme is not alone with these challenges. Successful growth in personal in the TEAM NAME is being used innovatively to bridge

some gaps. Additionally, there is a concerted effort to improve programme management capability by close collaboration between TLB NAME and the SERVICE HQ programme management teams. This is helping to raise the rigour of risk management and integrated scheduling across all Programme activities, with TLB NAME leaning in to help SERVICE HQ with skills gaps.

Perhaps one of the main risks now to the Programme may be loss of supplier interest or level of commitment. There have been visible delays to this programme since its initial market interest day in XX XXX 21 and XXXXXX release on XX XXX 22. While ORGANISATION has decided on its approach to evaluation and the Programme has affected clear and active communications with candidate suppliers, there has been mixed messaging about the Programme by media, which has been beyond the Programme's control. This has made it more complex for the Programme to maintain its relationships with industry.

This risk can be mitigated by driving for an ITN release as early as feasible in XX XXX and aligning all outstanding commercial reviews and scrutiny to be completed before the MPRG scheduled for XX XXX 24. The Programme Team is confident that it will have finalised all documents in the ITN and that support it by XX XXX.

Once the OBC is approved and ITN released, there is a well-prepared commercial team to handle the tender process. Programme leadership can then move on from managing approvals and assurance, to progressing all aspects of the Programme, and preparing for the FBC.

2. Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations

Priority	Recommendation	Risk and Issue Identified with Evidence	Classification Insert Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended
1	Head of the SERVICE's Programme and Change Portfolio Office must track and monitor that the agreed succession plan for XXXXXX SRO and Programme Director is fully executed.	Risk to delivery quality and pace and commitment by the three bidders if there are leadership gaps or weaknesses.	Resource & skills management	C Do now
2	XXXXXX SRO should take advice on how to provide a clear OBC and an unambiguous record for the Programme, without incurring increased cost or delay.	There is a risk that ambiguity in the OBC may create some confusion and not leave a clear record of the Programme approvals.	Governance	C Do now
3	After OBC approval and as part of FBC preparation, XXXXXX SRO should consider whether the full financial, commercial, social value, operational and ORGANISATION consequences of failure or delay of XXXXXX should be set out in the FBC, in case of need.	There is a risk that the implications and costs of delays or significant changes to the scope of this programme in the future are not fully understood and available for decision makers.	Governance	R
4a	Head of the SERVICE's Programme & Change Portfolio Office should continue to prioritise this Programme for the resources it needs to enable the XXXXXX SRO and Programme Director to deliver it successfully.	Not having access to the right resources and continuity of key team members is a risk which is being mitigated currently and innovatively by programme leaders, although things are tight.	Resource & skills management	C Throughout the programme
4b	TLB NAME Director should continue to prioritise this Programme for the resources it needs to enable the TLB NAME XXXXXX Delivery Team Leader and the XXXXXX SRO and Programme Director to deliver it successfully.	Not having access to the right resources will become a higher risk as the Programme proceeds, as pace picks up and with industry competition to respond to. This Review highlights lack of qualified resource as a potential blocker.		C Throughout the programme
5	XXXXXX SRO should ensure the team organises all outstanding commercial reviews that are needed (ORGANISATION and ORGANISATION 2) before the	To reduce the risk of any of the three suppliers losing interest or reducing the quality of the bid/bid team.	Programme and Project Management	C Do now

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

Priority	Recommendation	Risk and Issue Identified with Evidence	Classification Insert Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended
	MPRG so that all assurance and scrutiny is available for a decision about the OBC and ITN release at MPRG in XX XXX XX.			

3. Blockers to delivery

Ref No:	Blocker	Describe specific nature of blocker	Consequence if not resolved
1	Availability of appropriate resources and continuity of key team members	<p>Resources across all four projects, plus other cross-cutting areas" in the Programme are reported as a high risk to the XX XXX Programme Board. This is not just shortage of P3M resources. The XXXXXX Interface project has a severe shortage of resource, deemed by the Programme Director as red, as no mitigation actions are currently in place.</p> <p>The RT feel sufficient P3M resources has been accessed and is about to arrive to not be a blocker to progressing with ITN release. Although gaps do exist, and it is tight. However, recruitment must be progressed, and the existing team (especially the commercial team) does need to be retained and sustained.</p> <p>Beyond P3M, the broader resource requirement for this Programme needs to be kept under close review so that all aspects of the Programme can keep up with the procurement as it gains momentum and enable all the necessary work for FBC. And then delivery beyond that.</p>	If broader Programme resourcing does not keep up with the equipment and infrastructure procurement – this would impact delivery success and value for money overall.
2	Further delays to the OBC approvals process which may lead to withdrawal of any of the bidders. It is important the Programme team is supported to execute the Programme at the pace required.	<p>Since the original market interest day, the ITN release date has slipped by at least 15 months (assuming it can be released during XX XXX 2024).</p> <p>The RT heard that some bidders may be losing interest in this opportunity and/or may be considering standing their bid teams down.</p>	<p>The ITN documentation – with its clarity and maturity of development – is setting the right environment for a healthy competition through the chosen negotiation procedure.</p> <p>Three bidders are ideal for this – but unless this programme gets a move on – bidders may withdraw.</p>

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

4. Comments from the SRO

SRO Comments

This report confirms that we have used the extra time of OBC approval effectively, however frustrating the delay has been. It also notes the value of cohesion between the TLB NAME DT, core programme team, Fielding team and other key stakeholders under the 'one team' banner.

The Green is especially welcome as a testament to the extraordinary efforts of that one-team. The challenge and uncertainty of this extensive approvals period has demanded patience, belief and long hours. And within the hardworking and devoted cast, the exigencies of securing Ministerial approval and resource shortfalls have caused a select few to routinely sacrifice work-life balance to keep this programme alive. The Green is not seen as a reward for that; but it is received as a fitting testament to the herculean and cohesive one-team effort, and vindication for the decisions made.

I'm re-assured that this independent review has corroborated the assessment that risks to the competition have been minimised and that the commercial products are ready for release.

Overall, I am delighted with the Green assessment. However, I also recognise the challenge of staying Green through FBC approval. Resourcing remains parlous, and the continued support and prioritisation from SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME is crucial if we are to avoid back-sliding on the progress made.

5. Review Team findings and recommendations

The full terms of reference for this – partial - review are in Annex B. The last full PAR was in XXX 23 (hereafter called XXX 23 PAR). This top-up review focuses primarily on the commercial products that have developed since the PAR and following ORGANISATION's decision to use the weighted evaluation approach. The purpose is to inform an MPRG on XX XXX 24 that will consider the XXXXXX OBC, approval of which will enable ITN release.

5.1 Programme changes since XXX 23 PAR

The XXX 23 PAR review stated the underlying programme, to purchase EQUIPMENT, is a low-risk proposition - however, it determined the programme SGA as RED. This was because the proposed approach to bid evaluation that the Programme Team were being requested to use included a pass/fail condition into the competition for EQUIPMENT to be produced in the UK and a pass/fail condition that at least 25% of all work content was sourced in the UK. (Approach 1 in the OBC.)

The significant programme change since the XXX 23 PAR has been a decision (on XX XXX 23) to proceed using a weighted approach to bid evaluation (Approach 2 in the OBC) and this has reduced the risks facing the Programme. This weighted approach has always been the preferred approach of the SRO and Programme team (and has been

endorsed by the IAC). This approach was assessed as Amber by the XX XXX 23 PAR. All of the assurance and scrutiny that has been applied to the Programme so far, is behind the weighted approach to bid evaluation.

Approval of the weighted – and preferred – approach to evaluation has enabled the Programme Team to focus and finalise the commercial documents for ITN release and progress all projects across the Programme. The Programme senior leadership are unanimous this decision has removed the principal blocker to value for money and delivering the minimum viable fleet that was identified in the XX XXX 23 PAR. The ITN documentation were finalised by the Programme Team during this Review and are now ready for final TLB NAME and ORGANISATION 2 review.

Importantly, the requirement for medium helicopters has not changed and the approved financial provision and profile has remained the same. ORGANISATION HQ and XXXXXX has not changed any requirement and there has been time for the Programme team to remove all gold-plated requirements and keep the scope of the draft contract as tight as possible. The mission profiles have been reduced from initial ranges and the scope of the contract (platforms, training, infrastructure) together with the 5-year period of support (before further competition) has also all remained the same. The budget and spend profile remain the same.

There has been a decision to separate out and progress the EQUIPMENT procurement to meet the specific LOCATION requirement (£XXXXXX), but this does not affect the OBC. EQUIPMENT is being implemented through a separate programme (approval delegated to SERVICE Investment Committee). Progressing this separate yet connected programme is helping to protect the overall CDEL profile, despite delays in XXXXXX. It appears also to be a helpful signal to the market, that there is progress. EQUIPMENT remains appropriately connected to XXXXXX with the XXXXXX Programme Director appointed EQUIPMENT SRO.

The SRO appointment letter has also now been provided. Dated XX XXX 2023, it recognises the SRO has been accountable since XX XXX 2021. It defines this SRO role as a 50% commitment until XX XXX 2024. However, the RT notes that deadlines for outcomes defined in this letter are not achievable because of the delays in OBC approval. Specifically: Release Invitation to Negotiate did not happen in XX XXX 2023; Secure Full Business Case approval is not achievable by XX XXX 24 (level 0 Plan says QX 2025/26); and Contract Award will not meet the XX XXX 24 deadline (level 0 Plan says QX 2025/26. This is significant because of scheduled changes in senior leadership of the Programme during 2024 and handover of accountability. The Programme Director is to be replaced in XXX 2024 and the SRO in XXX 2024.

Well qualified and experienced successors to the SRO and Programme Director have already been identified, with sensible plans for handover and transfer of knowledge and relationship management. The current SRO and Programme Director have provided constant and solid leadership for the Programme Team, even despite delays. Knowledgeable of the ORGANISATION need of course, they have navigated difficult political issues, sustained industry relationships, created a positive “one team” culture across the Programme Team and all its stakeholders. Of note is the highly productive and effective relationship with the TLB NAME delivery team leadership. These successor appointments are critical for maintaining progress, confidence in the Programme and achieving FBC approval and contractor award as planned. It is therefore important that the 2 successors already identified are provided to XXXXXX, at the agreed dates. Any changes to this plan should be escalated urgently.

Recommendation 1: Head of the SERVICE's Programme and Change Portfolio Office must track and monitor that the succession plan for XXXXXX SRO and Programme Director is fully executed.

Delays and media interest in XXXXXX have created strain on the Programme Teams relationship with potential bidders. Market engagement started in XX XXX 2021 with XXXXXX release on XX XXX 2022. During the recent delays there has been media interest and messaging which has been beyond the Programme's control. The Programme team has done its best to maintain positive relationships whilst the decision about evaluation approach was resolved. All 3 bidders have told the Programme team they are under increasing pressure from parent companies to confirm the ITN release date. There is a strong inference that holding onto bid teams cannot continue indefinitely and this risk should not be ignored. If bid teams were to be stood down, it will take industry longer to provide quality proposals and make it more difficult to sustain the XXXXXX plan, post ITN release.

5.2 Progress against recommendations from XX XXX 23 PAR

The Programme has been carefully tracking progress in implementing recommendations from the XX XXX 23 review. The RT reviewed a table which provided frequent updates on progress towards all 7 recommendations to IPA in XXX, XXX, XXX and XXX.

5.2.1 XX XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 1:

In considering the approach to bid evaluation the focus should be on delivery of the requirement, at best value for money and commitments which provide the UK with operational independence.

This recommendation has been addressed. Now the weighted approach is agreed, the team have finalised the evaluation criteria to balance value for money, with operational performance.

Deciding the competition evaluation criteria and weightings has been important focus for finalising the commercial documents, heavily underpinned by the cost modelling and with input from external legal advisors (CONTRACTOR NAME) closely incorporated. It has been a robust process and is ready for final review and approval. The team has designed the approach to balance the technical requirement with operational independence (especially focused on design), resilience and reduced levels of unavailability- whilst incentivising the max number of platforms, fast pace of delivery and living with the agreed funding profile. Despite the complexity of this (and the sophistication of modelling that underpins it), criteria are mature. They have been reduced back to focus on the priority requirements and language simplified to avoid ambiguity. There has been a specific attempt to limit the number of pass-fail criteria to mandatory requirements, legislative or regulatory aspects, required insurance and security, as this maximises the trade-space for suppliers. As well as the modelling and additional legal expertise from CONTRACTOR NAME, a high level of market insight has been applied to deciding these criteria, for ensuring a fair and open competition and mitigating risks of legal challenge. Best and emerging practice in industrial participation from other programmes has also been sought (for example PROJECT and PROJECT), to challenge and validate the XXXXXX Team thinking.

The evaluation criteria in summary:

- Time and delivery confidence is 8% (50% of which is on time delivery)
- Technical is 40% (25% of which is number of EQUIPMENT)
- Support is 17% (60% of which is support solution)
- Commercial is 10%

- Social value is 10%
- UK Industrial contribution is 15% (with greater relative weighting to UK onshore Design Organisation capability)

5.2.2 XX XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 2 & 3:

The PD to assess the likelihood of delivering the minimum viable fleet under current economic conditions for the two stated approaches.

AND

XX XXX 23 Recommendation 3: The PD to review affordability taking account delays in the issue of the ITN and any change in approach.

These recommendations have been addressed. Taking these two recommendations together, now reduced in scope with the team focused on the weighted approach, there has been new work with the cost model to update the analysis of likely fleet size and affordability. Designed originally in 2020 by the XXXXXX TLB NAME delivery team, the cost model has undergone continued improvement, has been reviewed and tested by TEAM NAME. This is a detailed cost model, and the RT leader was given a walk-through of the current instance. It has been built on a rich data set derived from historic parametric comparisons for EQUIPMENT, EQUIPMENT and EQUIPMENT, to increase confidence in the cost estimation analysis. This is a sophisticated and well understood model, originally developed for the weighted evaluation approach, so well-tuned into addressing the commercial approach that is now proposed by the Team.

Since the last review, the latest Economic inflation figures and a meaningful schedule have been factored in to assess impact on platforms numbers, funding profile and timing of introduction to service. The analysis suggests that XXXXXX EQUIPMENT can still be delivered (which is above the XXXXXX minimum of XXXXXX) within the ABC 22 provision and therefore the Programme Team are confident a minimum viable fleet is still achievable.

The commercial and value management approach are designed to ensure the budget will not be exceeded. The budget is set, and the fleet size is the main trade-space which the bidders are empowered to judge, along with UK content.

If no bid proposes sufficient EQUIPMENT, the Programme team plan to take the proposition back to XXXXXX. Time to do this is included in the schedule for the final evaluation, and before the FBC is submitted. To reduce the risk of declaring a failed competition (if all 3 bids are non-compliant), the competition threshold has been set at XXXXXX EQUIPMENT vice XXXXXX EQUIPMENT. However, it is important to say that the Programme leadership across SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME are confident this will not be necessary.

5.2.3 XX XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 4:

The OBC should identify the additional cost and benefits of the UK content approach to demonstrate improved Value for Money.

With agreement on the weighted evaluation option, the additional work suggested by this recommendation has not been needed.

The criteria and threshold for the weighted evaluation will still require all XXXXXX interested bidders to increase UK footprint to do well in the competition, and bidders will need to demonstrate how the footprint they propose will deliver the greater operational independence being sought by ORGANISATION. However, it gives the

bidders freedom to decide where and how to do this and this provides greater likelihood of being able to deliver the minimum viable fleet within the approved budget profile.

The RT notes that the OBC remains version 2.1, dated XX XXX 23. This version includes both evaluation approaches as it predates the XX XXX decision. We heard the Programme has decided not to update the OBC and remove Approach 1, as this change would trigger another round of scrutiny and approvals within ORGANISATION and delay the Programme even further. The Programme argues that the strategic, economic, financial, commercial and management cases do not need to be modified as they were designed for the weighted evaluation (Approach 2 in the OBC). However, the RT is concerned that V2.1 of the OBC might cause confusion and suggests the Programme take further advise on how to handle this situation - to ensure the Programme has a clear and unambiguous record of the case for XXXXXX and any misperceptions (now or in the future) are avoided.

Recommendation 2: XXXXXX SRO should take advise on how to provide a clear OBC and an unambiguous record for the Programme, without incurring increased cost or delay.

Unusually, the OBC does not present any detailed analysis of the impact of Programme failure or significant delay in XXXXXX, even though it states that fall-back options are limited. The RT understand this is the case because XXXXXX is one component of a broader rotary strategy refresh that is being prepared by others, and to inform a future Integrated review. Nevertheless, in the preparation for the FBC, it may be worth including the analysis of Programme delay or in the unlikely event that the competition unravels or becomes redefined into a broader future strategy to ensure decision making remains coherent.

Recommendation 3: After OBC approval and as part of FBC preparation, XXXXXX SRO should consider whether the full financial, commercial, social value, operational and ORGANISATION consequences of failure or delay of XXXXXX should be set out in the FBC, in case of need.

5.2.4 XX XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 5:

The Programme Team to update the Risk Management Strategy and align SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME approaches.

This recommendation has been addressed.

Risk management is improving. Improvements are being implemented helping to make and sustain improvements to risk management collaboratively between SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME. The XX XXX 23 PAR reported that the SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME used different programme management tools (POL and ARM respectively). This makes it difficult to maintain a holistic view of programme risks, to transfer risks, escalate or de-escalate risk between different owners, in different organisations. Switching to a common tool has been explored, but it is not feasible at this time, for SERVICE HQ & TLB NAME to use the same risk management toolset. The 2 organisations are separately governed, and each require their programmes to report in different ways. Therefore, what the Programme has done is to develop a common approach, language, methodology and practices, to ensure there can be effective transfer of risk ownership or escalation of risks between the different systems, and that there is a single version of the truth. This is documented in an updated and approved Risk Management Plan. Programme leaders across the SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME delivery partner are committed to making this work effectively.

Further work is ongoing to bring the operational procedures for reporting and managing Assumptions, Issues, Dependencies and Opportunities to the same standard and level of collaboration. This builds on the PAR's recommendation to improvement risk management but extends the scope. It demonstrates the team is going beyond what the PAR recommended.

5.2.5 XX XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 6:

SRO to ensure recruitment of in-house SQEP P³M resources with capability to update and maintain programme artefacts.

This recommendation is being addressed. Programme management capacity and capability is improving. Programme leadership have been taking action to recruit, but accept resources are still not where they should ideally be. This is not judged by the Programme to be an intolerable risk at this point.

Leadership has been proactive in addressing gaps, but recruitment continues to be a struggle and has been delayed by the Civil Service Recruitment Freeze. XXXXXX has secured some exemptions to the Recruitment Freeze, but at the time of this review, new recruits have yet to arrive and the time to onboard is reported to be very slow. Gaining these exemptions consumes a lot of management time and the situation is further compounded by ORGANISATION-wide RDEL pressures which means contractors cannot be extended to help bridge gaps. Nevertheless, the Programme has active training plans to upskill people and through the collaboration trial, TLB NAME are assisting the SERVICE HQ Programme team to plug gaps.

There has been impressive work on developing a properly integrated schedule across all DLODs with TLB NAME leaning in to support SERVICE HQ, to help ensure quality and robustness. The SERVICE HQ team remain under resourced to do all that is needed to maintain a full integrated schedule across all the projects in this programme. The integrated Programme schedule is held by TLB NAME – SERVICE members of the Programme team have view access to it; TLB NAME manage the changes.

Despite management effort, gapped posts remain and there is a lack of suitably qualified people available. Programme leadership feel able to manage this situation and appreciate they have less shortages and challenges than other SERVICE Programmes. The RT understands these continued shortfalls in professional expertise for Programme Management is a strategic issue for the SERVICE. What is different here is how effective the TLB NAME delivery team has been on close collaboration and leaning in to help fill high priority gaps.

Beyond P3M, “Resource and workforce capability delays delivery” is one of 5 top risks reported to the XXXXXX Programme Board #7, XX XXX 2023. In the short term (meaning QX 2023/24):

- Only two projects in the Programme – Equipment Delivery and Fielding - are reporting Green (resourced).
 - Since the last PAR, 11 personnel have been appointed to the TEAM. This provides some extra capacity to offset certain gaps in the PMO, even if P3M skills are limited.
 - Although one project Equipment delivery turns amber at the start of next FY as it waits for the outcome of FCR for RDEL budget availability. However, the risk of not getting this approved is deemed minimal.
- Three projects - XXXXXX, XXXXXX and XXXXXX are reporting Amber (resource gaps but mitigation plan agreed).

- Project XXXXXX Interfaces is reporting red (critical resources shortfall with no mitigation plan).

The RT also heard some concerns about whether the TLB NAME team will be able to keep the commercial team together and the negative impact that replacement personnel would have on the negotiation and evaluation phases. The commercial team (even with one gapped post currently) are doing a good job and are working well with their independent legal advisor, CONTRACTOR NAME. I received some assurance that this team was being protected for this programme, as it is a high priority.

Whilst being innovative and creative about filling resource gaps today, having access to qualified and experience people will remain a critical determinant for a successful outcome from this Programme. The RT encourages Programme leadership to continue to be innovative in mitigate resource risks within the Programme: to continue to collaborate, train and develop people, to make optimum use of resources they have and share expertise between SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME. The SRO, Programme Director and TLB NAME XXXXXX Delivery Team Leader need also to remain on top of resource needs as the Programme progresses and always be able to anticipate these sufficiently far in advance. Both SERVICE HQ and TLB NAME need to continue to prioritise this Programme and ensure it has the resources it needs to deliver successfully.

Recommendation 4a: Head of the SERVICE's Programme & Change Portfolio Office should continue to prioritise this Programme for the resources it needs, to enable the XXXXXX RO and Programme Director to deliver it successfully.

Recommendation 4b: TLB NAME Director Helicopters should continue to prioritise this Programme for the resources it needs, to enable the TLB NAME XXXXXX Delivery Team Leader and the XXXXXX SRO and Programme Director, to deliver it successfully.

5.2.6 XXX 23 PAR Recommendation 7:

The Programme must consider how to monitor UK content and any export undertakings in the event that the direction changes.

This recommendation has been addressed.

The Programme Team understand they need to monitor and hold any UK industrial commitments to account through contract management, to ensure industrial contributions proposed and accepted are followed through. The RT found that auditable but also pragmatic and semi-independent means to do this are being developed. For example, the TEAM NAME approvals system is proposed to be used to ensure compliance, e.g., if a supplier is awarded credit for an onshore Design Organisation.

5.3 Commercial readiness

The ITN pack and supporting commercial documents are more mature that at the XXX 23 PAR. They have been developed by the TLB NAME Delivery Team with the support of external legal advisors (CONTRACTOR NAME). CONTRACTOR NAME 2 are supporting in the specialist area of the levels of insurance required. CONTRACTOR NAME have played an important role in the team, with unrestricted scope, and have been involved with all ITN documents, requirements and contract documents as well as evaluation criteria and weightings. They understand the commercial intent in the round and have been engaged strategically and on detail. The RT heard from the Partner in charge that the XXXXXX team

have been receptive to challenge and, in their view, the ITN documentation is in a better place for ITN release than the firm has seen in other ORGANISATION teams.

The team has applied best practice and broader experience from other Programmes into the draft contract and schedules and it has been outward and forward looking in mindset. For example, the external legal advisors (CONTRACTOR NAME) have bought commercial dispute specialists and litigators into the team, to ensure that potential downstream contract management issues and implications are bought into consideration at this early drafting stage. Commercial leadership in TLB NAME has stressed the importance of simplicity and clarity in all drafting, which all helps to enable contractors to prepare accurate proposals and fair open competition and decrease clarification questions.

The process of preparing, getting SME agreement, quality control and finalisation has been well managed. Good advantage has been taken of the delays in the programme, to work through the ITN suite of documents (plus supporting commercial, evaluation and negotiation strategies and plans) and develop these to a mature status. All commercial documents have been subject to several TLB NAME reviews (Red Team & Peer Review) during their build, plus a CONTRACTOR NAME Review (including for a Legal Assurance Note).

The RT heard strong faith in the XXXXXX commercial team and what they have achieved together with all subject matter experts across the Programme. TLB NAME commercial officers and the external legal advisors (CONTRACTOR NAME) have all told the RT they have confidence in the commercial documents developed by the programme and how well the team has worked together (commercial and subject matter experts) to achieve the level of maturity they have. The one team away days were mentioned several times as instrumental in developing the closely knit programme and stakeholder team. This enables robust conversation and challenge without tension, and this has driven quality and understanding up.

At the start of this Review, the contract was near finalisation. In a status report to the RT dated XX XXX XX, 23 of 35 schedules were final and approved (in the XXXXXX team), ten were near to finalisation, and 2 were in progress (insurance and shared data were the least developed).

During the Review, the RT Lead observed two half day team sessions seeking to finalise the multiple documents that comprise Schedule 2 – the statement of requirement. This involved a multi-disciplinary team of experts from TLB NAME (engineering, project management, integrated logistics and commercial together with CONTRACTOR NAME (Partner level). Over 6 hours, these sessions undertook a detailed and final check on the whole of Schedule 2. This includes the Parent SOR, XXX System Delivery SOR, Support SOR and Training SOR. There was an emphasis on clarity of language, removing inconsistency and ambiguity, checking defined terms and cross references. A few final conflicts between schedules and requirements were identified and removed, but this was not extensive. There was clear focus on managing the scope of requirements; putting bounds on things wherever possible to minimise scope for clarification questions or higher price/risk in bids. Anything superfluous was deleted and items consolidated into the most appropriate schedule. The team performing this review demonstrated a high level of familiarity with all schedules and were open to challenge and advise from the legal partner. It was a careful and thorough review process with different points of view represented and discussed, with no visible tension in the team. Agreement was reached on all items with only a few minor actions left outstanding, to be closed outside the meeting. Whilst refinements were agreed, no missing or inaccurate items in the SOW were identified.

The TLB NAME XXXXXX Delivery Team Leader was driving for completion of all ITN documents by XX XXX XX, meaning the ITN product set and supporting strategies and plans will be in good shape and ready for final review and approvals early in 2024. At the final meeting of this Review with the SRO (on XX XXX XX), it was confirmed this deadline had been met. To avoid further delay, the RT recommends all outstanding commercial reviews are scheduled for XX XXX XX, so that all assurance is brought together and available for the MPRG consideration and decision at the MPRG in XX XXX 24.

Recommendation 5: XXXXXX SRO should ensure the team organises all outstanding commercial reviews that are needed (ORGANISATION and ORGANISATION 2) before the MPRG so that all assurance and scrutiny is available for a decision on XX XXX XX.

A rigorous approach has been taken to market engagement to regain “one voice to suppliers”. Market engagement has been challenging during the recent delay, with media interest. The team has sensibly focused on maintaining its single voice to bidders, maintaining clear and consistent updates. This includes: maintaining a regular communication bulletin (with disciplined management control of information released); continued industry events; early controlled release of some further information (to provide bid teams content in the hope they will not be stood down); and focused bilaterals with key suppliers (and involving the strategic supplier partnership team).

Beyond the ITN documents, there are several other commercial plans and strategies which are well advanced for this stage, and in a good position to be evolved as the Programme moves forward. The approach to evaluation has been set out, already identifying the experts that will be evaluators and moderators (with appropriate separation of duties). Dedicated team training will be undertaken, including for those who may consider themselves to be expert, to ensure consistency throughout. The responsibilities and expectations of each evaluator will be set out and formally accepted through signature. A robust system has been defined for managing the documentation, ensuring evaluators see what they are meant to and not beyond. The negotiation strategy has been designed to maximise the number of platforms for the budget.

6. Areas of good practice

This has been a restricted scope review focused on commercials, but the RT recognises one key area of good practice.

	Describe specific details of successful delivery
--	--

1	<p>One team approach. This Programme Team continue to work collaboratively across organisation boundaries, and this is maintaining a healthy team culture. Prior reviews have also acknowledged this strength of the team and of leadership.</p> <p>Despite resource gaps, this is helping the team to maintain momentum and, in the future, will assist resilience and sustainability. Team away days have been effective at forming a strong bond between the Programme team, TLB NAME, TLB NAME and other Stakeholders. The collaboration pilot has delivered added value to many aspects of the Programme – effectiveness of programme management and through to the level of healthy interdisciplinary working necessary to get the draft contract and schedules right.</p> <p>It is key that future leaders of this Programme maintain this standard of collaboration and leadership.</p>
---	---

7. Acknowledgement

Review Team Acknowledgement
<p>The RT appreciate there has been a lot of assurance on the OBC for this programme. Despite this, the team have been diligent and energetic in providing information, answering specific questions and responding to queries.</p> <p>Allowing the RT leader to observe 6 hours of commercial reviews between the team and its independent legal advisors (CONTRACTOR NAME) provided a deeper way to assess the maturity of the ITN set and the team's performance. Thank you for having the confidence to afford me this access.</p>

8. Next Assurance Review

Next Assurance Review
FBC approval

9. Additional Information for the MPRG panel

This section builds on the lines of Enquiry developed in the XXX 23 PAR, updated and reordered in the light of this update Review.

Issue 1 Will the commercial approach (contract structure and weighted evaluation approach) deliver the key ORGANISATION needs (fleet numbers, operational independence and scope of supply)?

Evidence and findings

The team has matured its commercial approach. This is underpinned by updated cost modelling (taking account of economic conditions and delays in OBC and ITN release) and continued market engagement.

MPRG needs to be satisfied the approach will deliver the core ORGANISATION requirement and provide for 5 years of support, that it will be affordable, and that the ability to recompute the support solution successfully after 5 years is built into the approach.

Also, that the risk of legal challenge is being managed in the best way.

Suggested lines of enquiry

Explore how the approach protects value for money and delivers the minimum viable fleet numbers in the timeframe needed.

Issue 2 Delivering the ORGANISATION STRATEGY

Evidence and findings

In addition to rationalising the fleet, XXXXXX is also to deliver STRATEGY – to influence international programmes, contribute to UK prosperity and social value. With the decision to apply the weighted approach, the MPRG might wish to explore how the draft contract, and system of evaluation criteria, weightings and thresholds that is now proposed by the Programme team, achieves these objectives.

Suggested lines of enquiry

Explore the weighted approach to determine whether it meets the intended STRATEGY objectives in terms of providing the operational independence.

Determine there is nothing substantive in the STRATEGY, Land Industrial Strategy or STRATEGY 2 that the weighting approach is failing to properly address.

Issue 3 Ensuring the Programme has the resources it needs to progress.

Evidence and findings

This review has on the one hand found that Programme leadership have been proactive and resourceful in accessing the people with the skills and experience needed, at all levels. They have also been resourceful in using the P3M experts they do have to unify and make management processes effective.

However, the reality is that there are still resource gaps being reported, with one project XXXXXX Interfaces reporting red on resources to the Programme Board in XX XXX 2023.

Furthermore, the SRO and Programme Director are due to be changed during 2024 and specific successors for both positions have already been identified. And there are concerns that the Programme may not be able to protect the commercial team in TLB NAME who are well set up to manage the next phase of the Programme but might be moved to other higher priority programmes.

The MPRG might want to explore how confident the Programme leadership feel, that sufficient and the right resources will be available, and that gaps and shortages do not

represent an intolerable risk for the next phase of the Programme, and to achieving FBC approval. Once OBC approval is achieved and the competition is underway, this Programme needs to ensure it makes progress in all its projects, to be able to optimise its FBC.

Suggested lines of enquiry

Does the Programme leadership feel confident they will have the leadership and resources they need to progress beyond OBC approval and to achieve FBC?

Is SERVICE HR, TLB NAME, and other key stakeholder organisations giving the right support and priority to this Programme?

ANNEX A – Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) Descriptions

From XX XXX 2021, the IPA has moved to a 3 tier SGA RAG status (Red, Amber, Green). The SGA will be based on the following definitions:

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 ORGANISATION 3 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 - Terms of Reference for Review

This Review is primarily to provide assurance regarding commercial products for the MPRG for XX XXX 24. The MPRG will consider the XXXXXX Programme's Outline Business Case (OBC), approval of which will enable Invitation-to-Negotiate (ITN) release. The Programme's intent is to release the ITN as soon as possible after OBC approval; hence, there is a focus on the commercial readiness to launch the competition.

Assurance and Approvals

Since XX XXX 22, the OBC has been subject to two ORGANISATION-led scrutiny reviews, an IPA Gate 2 Review (Red Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)), an IPA Independent Peer Review, an Assurance of Action Plan (AAP) Review (Amber SGA) and a PAR in XX XXX 23. The PAR provided an independent view on two approaches to treating UK Industrial Capability within the XXXXXX competition. The two approaches were: 1) XXXXXX intent to mandate onshore production and a minimum threshold of 25% for UK work content, and 2) the Programme's recommended approach of incentivising onshore industrial investment through the inclusion of weighted criteria (this approach also received the IAC's endorsement).

Although the PAR reported a Red SGA, the report provided separate SGAs against each approach. The Red SGA reflected the existing impasse with no agreed ORGANISATION position on which approach to use for the competition, compounded by a concern that XXXXXX intent (Approach 1)) would increase Accounting Officer risk to intolerable levels. The RT concluded that *"A decision to use the evaluation approach approved by the Department's Investment Approvals Committee (IAC) [Approach 2, the 'weighted approach'] would cause the RT to consider the rating AMBER..."* [but] *"...Should the proposal be to apply a mandatory minimum UK content to the platforms then, on the evidence presented, the RT would deem the SGA as remaining RED"* (i.e., Approach 1)). Because the Red SGA was dependent upon which competition approach ORGANISATION ultimately adopted, it did not invoke an AAP.

The Review Team's (RT) conclusion aligned with the SRO's position and supported the Accounting Officer's Assessment of the Pass/Fail approach. The RT's findings were referenced in a revised OBC. Subsequently, XXXXXX has agreed to revert to the programme's recommended position and OBC approval using the Weighted Approach has been requested from ORGANISATION 3.

This agreement of a unified ORGANISATION position on competition evaluation criteria addresses a key concern from the PAR. However, the desk-top review is required to assess the readiness to launch a successful competition, primarily by assessing the ITN commercial products (which were yet to be finalised at the time of the XX XXX 23 PAR).

Background

The XXXXXX programme intends to rationalise up to five REQUIREMENTS into one EQUIPMENT-type; maximising commonality to improve efficiency and operational flexibility. XXXXXX is required to address current and impending gaps in medium lift rotary wing capability, providing a multi-role platform to operate in all environments. ORGANISATION has pursued commercial or modified off-the-shelf (COTS/MOTS) competitive procurement. The Programme's Whole Life Costs until 2040 is estimated to be £XXXXXXX at 50% confidence.

Situation

To meet the intent of the STRATEGY and the STRATEGY 2 ORGANISATION is seeking to use XXXXXX procurement to maintain a UK XXXX XXXX Design and Manufacture base to maximise the likelihood of XXXXXX maintaining Operational Independence from a XXXX XXXX perspective (as per STRATEGY intent). As such it is intended to include a 15% weighting for UK Industrial Contribution (in addition to the ORGANISATION 2 mandated for 10% for Social Value) within the Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) competition criteria. The UK Industrial Contribution weighting will provide additional credit to suppliers who decide to invest in onshore Design, Production and Maintenance facilities, as well as undertaking to use these facilities for any subsequent Export orders.

IPA and ORGANISATION 3 believe that the outcome of the XXXXXX OBC approval point will set a precedent for future ORGANISATION major programme commercial decisions, especially those with a STRATEGY/onshoring of ORGANISATION industrial capability angle, and therefore MPRG level scrutiny against the approval has been agreed.

Review Focus Areas

Noting the above situation and significant amount of scrutiny and assurance already undertaken on the Programme, this short review to support the forthcoming MPRG:

- (1) This is a deliberately 'light touch' review, which will focus primarily on confirmation that the PAR recommendations have been progressed and that there have been no fundamental changes to the programme.
- (2) A review of the commercial products, in advance of submission to the ORGANISATION 2, is required to provide assurance to SRO of readiness to commence the competition.
- (3) Any significant risks or blockers to a successful competition.
- (4) The RT are invited to provide suggested commercial-focused lines of enquiry to inform the Programme's forthcoming MPRG.
- (5) A re-evaluation of the programme's Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) to reflect the current position.

ANNEX C - Background

Question	Answer
The aims of the programme	<p>The Programme intends to rationalise up to three REQUIREMENTS into one EQUIPMENT-type; maximising commonality to improve efficiency and operational flexibility. There is a pressing need to treat existing gaps and capability cliff edges and the EQUIPMENT needs to enter service as quickly as possible. The user requires a multi-role platform to operate in all environments. An open architecture is required to allow for rapid employment of different role-fits and carry-on equipment. This will also allow for future development to meet the demands of a changing threat environment. The XXXXXX requirement is compliant with revised draft ORGANISATION Planning Assumptions (DPAs). The Concept Phase has confirmed the credibility of a competition to meet threshold requirements with available off the shelf solutions and LOCATION has been confirmed as the XXXXXX Main Operating Base (MOB). The programme intends to enter the Assessment Phase and to progress to Contract Award by conducting a competition through the release of an Invitation-to-Negotiate (ITN). The XXXXXX programme aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Procure a modernised XXXX XXXX to meet the pan-ORGANISATION future operational requirements to at least 2040. b) Treat the TLB NAME 2 capability gap, removing the requirement to double-hat XXXXXX against ORGANISATION and ORGANISATION requirements. <p>Drive operational, training & support efficiencies by rationalising four fleets and regenerating the LAH capability into a single EQUIPMENT-type</p>
Reasons for programme's existence, by type and description	<p>The XXXXXX programme is required to provide the ORGANISATION with a medium XXX XXX capability for use by both SERVICE and the Special Users. Both capabilities are currently gapped and require rapid resolution to avoid continued reliance on other aviation capabilities that are either not optimised for these tasks or are already over-committed. In addition, it will provide a replacement EQUIPMENT to conduct UK STRATEGIC activities when the XXXXXX retires in 2029. The UK, as part of UK/INTERNATIONAL PARTNER staff collaboration, has agreed five bilateral interoperability and modernisation priorities including consideration of a medium helicopter as part of the XXXXXX programme and is also a signatory to the ORGANISATION 4-led PROGRAMME. However, even if the UK were to procure one of these resultant EQUIPMENT-types neither are likely to be available until approximately 2035-2040 and yet existing capabilities have cliff edges in the first and second epochs.</p>
Impact if the programme fails to deliver	<p>If the project/programme fails to deliver the existing capability gaps will endure for the long term, and there would be a lack of rotary wing support to UK CT by 2029. This would present a significant capability impact and goes against the expectation that the UK will operate in a state of constant competition, as outlined in the IOpC framework. TEAM NAME have previously advised their other capabilities are committed and do not have the capacity to backfill medium helicopters. Moreover, even if capacity existed there will be tasks, in complex urban environment that could not be conducted by EQUIPMENT or EQUIPMENT.</p>
Programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies:	<p>Social Value and UK Contribution. XXXXXX seeks to apply a hybrid approach to Social Value in accordance with Government policy, as expressed through the ORGANISATION and Security Industrial Strategy and the Land Industrial Strategy. The criteria will be tailored to require UK Social Value as opposed to geographically agnostic Social Value.</p> <p>Environmental Protection (EP) legislation. The XXXXXX programme will be compliant with relevant Environmental Protection (EP) legislation. The procurement of a modern PLATFORM, over legacy platforms, will greatly reduce environmental impact of</p>

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

	<p>operation of the system. XXXXXX is likely to make use of modern turboshafts as its main source of propulsion; improving fuel efficiency when compared to legacy systems. A through-life spiral upgrade programme, reliant on an open EQUIPMENT architecture, may be able to make use of emerging technologies and concepts such as greater levels of electrification, hybrid-electric drives and increased used of biofuels to reduce reliance on fossil fuels. A fully electric EQUIPMENT is unrealistic in the given timescales, but this assumption will be tested with ORGANISATION and industry engagement. The support provision across all DLoDs will consider EP and sustainability.</p> <p>Safety. Mandatory certification, through the TEAM NAME, legislative and safety requirement to allow XXXXXX to operate across all domains and roles. XXXXXX must also be compliant with all H&S requirements, across all DLoD capability delivery.</p>
Programme interdependencies:	<p>Realisation of the XXXXXX outcomes and benefits is dependent on several external programmes. Understanding and managing the potential for these dependencies to impact on the programme is recorded on SERVICE PoL. The key dependencies for XXXXXX are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Business case approval (OBC and FBC) b) Programme Organisational Requirement (creation of Joint force across SERVICE and SERVICE) c) Infrastructure d) Information Communication Systems (ICS) e) TEAM NAME
SRO Osmotherley letter	<p>No. The XXXXXX Programme Mandate has yet to issued (awaiting XXXXXX approval). SRO appointment letter issued by XXXXXX on XX XXX 23.</p>
Procurement/delivery status	<p>Procurement Strategy. The XXXXXX Procurement Strategy recommended a competition for a single contract, in accordance with ORGANISATION and Security Public Contract Regulations 2011 (DSPCR 2011), for the procurement and delivery of the air system, design integration of Mission Role Equipment (MRE), training simulators, training services and an initial period of support.</p> <p>Early Market Engagement. EME has concluded that a competition is credible to meet threshold requirements with available C/MOT'S solutions and that the most likely candidate suppliers had appropriate resource and manufacturing capacity to deliver the programme; hence industry's ability to deliver the programme is not considered a principal risk. Threshold and Objective requirements have been tested through EME and endorsed by the ORGANISATION's XXXXXX committee.</p> <p>Value Management. The affordability risk will be further controlled by applying the principles of Value Management, whereby the Authority intends to disclose the budgetary profile and delivery timeframe in the competition, and transfer performance trade space to industry. Emphasis will be on industry to apply innovation in its proposals alongside performance trade, to deliver an affordable bid that meets the KURs.</p> <p>Social Value will be supplemented with specific UK centric requirements to achieve the aims of the STRATEGY 2 to sustain a minimum onshore Design Organisation (DO) and engineering base. This seeks to preserve operational independence and freedom of action, generating UK jobs and prosperity.</p> <p>Commercial Strategy. The programme's Commercial Strategy received ORGANISATION 2 endorsement to proceed to Formal Market Engagement ahead of OBC. The CN and XXXXXX have been issued, the results of which have been used to down select a list of credible suppliers. The XXXXXX assessed each candidate supplier's financial standing to better understand their ability to deliver XXXXXX.</p>

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

OFFICIAL (REDACTED AND ANONYMISED)

	Competition Phase. The competition will be run on a restricted basis inviting only those pre-qualified suppliers that pass the XXXXXX to participate in a competitive negotiated procedure. This will entail the suppliers responding to the ITN with initial bids within 6 months of ITN issue which will be assessed against the award criteria to inform negotiations. Following negotiations, the suppliers will submit final bids with the winner being the best technically affordable bid as judged against the award criteria. This approach will ensure that XXXXXX delivers the maximum number of EQUIPMENT for the available budget.
Funding / Business Case:	XXXXXX programme is seeking approval for OBC. SOC approved by IAC XX XXX 21. OBC endorsed by IAC in XX XXX 23. ORGANISATION Secretary endorsed the OBC and agreed that the competition should employ the Weighted approach to UK Industrial Capability (Approach 2) and wrote to CST to request approval in XX XXX 23.
IAAP	AAP is in place and approved by SRO.
Programme & Project plans:	Does the project / programme have an appropriate plan in place? Yes Has the plan been baselined? Please include who signed it off etc. Yes - SRO
IPA assurance reviews:	This is the second review for the XXXXXX programme.

ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review

This has been covered in the body of the report.

ANNEX E – List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

Name	Organisation and role
XXX XXX	XXX XXX
XXX XXX	XXX XXX
XXX XXX	XXX XXX
XXX XXX	XXX XXX
XXX XXX	XXX XXX

ANNEX F – Recommendation Classifications and Priority Order

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. [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.]

