



**Ministry
of Defence**

**OGC Gateway™ Review
Gate 0/4 hybrid**

Version Number:	1.0 FINAL
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	XXXX XXXX
Date of Osmotherley Appointment letter issued to SRO:	XX XXX XX
Has SRO completed the Major Projects Leadership Academy?	Yes, SRO has completed the MPLA
Programme/Project Director:	XXXX XXXX
Review Dates:	DAY/YEAR/MONTH to DAY/YEAR/MONTH
Review Team Leader:	XXXX XXXX
Review Team Members:	XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX
Report Distribution	Final report: SRO, Accounting Officer via the MOD IA Hub, HMT
Previous Review:	Gate 0/4 hybrid DAY/YEAR/MONTH to DAY/YEAR/MONTH DCA : Amber
Review ID Number (For MOD IA Hub use only)	XXXX/XXXX

Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA)

See Annex A for DCA criteria and definition

<u>Delivery Confidence Assessment:</u>	Amber/Green
<p>The Delivery Confidence Assessment is rated Amber/Green because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the successful delivery of XXXXX v1 appears probable, though some residual risks remain.• good progress is being made in preparation for the subsequent migration to v2. Risks pertaining to connectivity remain though their resolution appears to be in hand. <p>A number of risks to delivery require prompt resolution if they are not to escalate into issues that would reduce delivery confidence. Those risks lie mainly in resetting the working relationship between the Programme Team and the DELIVERY TEAM, the confidence in the delivery schedule and the ever-present challenges faced by DELIVERY TEAM in respect of staff capacity.</p> <p>The XXXXX Programme has been running now for some considerable time and supports the non-discretionary Defence Task NUMBER. Having endured significant difficulty along the way, the Programme is now poised to deliver successfully. The Review Team observes a very high degree of dedication and commitment, a strong desire to succeed and a work ethic geared towards delivery. As success approaches it will be important to guard against over-stretching elements of the team who are working at or close to their capacity.</p>	

Summary of Concerns, Evidence and Recommendations

Priority	Risks* Identified with Evidence and Recommendations	Classification Insert Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Target Date
1	There is a risk that lack of an agreed programme integrated master schedule and a set of risk-adjusted programme milestones could cause a lack of clarity between stakeholders and impede delivery.	3. Programme & Project Management	Critical	
	<u>Recommendation 1</u> : Work with DELIVERY TEAM to revise the detailed integrated master schedule, including non-CONTRACTOR NAME deliverables/dependencies and conduct a four-way (non-commercial) workshop (TLB NAME PMO / DELIVERY TEAM / CONTRACTOR NAME / OTHER TLB NAME) to discuss in detail (with focus on period beyond IOC) and 'get all delivery partners on the same page'.			End July 2021
2	There is a risk that failure to stay on top of the OTHER TLB NAME relationship will affect the onward relationship with COMPANY NAME and thus lead to further delay and uncertainty.	7. Commercial Strategy & Management	Critical	
	<u>Recommendation 2</u> : Maintain active relationship with OTHER TLB NAME to make sure that the solution for V2 remains on track for the V2 UK XXXXX FOC (beyond LOCATION FIVE).			Ongoing
3	If left unresolved, current points of friction between TLB NAME Cmd and the DELIVERY TEAM could present		Critical	

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

	the risk of further loss of confidence and thus impede delivery.	3. Programme & Project Management		
	<u>Recommendation 3:</u> Hold a 'clear the air' session between TLB NAME PMO and DELIVERY TEAM to agree engagement protocols, including with CONTRACTOR NAME.			End July 2021
4	If the master schedule does not adequately reflect the dependencies for all partners in the delivery chain, this could result in unnecessary ongoing changes to the schedule and the implications that entails.	3. Programme & Project Management	Essential	
	<u>Recommendation 5:</u> Confirm the resource (money and SQEP) parameters for delivery of v2 and ensure that the integrated master schedule identifies the critical path, risk adjusted to cater for implementation dependencies across all partners in the delivery chain. Engage with the end user operator community to confirm that user needs are met in the current v2 design.			End 2021
5	Resource overstretch presents a significant risk to delivery and there ought to be an opportunity to 'pause, breathe and review' after XXXXX v1 completion in readiness for the challenges of v2.	10. Resource & Skills Management	Recommended	
	<u>Recommendation 4:</u> Request DELIVERY TEAM produce a simple staff succession plan to outline the approach to resolving current and anticipated resource shortages and moves (specifically, staff on temporary promotion and provision of EDP technical support).			ASAP

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

Comments from the SRO

Although XXXXX is not the biggest programme in the TLB NAME portfolio, the pivotal role it plays regarding the execution of DT1 means that success is critical and non-discretionary. As ever, having 4 independent SMEs conducting an impartial, objective review will be of benefit to both the Programme and those involved with it, and will do much to keep the Programme on track towards a successful conclusion. My thanks go to all the Review Team members for their considerable efforts and for the pragmatic approach they have adopted throughout.

Review Team findings and recommendations

Background Context

Previous Gateway Reviews recorded that:

XXXXXX is a Programme to deliver against a non-discretionary Capability for the UK. It is the future TLB NAME PROCESS 1 (TLB NAME) Capability for UK TLB NAME defence. It is intended that the Programme will replace the current in-service TLB NAME systems.

The current systems were predicted to reach an Out of Service Date in YEAR. There is no shift away from the non-discretionary nature of this Capability.

This Capability is currently delivered from two Control & Reporting Centres (CRCs) at LOCATION ONE and LOCATION TWO. The future locations have now been decided under the re-basing review following the decision to close LOCATION TWO (by end YEAR) announced in MONTH YEAR. The CRC is to be at LOCATION ONE and a Resilience Entity (RE) will be established at LOCATION THREE.

Programme XXXXX was previously developed to the point of IGBC submission-readiness in YEAR, whereupon the project was suspended during the Planning Round 12 (PR12) prioritisation. The deferral for a period of three years necessitated an extension to the existing Capability (UK TLB NAME PROCESS 2 System). This was achieved by the ANONYMISED Project which engaged CONTRACTOR NAME on a single source contract for a five-year period. The re-initiation of XXXXX in YEAR provided the basis upon which to acquire, and bring into service, the new Capability.

The (TLB NAME PROCESS 1 System) currently being developed has been deemed unsuitable for the UK, following a review of the safety case in YEAR and a Ministerial decision in YEAR for UK. The Review Team was told that this stance was re-validated most recently in YEAR and furthermore that the project was undergoing an Analysis of Alternatives process.

Business Case

XXXXXX submitted its Main Gate Business Case (MGBC) in MONTH YEAR, which was approved in MONTH YEAR. Procurement for the main XXXXX system achieved contract signature with CONTRACTOR NAME in MONTH YEAR.

Subsequently it became evident that XXXXX would exceed its MGBC approval in terms of time and cost. This arose from the TLB NAME decision to close LOCATION TWO and to locate the Resilience Entity (RE) at LOCATION FOUR, together with the derailment of the plan through the NAME OF INITIATIVE being deemed unsuitable for XXXXX.

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

A XXXXX Review Note (RN) was submitted by TLB NAME to MoD IAC in MONTH YEAR, with the subsequent Outletter being received on DATE MONTH YEAR.

The RN approved an increase in budget to £XXm (P50) to cater for the move of the Resilience Entity (RE) to LOCATION FOUR and the implementation of the two-step (XXXXX v1/v2) approach in response to the unsuitability of the OTHER TLB NAME NAME OF INITIATIVE programme.

At this juncture the programme is on track to deliver within its Approved Budgetary Limit (ABL). There remains, however, a degree of uncertainty surrounding v2, mainly in the cost of provision, which lies outside the scope and funding provision of the Programme. Scoping work has been undertaken, by DD and COMPANY NAME, to provide cost estimates and enable architecture choices to be made balancing cost and resilience.

The 'Plan On A Page' indicates that v1 IOC is on schedule for delivery within approvals.

Governance

The Programme Board, chaired by the SRO, continues to operate effectively, preceded by the Programme Working Group, chaired by the Programme Director.

Noting that the SRO continues to carry other duties from his previous role, it is positive to note that the Programme Director has extended his posting to provide continuity during this period of transition and SRO stretch. Additionally, a new, highly qualified, Programme Manager has taken up the reins alongside a committed Programme Management Office (PMO) officer.

The Governance of XXXXX has managed to smooth the rotation of multiple personnel during the past 12 months and maintain a positive trajectory towards v1 IOC. As the programme progresses there is always the potential for an increase in tempo and the SRO should maintain awareness of the possible impact this could have on the speed of decision-making. There are currently no indications that this should be an issue, though the chain of communication with DELIVERY TEAM will need to be effective if changes to deployment order or priorities are encountered during v2 rollout.

DLODS & Dependency Management

The Capability Integration Working Group (CIWG) continues to provide an effective forum for pan-DLOD coordination. The CIWG is chaired by the acting Business Change Manager, noting that SENIOR LEADER NAME is shortly to depart.

As the dependencies become more visible during the rollout phase, issues have been reported such as site access and short notice change control. Whilst not a CIWG problem *per se*, the opportunity exists for the PMO to use the forum to spot early warnings of such dependencies.

Of the LODs, the two most often cited by interviewees were:

- Personnel - LOCATION ONE staff currently operating out of LOCATION TWO with significant commuting and impact on personal/family lives. Schedule slippages have been unhelpful, reinforcing the need to establish a credible delivery schedule to manage expectations and morale; and
- Training – Concern that the training has not yet been completed properly. Examples cited CONTRACTOR NAME operator training being substandard. The Review Team was also told that there is a desire to ensure v2 training can be included in the ANONYMISED programme.

The PMO has created an Integrated Master Schedule which includes analysis of RAIDO (Risks, Assumptions, Issues, Dependencies, Opportunities) to provide as confident a view of delivery as practicable. This is good practice and should be kept under review as the programme progresses. The CIWG will continue to be a good source of intelligence for PMO analysis.

Delivery Schedule / Plan

The Review Team heard that there were three key schedules against which the programme is managed. There is a contractual delivery schedule produced by CONTRACTOR NAME, a schedule managed by the DELIVERY TEAM Delivery Team (DELIVERY TEAM), which includes the contractual dependencies, and an integrated Master Schedule, managed by the PMO, which brings together delivery of all LODs. Different views were expressed as to the quality and maturity of CONTRACTOR NAME's contractual schedule, and therefore the amount of schedule risk which the programme carries.

The approved Initial Operating Capability (IOC) date for v1 operation at LOCATION ONE is XX XXX 2022. The Review Team heard that CONTRACTOR NAME were expected to have completed their installation work by XXX 2021, and that the current forecast achievement date for TT1 is between XXX and XXX 2021.

The Delivery Team is responsible for delivery of a significant number of dependencies which sit outside the CONTRACTOR NAME contract, including achievement of an endorsed Safety Case and necessary certification, as well as provision via OTHER TLB NAME and OTHER PROGRAMME GFX.

A view was expressed by some that the Delivery Team's appetite to schedule risk was low and that the Delivery Team should be committing to a more challenging delivery schedule. Schedule Risk Analysis (SRA) has been conducted by the

Delivery Team on more than one occasion, but as yet an agreed set of risk adjusted delivery dates has not been agreed. It was not completely clear to the Review Team whether the inability to reach agreement was due to disagreement over the fidelity of the SRA process utilised, the amount of schedule risk applied to individual risks, or the acceptability of the risk-adjusted milestones. The Review Team understand that the inability to agree the SRA output has meant that CASP milestones for 2021/22 (including a CASP Strategic Milestone) had not yet been agreed between the SRO and the Delivery Team.

There is a risk that lack of an agreed programme integrated master schedule and a set of risk-adjusted programme milestones could cause a lack of clarity between stakeholders and impede delivery.

Recommendation 1: Work with DELIVERY TEAM to revise the detailed integrated master schedule, including non-CONTRACTOR NAME deliverables/dependencies and conduct a four-way (non-commercial) workshop (TLB NAME PMO / DELIVERY TEAM / CONTRACTOR NAME / OTHER TLB NAME) to discuss in detail (with focus on period beyond IOC) and ‘get all delivery partners on the same page’. (Critical – Do Now)

XXXXX v1

The Review Team heard that XXXXX v1 is progressing towards delivery and now appears to be under control. Remaining activities include Site Acceptance Testing and integration at LOCATION ONE. Risks to delivery therefore remain, but the majority of interviewees were confident of delivery in the XXX to XXX 2021 timeframe.

The Review Team heard that delays to delivery of XXXXX V1, coupled with ongoing schedule ambiguity, are causing ongoing disruption and uncertainty to LOCATION ONE staff who have been required to relocate to LOCATION TWO on an 8 to 10 day commute cycle. This has had an impact on personal and working lives, which have been further complicated as a consequence of COVID-19. Views were expressed that project timelines have not been communicated adequately to some LOCATION ONE staff.

Relocation of 2nd CRC from LOCATION TWO to LOCATION THREE

Agreement has been reached with LOCATION THREE that an alternative room will now be provided at LOCATION FOUR to become XXXXX Room 2. This has the benefit of removing a dependency on LOCATION THREE to vacate prior to XXXXX occupation. The Review Team felt this represented a beneficial risk mitigation solution.

The Review Team understands that the Resilience Entity at LOCATION FOUR is now broadly on schedule for delivery as planned. Impacts of the decision to delay the LOCATION FOUR installation and the gap between IOC and FOC were not brought to the attention of the Review Team, but this should be reviewed and monitored to ensure that any risks are understood and are being managed appropriately.

Connectivity

Many interviewees agreed that the issue of connectivity to support XXXXX v2 was the most serious programme uncertainty affecting delivery schedule and cost. The failure of NAME OF INITIATIVE as the bearer for inter-site data links has clearly created additional cost and delay, and it is not yet clear how additional estimated costs of £XXM-£XXM will be allocated between the XXXXX programme and OTHER TLB NAME. The Review Team heard that there have been blurred lines of accountability for this issue between OTHER TLB NAME, DELIVERY TEAM, COMPANY NAME and CONTRACTOR NAME, and that OTHER TLB NAME is serving a number of different customers through its relationship with COMPANY NAME. However, OTHER TLB NAME has come “up to speed” and is now across the issues.

The programme maintains a strong link to OTHER TLB NAME, but SENIOR LEADER IN TLB has been posted to a new position and this relationship will need to be renewed through his successor. There is a risk that failure to stay on top of the OTHER TLB NAME relationship will affect the onward relationship with COMPANY NAME and thus lead to further delay and uncertainty.

Recommendation 2: Maintain active relationship with OTHER TLB NAME to make sure that the solution for V2 remains on track for the V2 UK XXXXX FOC (beyond LOCATION FIVE). (Critical – Do Ongoing)

The Review Team heard that CONTRACTOR NAME has worked pragmatically outside the contract to continue work in the absence of these links. Options have been clearly proposed by OTHER TLB NAME that balance the physical practicalities of reaching far-flung locations, xxx XXX, against the High Availability redundancy requirements of the accreditor. Despite the historic uncertainty, this issue appears to be in hand and a clear decision in YEAR MONTH will allow the programme to remain on track for delivery against the revised schedule. If a decision is taken in good time, this issue appears to be a sufficient priority for OTHER TLB NAME to deliver.

TLB NAME Cmd / DELIVERY TEAM Relationship

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

The Review Team observed strong commitment from the TLB NAME PMO and DELIVERY TEAM. Both teams continue to work long hours to make sure this programme delivers its required outcomes. The Review Team also observed a tension that has developed in recent months between the teams which could prove to be a problem as the programme proceeds.

As discussed earlier in the report, the Review Team heard from a number of interviewees about a disagreement over the degree to which certain schedules had or had not been risk adjusted. This disagreement would appear to be a totemic example of the tension that exists between both teams. The tension, which is a consequence of a different approach to identifying and managing risk within a schedule, has been interpreted by some interviewees as a problem of trust between both teams rather than, as the Review Team concluded, more a question of different approaches to the identification and management of risk.

As concerns about this difference in approach to risk adjusted scheduling have increased, so too has the drumbeat of requests from the PMO for more information from the DELIVERY TEAM. The Review Team heard concerns about the extent to which the requests for information from the Programme Team were stretching an already-stretched DELIVERY TEAM and heard differing views about the necessity of the PMO to assure the outputs of the DELIVERY TEAM. The Review Team also heard concerns about the time it takes for the DELIVERY TEAM to respond to those requests. There was a further concern about the perception over the extent to which the PMO was interfacing directly with the principal commercial partner, CONTRACTOR NAME, which would appear to be contrary to established engagement protocols.

The Review Team has concluded that neither team is wrong on this issue of risk adjusted scheduling. It is more a case of different working styles that appear to be currently at odds. The Review Team feels that there is more transparency DELIVERY TEAM could offer to the Programme Team to build that team's confidence in the work of the Delivery Team. Equally, the PMO, in the view of the Review Team, could afford to create more space for the DELIVERY TEAM to deliver against its agreed commitments to the PMO and only when that appears in doubt should the PMO intervene.

The Review Team observed that key members of the PMO have joined during the course of the past 18 months and have consequently been unable to meet DELIVERY TEAM members in person. This lack of in-person interaction has undoubtedly amplified the tension between the teams. The Review Team is encouraged that the PMO and DELIVERY TEAM plan to meet in person in July. The Review Team would strongly encourage both teams to use this meeting to clear the TLB NAME and reset the relationship. If left unresolved, current points of friction between the FRONT LINE COMMAND and the DELIVERY TEAM could present the risk of further loss of confidence and thus impede delivery.

Recommendation 3: Hold a ‘clear the air’ session between TLB NAME PMO and DELIVERY TEAM to agree engagement protocols, including with CONTRACTOR NAME. (Critical – Do Now)

Resources / SQEP

As discussed, the TLB NAME Cap Programme Team has absorbed a high degree of staff churn in recent months, stabilised by the continuity of the Programme Director. As far as SQEP levels are concerned, the appointment of highly qualified staff is encouraging, and further expertise will be gained with experience.

Within the DELIVERY TEAM there have been temporary promotions with various personnel ‘stepping up a rung’ after many years of service, leaving a gap at the bottom which appears to be resulting in overstretch. Various interviewees expressed concern that this overstretch was leading to a lack of responsiveness from the DELIVERY TEAM whilst also presenting a ‘wellbeing’ risk for those staff as they try their best to keep on top of demand.

Furthermore, contractor staff employed via the Engineering Delivery Partnership (EDP) (so-called ‘manpower substitutes’) and CONTRACTOR NAME are being called upon to cover gaps in current levels of DELIVERY TEAM SQEP. The Review Team was told that, in turn, this is placing additional stretch on the CONTRACTOR NAME team and the DELIVERY TEAM. This presents a significant risk to delivery and there ought to be an opportunity to ‘pause, breathe and review’ after XXXXX v1 completion in readiness for the challenges of v2. This might usefully incorporate an extended Lessons Identified activity.

Recommendation 4: Request DELIVERY TEAM produce a simple staff succession plan to outline the approach to resolving current and anticipated resource shortages and moves (specifically, staff on temporary promotion and provision of EDP technical support). (Recommended - Do ASAP)

Commercials / GFX

The Review Team observed strong commitment from the commercial partners key to the programme’s success, principally CONTRACTOR NAME. While moving to XXXXX v1 IOC has not been without its problems, the Review Team could not discern a fundamental problem with the commercial relationship with CONTRACTOR NAME right now that risks the programme’s ability to reach the upcoming key milestones.

Tensions arose earlier in the programme when CONTRACTOR NAME-produced schedules were observed not to be robust or believable, resulting in a high degree of handholding at times. The Review Team also identified an issue with the maintainer

training package developed by a CONTRACTOR NAME subcontractor which fell well below the required standard. The Review Team is satisfied that these issues have either been resolved or acknowledged and that they do not jeopardize the achievement of v1 IOC.

Concerns were raised about the value for money aspects of the CONTRACTOR NAME contract and, in particular, intellectual property lock-in where the MOD has no other option but to contract again with CONTRACTOR NAME in the future. The Review Team also acknowledged the export opportunity for CONTRACTOR NAME, when an Export Levy could potentially offset future development costs of the XXXXX product in the UK. The Review Team concluded that while it had no specific recommendation to make on this matter, consideration should be made around the development of a future in-life commercial strategy that avoids 'lock-in' in the long term – which might best be built-in to the requirements for the mid-life upgrade. The Review Team also suggests DELIVERY TEAM carefully monitors CONTRACTOR NAME's commitments and resources as it seeks to secure business from other nations, while at the same time managing the roll-out of XXXXX v2 here in the UK.

Some concerns were also raised about the extent to which the PMO was interfacing directly with CONTRACTOR NAME which could risk confusing the contract management picture. The Review Team concluded that while it is important that CONTRACTOR NAME has a relationship with the PMO, the PMO should continue to respect the primacy of the DELIVERY TEAM's contractual management relationship with CONTRACTOR NAME.

The dependency on GFX was routinely raised as a risk throughout the course of this review. CONTRACTOR NAME scheduling takes account of some but not all GFX dependencies. The Review Team observed a risk that accelerating the CONTRACTOR NAME schedule could result in CONTRACTOR NAME committing resources to a deliverable which is dependent on a GFX dependency that is not ready, giving rise to a contractual claim from CONTRACTOR NAME back to the Authority. An example of this potential risk is discussed earlier in the report with regards to the fitting out of the second CRC at LOCATION FOUR. The Review Team was encouraged to hear about how well OTHER TLB NAME is managing the programme's commercial dependency with legacy COMPANY NAME infrastructure and the developing plans for the future required resilience in hard-to-reach areas in support of v2, also discussed earlier in the report.

XXXXX v2

The Review Team heard that most end users are looking forward to the delivery of XXXXX v2, which they believe will unlock significant new opportunities, and they are reconsidering their Concept of Operations as a result. While v2 has been described as "an upgrade", the hardware delivered in v1 will support a more flexible set of software-enabled capabilities running on the same installed kit.

The large step change represented by v2 could bring challenges, however. The Review Team heard that XXXXX might anticipate a “massive change process” when operators engage with these new capabilities for the first time. Some interviewees indicated that operators have been “out of the loop for XX months”, and while their needs have been captured and represented through more conceptual forums, operators have not been closely and recently involved in the prioritisation and definition of the functionality.

XXXXX v2 will require an even closer working relationship between the programme, the delivery organisations and the suppliers to ensure that the risk of user non-acceptance of the solution is eliminated. This will need ongoing engagement with the end user operator community to confirm that user needs are met in the design. If the master schedule does not adequately reflect the dependencies for all partners in the delivery chain, this could result in unnecessary ongoing changes to the schedule and the implications that entails.

Recommendation 5: Confirm the resource (money and SQEP) parameters for delivery of v2 and ensure that the integrated master schedule identifies the critical path, risk adjusted to cater for implementation dependencies across all partners in the delivery chain. (Essential – Do by v2 commencement)

The majority of the XXXXX programme benefits will be realised in the v2 timeframe, so it is important that these benefits be managed carefully, or even revisited. Both the programme team and the prime supplier will need to carefully allocate suitably qualified and experienced personnel to realise the projected benefits. End users have an enthusiasm for the new opportunities of v2, and the programme should capitalise and support this morale factor to maintain momentum.

Look Ahead

Interviewees indicated that there is already a substantial ‘wish-list’ of capabilities that might become part of a “Version 3” or even a “Son of XXXXX” system, and it is important that these ideas are not lost. A medium-term technical refresh is covered in the current budget envelope, but the Review Team heard that this was unlikely to bring any radically new capabilities.

Future development of the platform may be paid for in part by an export licensing scheme in which CONTRACTOR NAME would market XXXXX to other governments and pay a generous export levy to the UK (already part of the current contract between the DELIVERY TEAM and CONTRACTOR NAME). This scheme is welcome, but the Review Team do worry about excessive vendor lock-in. Several interviewees gave clear indications that the platform will require further evolution to take advantage of potentially transformative opportunities, and the Ministry of Defence should not be beholden to a single supplier, however capable, in the

furtherance of this strategic mission. Where possible the MoD should rely on or create open standards for data, software and hardware and endeavour to support an open ecosystem of suppliers aligned with real-world developments in aviation.

As one interviewee said, “We need to embrace modern technologies to fight TLB NAME battles in a different way.” The Review Team feel that, managed, and extended correctly, XXXXX will form an important part of this response.

Acknowledgement

The Review Team would like to thank all participants for their contributions to the review. Additionally, the support provided by PERSON NAME was outstanding.

Next Assurance Review

The next Gateway Review should be conducted post v1 IOC and ahead of shifting focus to v2 implementation. That review might usefully be conducted ahead of TT4 LOCATION FIVE - **around June 2024**.

ANNEX A – DCA Descriptions

The Delivery Confidence Assessment RAG status should use the definitions below.

<u>RAG</u>	<u>Criteria Description</u>
Green	Successful delivery of the programme to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery.
Amber/Green	Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.
Amber	Successful delivery 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.
Amber/Red	Successful delivery of the programme is in doubt with major risks or issues apparent in a number of key areas. Urgent action is needed to ensure these are addressed and establish whether resolution is feasible.
Red	Successful delivery of the programme appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed.

ANNEX B – Bespoke Terms of Reference for Hybrid Review

This is a blended Gateway 0/4 review and draws upon elements of the standard terms of reference for Gateway 0 and 4, the guidance and workbooks for which can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/infrastructure-and-projects-authority-assurance-review-toolkit>

No specific bespoke Terms of Reference (as per former-PAR) were drawn up for this review since most Defence reviews tend to be of a blended nature.

The SRO did request a focus on:

1. Delivery optimised for XXXXX V2.
2. DELIVERY TEAM capacity & SQEP.
3. Utility of SRA vs Integrated Master Schedule.
4. Effective management of GFX dependencies.
5. Agility of commercial arrangements/commercial relationship with CONTRACTOR NAME.

ANNEX C – Project/Programme Background

[Completed by the Programme Team]

<p>The aims of the programme / the driving force for the programme / the policy intent the programme is delivering to:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The UK has an enduring requirement to conduct TLB NAME solution as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under Defence Task NUMBER. Maintain security of the UK under the direction of the XXX Centre and as a contributor to the TLB NAME and Defence System under the command of the joint Combined TLB NAME Operations Centre (OC) a. Under Defence Task N. Maintain security of the LOCATION FIVE under the direction of TLB NAME. 2. XXXXX will replace the in-service UK and LOCATION FIVE TLB NAME solution systems with a common solution to sustain an TLB NAME solution capability. It was initiated to provide a capability which is technically supportable until 2040 (subject to a Technical Refresh in c.2028) as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. UCCS, operated in the UK and located at the XXXs at LOCATION ONE and LOCATION TWO, and at OTHER LOCATION¹ (Extended OSD XXX 21). b. FCCS, operated in LOCATION FIVE and located at FURTHER LOCATION (OSD XXX 22). <p>Beyond their OSDs, the availability of the current systems cannot currently be guaranteed due to obsolescence issues.</p> 3. XXXXX was initiated when the UK withdrew from the XXXX Programme in 20XX when it became clear that the solution could not be proven to meet the UK safety standards.
<p>The impact if the programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on civilians/citizens:</p>	<p>If XXXXX fails to deliver its benefits, there will be a gap in the UK's ability to defend itself against criminal/terrorist threats, and to meet its obligations, including TLB NAME surveillance and policing. Training will be severely curtailed.</p>
<p>Project/programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies:</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

¹ A small number of consoles (9) will be located at the NOC at LOCATION FOUR.

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

Projects or programme interdependencies [if applicable]:	<u>Internal dependencies</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BMFC for funding of BAU costs.• Ditto OTHER TLB NAME for LOCATION FIVE.• Integration of specific capabilities within the following programmes: LIST OF OTHER PROGRAMME NAMES.• OTHER PROGRAMME to ensure timely delivery of INTERRELATED requirements. <u>External dependencies</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LOCATION THREE for provision and preparation of facilities at LOCATION FIVE.• COMPANY NAME for integration with RELATED TECHNOLOGY.
Has the SRO's Osmotherley letter (letter of appointment) been approved at the appropriate levels?	XXXXX does not hold this as a Programme Artefact. However, SRO responsibilities are detailed in the Command Plan, which is signed-off by the Chief of the TLB NAME Staff.
The procurement / delivery status:	The Programme was placed on contract following a successful MGBC and emerged from a successful Review Note process in XXX 2020.
Funding / business case:	The Programme is funded for the scope of its current phase of delivery. A Full Business Case (RN) was approved by the Defence Investment Approvals Committee (Category B Approvals Authority) on XX XXX 2020.
Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP):	While an Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan is in place (and is being used in conjunction with a Route to IOC/FOC process) work to finalise the project baseline (in conjunction with the DELIVERY TEAM) is ongoing.
Project plan:	A Programme Integrated Master Schedule was ratified with all DLODs in XXX 2020. As was noted above, work to finalise the project baseline (in conjunction with the DELIVERY TEAM) is ongoing.
Current position regarding previous IPA assurance reviews:	GW0 - XX XXX 17 – Amber/Green. GW3 – XX XXX 18 – Amber/Green. GW0 – XX XXX 19 – Amber/Red. AAP – XX XXX 19 – Amber. GW0/3 – XX XXX 20 – Amber.

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

	<p>GW0/4 – XX XXX 21 – current review.</p> <p>A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous assurance review can be found in Annex D.</p>
--	--

**ANNEX D – Progress against previous assurance review
(XX-XX XXX 2020)**

[Completed by the Programme Team]

Problem or blocker identified	Progress/Status
<p>Covid-19</p> <p>Covid-19 is a prevailing Issue for all aspects of life and is not explicitly addressed as part of the Review Note approval.</p> <p>Recommendation: Identify immediate and probable Covid-19 impacts and put in place appropriate mitigation and ongoing integral planning and risk-management processes.</p> <p>Critical – Do Now.</p>	<p>On-going (Green)</p> <p>Managed via Risk Response plans to ensure effective mitigation in place, also tracked at portfolio level COVID Risk Register. Impacts, where identified, are now reflected in contract amendments with CONTRACTOR NAME, in addition to resourcing delayed work in key dependencies</p> <p>Impact currently limited to 4-week delay.</p>
<p>Resource constraints and fatigue</p> <p>Resource constraints and fatigue were identified as potential impediments to successful delivery in a demanding timeframe.</p> <p>Recommendation: Review resource to task allocation in the context of Covid-19 Ways of Working and identify changes to the resource requirement accordingly.</p> <p>Critical – Do Now.</p>	<p>On-going (Amber)</p> <p>DELIVERY TEAM are currently under resourced due to a combination of vacant posts and their management response to the departure of the previous SENIOR PERSON ROLE TITLE. PEOPLES NAMES are currently all covering roles one grade up, with PERSON NAME also continuing to cover his previous workload. Similarly, PERSON NAME continues to cover his role of TDL Engineer while also acting as cover Transition Manager.</p> <p>In addition, no individual has as yet been assigned the role of Project Manager/Control Account manager for LOCATION FIVE.</p>
<p>GFx formal management</p> <p>The former NAME OF INITIATIVE programme was a key external dependency which led to the re-baselining of XXXXX. There remains some lack of clarity about the plans, funding and limitations of GFx provision</p> <p>Recommendation: Detail the GFx dependencies, owners and impacts. Engage all DLOD owners to ensure responsibility for GFx provision is properly understood, correctly assigned and appropriately resourced.</p> <p>Critical – Do Now.</p>	<p>On-going (Amber)</p> <p>Pan-DLOD GFX aspects at the DLOD level are routinely managed through the CIWG by the BCM. Additionally, XXXXX has developed & ratified an Integrated Master Schedule with each DLOD owner and has revised 3OAs accordingly. DELIVERY TEAM have developed and ratified an IBA to reflect mutual dependencies on GFX provision from within their programmes.</p> <p>Recent integration work was delayed by inconsistent support from COMPANY NAME.</p> <p>Jointly managed by DELIVERY TEAM and TLB TEAM NAME.</p>

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

<p>NAME OF INITIATIVE programme dependency</p> <p>The former NAME OF INITIATIVE programme was a key external dependency which led to the re-baselining of XXXXX. There remains some lack of clarity about the plans, funding, and limitations of substitute GFx provision.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly describe and communicate to key stakeholders the sequence of GFx connectivity and the link to funding & benefits realisation for V2,</p> <p>Essential – Do By end 2020.</p>	<p>On-going (Green)</p> <p>Stakeholders are CONTRACTOR NAME, COMPANY NAME, TLB NAME, COMPANY NAME & TLB NAME. TLB NAME confirmed that V2 will be supplied under the DFTS contract with COMPANY NAME.</p> <p>DFTS contract extension has facilitated early submission of V2 Service Order Request Forms to TLB NAME.</p> <p>A COMPANY NAME study into V2implementation is underway.</p>
<p>Integrated Master Schedule</p> <p>The Programme intends to construct an Integrated Master Schedule – this is good practice. This could be extended to enhance its value as a decision-making tool.</p> <p>Recommendation: Ensure that the intended pan-DLoD integrated master schedule includes mapping to risks, benefits, budgets, ownership and delivery SQEP.</p> <p>Recommended – Do By end Sept 2020.</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>The IMS was completed in September 2020, with ratification by all DLoD owners achieved December 2020.</p>
<p>Early delivery of LOCATION FOUR Room 1</p> <p>If access to LOCATION FOUR room 1 could be achieved earlier than planned, this could de-risk the window of single CRC running and offer additional contingency during V1 installation.</p> <p>Recommendation: Investigate opportunities with LOCATION THREE to accelerate access to the room at LOCATION FOUR earlier than planned and enable de-risking of the V1 installation schedule.</p> <p>Recommended – Do ASAP.</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>LOCATION FOUR acceleration for Room 1 was contracted for and is currently being implemented.</p> <p>Room 2 siting has been agreed with LOCATION THREE and is under contracting action for earlier occupation.</p>

OFFICIAL (ANONYMISED AND REDACTED)

This assurance review was arranged and managed by:

MOD Integrated Assurance Hub
Project Delivery Centre of Excellence

Teak Wing 1, #5013

Abbey Wood North

Bristol

BS34 8QW

MOD IA Hub shared mailbox: DefPDCoE-MODIAHub@mod.gov.uk