



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

**Stage Gate Assessment Review
XXXXXX Programme
Stage Gate 0**

Template Version	V3.0 2021
Report Version:	Final v1.0
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	XXXX XXXX
Date of Osmotherley Appointment letter issued to SRO:	Not issued yet
Programme or Project Title	XXXXXXX (XXXXXXX)
Does this review cover the entire Project / Programme?	Yes
Department/Organisation of the programme/project	MOD
Agency or NDPB (if applicable):	TLB NAME
Programme Director:	--
Business Case stage reached:	Final Business Case
Decision/approval point this report informs:	N/A
Review Start Date:	XX XXX 23
Review End Date:	XX XXX 23
Review Team Leader:	XXXX XXXX
Review Team Members:	XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX
Report Distribution	SRO / AO
Previous Reviews:	Gate 0/3 XX XXX 22 RED AAP XX XXX 22 RED
IPA ID Number:	XXXX
GMPP ID Number	MOD_XXXX_XXXX



Contents

1. Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)	3
2. Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations	6
3. Blockers to delivery	7
4. Comments from the SRO	8
5. Review Team findings and recommendations	9
6. Acknowledgement	13
7. Next Assurance Review	14
ANNEX A: Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) Descriptions	15
ANNEX B: Terms of Reference for Gateway Review	16
ANNEX C: Background	18
ANNEX D: Progress against previous assurance reviews	21
ANNEX E: List of Interviewees	27
ANNEX F: Recommendation Classifications and Priority Order	28

About this report

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>



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

1. Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)

Delivery Confidence Assessment

RED

This Review comes at a pivotal moment for the XXXXXX (XXXXXX) Programme. As the details of the MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP requirements start to emerge, the final development and manufacture of the EQUIPMENT for the OTHER PROGRAMME PLATFORMS is starting to gain momentum. Additionally, the final EQUIPMENT for the last OTHER PROGRAMME is in production and is a key part of the Programme. It is clear that completion of EQUIPMENT must be achieved to plan, currently XXX 24 with a required by date of XXX 24, to free up capacity at LOCATION ready for the essential regeneration of the site needed to meet the future undefined requirements of OTHER PROGRAMME or OTHER PROGRAMME. However, the Review Team (RT) also heard that equally important, but less obvious, is the need to complete the OTHER PROGRAMME build at LOCATION to provide the required capacity to build the next OTHER PROGRAMME PLATFORM.

During the Review we heard that the EQUIPMENT delivery are the priority for XXXXXX and are to be protected against any potential impact arising from the nascent requirements for OTHER PROGRAMME, MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP and OTHER PROGRAMME. That being said, the future requirements will inevitably impact the existing programme although exactly what that impact might be is unclear since the emerging requirements are unclear. This lack of clarity needs to be urgently resolved so that XXXXXX and CONTRACTOR (CONTRACTOR) can work together to deliver the EQUIPMENT whilst preparing for the future. In order to minimise unnecessary work part of Regeneration was paused, not all, and this now restarting in anticipation of delivering Technical Insertion/MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP.

At the start of the Review we were told that the first OTHER PROGRAMME EQUIPMENT (EQUIPMENT) had a required by date of XXX 25 with a recently updated deterministic date for the production of EQUIPMENT was XXX/XXX 25. During the week we were then told that the overall OTHER PROGRAMME programme schedule had been reassessed and that the EQUIPMENT was now needed in LOCATION in XXX 25. However, we also heard that the revised required by date was due to the late delivery date of EQUIPMENT and that the WIDER PROGRAMME was revised to work to that date, rather than other driving factors. We understand that although the CAPABILITY schedule noted a required by date of XXX/XXX 25 it would help the wider build programme if the EQUIPMENT could be delivered earlier. The interconnection of the key factors which determine the PLATFORM build schedule is complex, but there is an aspiration that across the INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP the aim should be to deliver all activities at the earliest possible dates without compromising safety and quality. It is essential that XXXXXX plays a leading role in making that aspiration a fact. The RT heard that there are potential opportunities to bring the required by date forward if a more vigorous approach to opportunity management were adopted.



Previous Reviews identified a range of issues that needed to be tackled. We noted that, for the most part, the Recommendations have been completed. However, we are not sure that the anticipated outcomes from those Recommendations have yet been achieved: There are clear sign of progress and ‘green shoots’ but many of the changes are behavioural and will take time. That being said, there are also a range of challenges that need urgent attention if the newly baselined schedule is to be delivered. These include capitalising on the changes that the CONTRACTOR is introducing at LOCATION, but more focus is needed on looking ahead for challenges before they arise and mitigating them at an earlier stage. A clear example in this regard is the transport of the EQUIPMENT to the LOCATION. This issue has been known about for some considerable time, with varying degrees of concern but has only recently been identified as a potential “showstopper”. This challenge needs urgent attention to resolve it as soon as possible. The lesson here is that horizon-scanning and early action is needed to identify possible risks before they emerge in order to maintain the schedule and prevent slippage or, even better, drive opportunities to bring the delivery dates forward without compromising quality.

It is self-evident that XXXXXX does not exist in a vacuum. Indeed, the complex network of directly supporting, and directly supported, programmes with Business as Usual (BAU) and a plethora of linked projects which will have an impact on XXXXXX or *vice versa*. The closest of these is ANOTHER PROGRAMME which seeks to apply a new commercial arrangement which amalgamates 4 other contracts with CONTRACTOR and XXXXXX into a single partnership contract. We were told that it is envisaged that this will offer significant benefits to both MOD and CONTRACTOR whilst driving transformational change into the CONTRACTOR business and management. However, what the transformation might be, and what the impact might be on XXXXXX, is unknown. Given that ANOTHER PROGRAMME aims to “go live” on XX XXX 24 this is both surprising and worrying.

The wider network of programmes, projects and BAU that are essential to the long-term delivery of the CAPABILITY appear to be co-ordinated by influence and goodwill with a wide range of SROs, Project Managers, Line Managers and complex governance or management structures. Given the complexity of the overall enterprise and the essential longevity of the capability requirement this somewhat informal arrangement seems to be sub-optimum and dependent on key individuals who will not be in post for ever. The long-term requirements are effectively the “far battle” which needs to be tackled in close co-ordination with the “near battle” to provide the optimum balance of investment and focus. We suggest that consideration be given to drawing the many elements that provide the long-term XXXXXX into a more effective organisational construct. One option would be for XXXXXX to become a “portfolio of change” and incorporate all relevant programmes, projects and BAU into a single portfolio under a “portfolio SRO” with several SROs leading the constituent programmes. An alternative might be to restrict the current XXXXXX programme to deliver the required EQUIPMENT with all other programmes, projects and BAU being drawn into a portfolio of change that focuses on the future. The RT leans to the first option, but further consideration should be urgently given to address this with the aim of providing more effective delivery but without excess bureaucracy or interference.

When considering the delivery confidence of XXXXXX this Review has focused on EQUIPMENT. Noting the issues identified in this Review it is obvious that there are real challenges to be tackled. The formal risks are being tackled but there are some that should be considered in the round: the need to clear the OTHER PROGRAMME build to plan (which requires EQUIPMENT to be delivered on time or early); the need for



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

EQUIPMENT to be delivered to plan; aging infrastructure and machinery at LOCATION; the paucity of SQEP; the very limited resilience of XXXXXX and the required production quality and rate of the build of key components of the EQUIPMENT. The aggregation of the existing risk, the unforeseen risks and the wider factors challenge the possibility of delivery to the P₀ date. Effectively, to achieve that the Programme would need to “roll sixes every day” and no risks would materialise as well as no new risks emerge or materialise. To achieve the target date of XXX 25, all these remain and significant opportunities must be identified and fully realised. The inevitable conclusion is that delivery confidence for XXXXXX must be **RED**. That being said, if appropriate focus and resources are effectively and quickly applied to support XXXXXX then theoretically success is possible.



2. Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations

Priority	Recommendation	Risk* and Issue Identified with Evidence	Classification Insert Reference	Critical, Essential, Recommended
1	Recommendation 1: That the SRO requests clarity on ANOTHER PROGRAMME's commercial/contract model; change programme outcomes and delivery plan in order to establish the impact on XXXXXX and determine whether that impact is acceptable.	See 5.2	7	Critical
2	Recommendation 2: That appropriate leadership and management resource be deployed commensurate with the complexity and strategic importance of the scope.	See 5.4	10	Critical
3	Recommendation 5: That the SRO should ensure that horizon scanning, and top-down strategic risk management are effective, including understanding systemic interactions between risks and testing the effectiveness of both identification and mitigation.	See 5.11	9	Critical
4	Recommendation 6: That an underpinned list of opportunities which have potential to bring the delivery forward ahead of the XXX 2025 target date, and the actions to realise them, are made visible and routinely tracked and challenged at programme level.	See 5.13	9	Critical
5	Recommendation 3: That a portfolio structure, including full Organisational Design, should be considered.	See 5.6	1	Essential by XX XXX 23



6	Recommendation 4. That the SRO should pursue a Department to Department(s) request for support and resources from both OGD and also OGD.	See 5.10	10	Essential by XX XXX 23
---	--	----------	----	---------------------------

All recommendations should be categorised 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.]*

3. Blockers to delivery

Ref No:	Blocker	Describe specific nature of blocker	Consequence if not resolved
1	Nil	--	--



4. Comments from the SRO

SRO Comments

I am most grateful to the Review Team (RT) for their advice and recommendations, all of which are accepted.

I am pleased that the RT recognised 'green shoots' following the completion of previous IPA Reviews actions and other progress in completing key tasks such as schedule re-baselining. They highlight that the full benefits of these have yet to be realised and that some require behavioural change, which will naturally take longer and require sustained leadership from me and the Programme Director.

The RT has graded the programme RED because of the challenges/risks in meeting required delivery dates for EQUIPMENT in particular, although they also highlight opportunities to both de-risk (perhaps advance) current delivery timescales. These will continue to be developed and vigorously pursued with CONTRACTOR, although residual delivery risk will nonetheless remain. It will be important to be clear on what the yardsticks for a move to AMBER might look like.

The points raised by the RT regarding the structure of the CAPABILITY PORTFOLIO and XXXXXX and the management of dependencies/activity across the associated interfaces are recognised. I think this worth reflecting on - particularly in light of the MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP, although some of the concerns aired by the RT may be addressed through improved portfolio management and collaborative behaviours expected as part of ANOTHER PROGRAMME (details TBD). Extended discussion on XXXXXX scope would be an unwelcome distraction at this stage when the focus needs to be on delivering EQUIPMENT and landing initial plans for delivering OTHER PROGRAMME's requirements.



5. Review Team findings and recommendations

5.1. The practical scope of the Programme is dynamic as a result of the uncertainty around the future demand requirements to inform the redevelopment of new facilities and capabilities for production of future requirements. The central activities of the Programme are to complete the technical development and validation work and to manufacture and deliver the final EQUIPMENT and the first four EQUIPMENT. Delivery of these before the required by date is essential for the continued delivery of the strategic imperative. This scope is the minimum for the ongoing programme. The related elements of the programme, around the regeneration of the site, are currently on hold pending definition of the future requirements.

5.2. The RT assess that the Programme is being impeded by lack of clarity about related programmes. In particular, the imposition of a new commercial model which is not yet understood is a key risk. ANOTHER PROGRAMME aspires to deliver both a revised consolidated contract model and a transformation programme to alter the fundamentals of the supplier relationship and management arrangements. It is understood that ANOTHER PROGRAMME will provide funding for the XXXXXX Programme from XXX 2024. We heard a variety of views from interviewees regarding the existing contract, currently in place to 2056, whether it will be terminated, amended, novated or put in abeyance, by the new arrangements. Following further consultation with the Programme team we understand that the existing contract will be terminated and replaced with the ANOTHER PROGRAMME contract. This confusion amongst interviewees is a concern that needs to be addressed. Moreover, it was not possible for the RT to obtain clarity on the proposed outcomes for the transformation elements of ANOTHER PROGRAMME. In particular, it was not clear how the new contract would incentivise the key delivery dates; drive performance improvements; better identification and resolution of risks; nor how the baseline (schedule, cost and scope) would be determined and agreed. There was no definition available of the change from the current work scope of the client team and the required activities in the new model. The RT understand that these details will be determined during the next six months. Given the scale and complexity of XXXXXX, this does not provide sufficient time for a managed transition and organisational change. In the meantime, the Programme and CONTRACTOR teams appear to receive unequal information. This is an increasing challenge to the relationship. Moreover, ANOTHER PROGRAMME presents a strategic risk to successful delivery of XXXXXX.

Recommendation 1: That the SRO requests clarity on the ANOTHER PROGRAMME commercial/contract model; change programme outcomes and



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

delivery plan in order to establish the impact on XXXXXX and determine whether that impact is acceptable.

5.3. The future uncertainty in relation to the requirement of XXXXXX also provides a substantial risk. For instance, the LOCATION Regeneration activities cannot be completed because the MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP design, demand and throughput rates are not confirmed, including the Technical Insertion requirements. The RT were told that there were around half a dozen initial critical decisions required before the Regeneration design could re-start in earnest, although some Regeneration work has restarted in anticipation of delivering Technical Insertion and MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP. As a result of the asset lifetime of the legacy plants and the timescales for design and built of new facilities, there is a distinct probability that there could be a capability gap of at least several years. Whilst there are contingency plans to meet demand during this gap, these compromise one of the central tenets of the XXXXXX Programme Mandate. The RT support the view of the Programme Team that the uncertainty around future requirements must not be allowed to detract from the essential production requirements.

5.4. In order to enable the effective delivery of all activities across the portfolio it is essential that all the constituent programmes be scoped and resourced appropriately for the different challenges of the different types of scope. The RT believe there would be benefit in taking a strategic look at the division of scope across the entire portfolio, including considering how to manage the strategic uncertainties, and to differentiate between business as usual production operations and development of new capabilities (technology insertion, new designs, replacement physical equipment and infrastructure, skills, supply chain and other enablers). The capability of the XXXXXX Programme Team appears to have been reduced more than once in order to move strategic resources to emerging or higher priorities. This reflects dynamic prioritisation across the portfolio but undermines the strength of Programme.

Recommendation 2: That appropriate leadership and management resource be deployed commensurate with the complexity and strategic importance of the scope.

5.5. As noted above the addition of the MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP introduces considerable uncertainty, however it also offers significant opportunities for greater capability and capacity development beyond our existing sovereign capability. To date this programme has been highly compartmentalised, but as decisions are made and further progress necessary those able to interface, respond and influence needs to expand. The RT spoke to a number of individuals who were being progressively "read" into the programme, but the list remains short. We acknowledge that there is a material danger that the existing finite resources, which are already stretched, could become distracted away from the core mission



EQUIPMENT, but a failure to expand the sphere of information and influence represents a far greater risk that key decisions will be made which are sub-optimal, not simply in terms of physical assets and infrastructure but also that the environmental, structural and cultural constructs do not support success.

5.6. The RT recognises that delivering the remaining EQUIPMENTs and maintenance and expansion of capability and capacity are both separate and also inextricably linked. Therefore, there are a range of credible Organisational Designs (OD) from a series of individual projects/programmes under a thin/light integrator up to and including a true portfolio, with nested programmes and projects. The RT is aware that whilst some early work has started on OD there is a huge amount still to do across a wide range of stakeholders, many of which are either not fully articulated and/or agreed, which in some cases may be conflicting. In this environment it would be all too easy just to focus on the top National priorities and then progressively work down the stakeholders, however this would risk the "officers losing the support of the crew". Noting that sensitivities remain, this is a major transformation programme and therefore needs to be initiated, resourced and managed as such.

Recommendation 3: That a portfolio structure, including full Organisational Design, should be considered.

5.7. The Programme is dependent on complex technical risks and tightly-coupled production activities with significant dependencies. Whilst there has been progress in identifying the bottom-up threats, there are many of these which are ranked as high or very high and which retain this level post-mitigation. This suggests that the current mitigation plans are not effective. In addition, the complexity introduces systemic and cascading impacts which are not well understood.

5.8. The RT learned about risks which had materialised, or were in the process of materialising, which we perceive to have been foreseeable. When tested, it was accepted that the Programme Team had made assumptions in the past and relied on these until they failed, when they had made significant efforts to manage the consequences and recover the situation. The RT believes that a more proactive and challenging identification and testing of assumptions for future phases of work would identify threats which could be mitigated early. Both the XXXX and the XXXX issues could, and should, have been foreseen and mitigated earlier. We were told that there were other examples, and that the team spent a lot of time 'fighting fires' rather than looking further ahead. There was a consistent theme from CONTRACTOR regarding increasing resilience, for example by increasing stock levels and replacement machinery. The RT perceived this as immature but essential and encourage the team to continue to develop and extend this approach.



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

5.9. The recent XXXX problem raises both strategic and tactical issues which further stresses an already challenging programme and we suspect will place unwelcome demands on the budget. The RT is aware that work has started to better understand both the root cause and potential solutions and people are leaning into help.

5.10. There are a range of potential solutions all of which have "pros and cons" but all of which will need significant focus and bandwidth to drive through an optimal solution. The CONTRACTOR has been commissioned to undertake further design work for an alternative road solution but that will not deliver an immediate solution - the current rough estimate is that this will be 18 months of additional work and even then the physical road problems may still remain. Ironically, and perhaps counter-intuitively, the new MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP programme offers the scope to design a solution which will not only work for delivering EQUIPMENT but also the longer-term requirements of the MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP. Fortunately, the existing XXXX safety case provides for both road and sea transport and the RT is aware that early discussions have commenced with a part of the public sector who not only have specialist domain knowledge but also essential and unique infrastructure. These discussions will not be easy and could very easily flounder as "too difficult" without senior leadership and sponsorship.

Recommendation 4. That the SRO should pursue a Department to Department(s) request for support and resources from both OGD and also OGD.

5.11. A related point is a lack of wider horizon scanning. The RT heard that the majority of people across all organisations were focused on a short, perhaps weekly, time horizon. Even at senior levels, individuals were frank about being too caught up in the immediate challenges to look further ahead. This is a major contributor to the sudden emergence of major shocks, which then increased the immediate focus on recovery and further decreased the time spent looking forward. Appropriate resource should be allocated to anticipating future challenges and ensuring preparedness.

Recommendation 5: That the SRO should ensure that horizon scanning and top-down strategic risk management are effective, including understanding systemic interactions between risks and testing the effectiveness of both identification and mitigation.

5.12. A revised baseline for the EQUIPMENT part of the Programme is now being finalised between the parties. This is described as a deterministic schedule and, in the opinion of the RT, this represents the earliest dates which can be achieved without significant changes to the underlying technical assumptions. The quantitative risk analysis shows that the XXX 2025 date represents a confidence level close to



Infrastructure and Projects Authority

P₀. Surprisingly, given that this is a “first of a kind” development of a new EQUIPMENT type the RT were told that P₇₀ is only an additional 6-7 months, which seems very optimistic. The analysis shows a long fat tail of risk impacts which reaches through 2026. This analysis is based on current understanding of aggregated technical risks; however, it does not allow for external or client risks, nor for uncertainty. Experience suggests that this long tail should be expected for this type of first of a kind, complex and technically demanding projects. The RT accept the view shared by some of those interviewed that the Programme would need to achieve success consistently across all of the programme in order to avoid a cascading impact which exacerbates the impact of other risks.

5.13. CONTRACTOR appears to have a list of potential opportunities which could bring forward the delivery from the deterministic schedule date of XXX 2025. The RT heard that there was no current data underpinning these opportunities, and that the action plans to realise them were still to be developed. These opportunities are critical to recover the schedule to the target date, and then to create float in the schedule to mitigate the inevitable threats which will materialise. Development, implementation and tracking of these opportunities is imperative. The RT also consider that a holistic search for further opportunities to bring the potential earliest date back before the target date of XXX 2025 is conducted and continued on an ongoing basis.

Recommendation 6: That an underpinned list of opportunities which have potential to bring the delivery forward ahead of the XXX 2025 target date, and the actions to realise them, are made visible and routinely tracked and challenged at programme level.

6. Acknowledgement

Review Team Acknowledgement

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



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

7. Next Assurance Review

Next Assurance Review

Given the issues identified in this Review, and the potential impact of the ANOTHER PROGRAMME programme the RT recommend that an AAP of XXXXXX should be combined with a short Review of ANOTHER PROGRAMME and the interactions with XXXXXX in c3 months. In order to minimise the impact on the XXXXXX Team it would be beneficial if the RT for that combined Review were the same as this Review.



ANNEX A: Stage Gate Assessment (SGA) Descriptions

From 1 April 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 HMT on the satisfaction of each time bound condition within an agreed timeframe.</i></p>
Red	<p>Successful delivery of the programme/project to time, cost and quality appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The programme/project may need re-baselining and/or its overall viability re-assessed.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: This programme/project should not proceed to the next phase until these major issues are managed to an acceptable level of risk and the viability of the project/programme has been re-confirmed.</i></p>



ANNEX B: Terms of Reference for Gateway Review

The purpose of this Annual IPA Assurance Review of the XXXXXX programme based on a Gate 0 strategic assessment:

1. Review the arrangements for identifying and managing the main programme risks, opportunities and dependencies (both at programme and individual project level), including external risks such as clarity of business priorities:
 - a. Does our approach to this look fit for purpose/ benchmark with generally expected good practice (and an improvement from last year)?
 - b. Are we all (TLB NAME, DELIVERY ORGANISATION, CONTRACTOR) aligned on key risks/opportunities and focused on mitigation/exploitation?
2. Review the arrangements for leading, managing and monitoring the programme as a whole and the links to individual parts of it (e.g. to any existing and related projects in the programme's portfolio):
 - a. Programme governance and other roles and responsibilities – is everyone clear on who's doing what?
3. Check that there is engagement with the market as appropriate on the feasibility of achieving the required outcomes:
 - a. Supplier management – view on efficacy of DELIVERY ORGANISATION's management of CONTRACTOR on XXXXXX (arrangements for managing the contractor, holding to account, building a strong partnership - areas for improvement?)
4. Check that plans for the work to be done through to the next stage are realistic, properly resourced with sufficient people of appropriate experience, and authorised. Check progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes:
 - a. Plans and SQEP for Phase 2 Regen – do we look set up for success (DELIVERY ORGANISATION and CONTRACTOR)?
5. Ensure that the programme is supported by key stakeholders and that key stakeholders understand where appropriate intervention is required or expected;
6. Confirm that the programme is deliverable, regarding its alignment with wider government policy and procurement objectives, the organisation's delivery plans and programmes and interdependencies with external programmes;
7. Check that the programme takes account of joining up with other programmes within the TLB NAME, MOD and external;
8. Check that provision for financial and other resources have been made for the programme (initially identified at programme initiation and committed later);
 - a. Check that there is sufficient agility to request funding for the needs of the programme in the current approvals plan;
 - b. Check that the resourcing and skills needs of the programme have been considered and will be met now and for the duration of the programme.
9. With reference to the previous IPA review, check progress against plans and the expected achievement of outcomes and evaluate actions taken to implement recommendations;



10. Evaluation of actions taken to implement recommendations made in any earlier assessment of deliverability.



ANNEX C: Background

Question	Answer
Describe the aims of the Programme	The Aim of the XXXXXX Programme is to provide the COMMAND with the means to enable a CAPABILITY, and will provide the UK with a modern, safe, and Sovereign capability to manufacture further EQUIPMENTs for a fleet of flexible and adaptable PLATFORMs. To maintain the UK's PLATFORMs XXXXXX - to manufacture, store and prepare EQUIPMENTs ready for dispatch in accordance with the PLATFORM build programme.
Reasons for the Programme's existence, by type and description	<p>The Vision of the Programme is to provide the UK with a modern, safe, and 'assured' capability to manufacture EQUIPMENTs for the COMMAND, to propel the OTHER PROGRAMME and OTHER PROGRAMME PLATFORMs.</p> <p>The Mission of the Programme is to maintain, operate and regenerate the UK's 'assured' capability to manufacture, and make ready for installation, EQUIPMENTs that meet the technical standards for safe, available and militarily capable COMMAND PLATFORMs.</p> <p>The Ambition of the Programme is for the first EQUIPMENT for the OTHER PROGRAMME PLATFORM to be delivered in 2025 and for the XXXXXX to meet the required PLATFORM production drumbeat thereafter.</p>
The impact if the Programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on civilians/citizens:	If the programme fails to deliver then the Royal Navy will not be able to introduce new PLATFORMs into service, ready for military operations in time to maintain the required force levels to deliver the highest priority Defence Tasks.



Programme link to departmental or government strategies or policies:	<p>This programme underwrites the capabilities required by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Global Britain in a Competitive Age: the Integrated Review of Security, Defence, Development and Foreign Policy</i>, published by the Cabinet Office, March 2021• <i>Defence in a Competitive Age</i>, published by the Ministry of Defence, March 2021• <i>Defence and Security Industrial Strategy</i>, published by the Ministry of Defence, March 2021
Programme interdependencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• OTHER PROGRAMME, Cat A, GMPP• OTHER PROGRAMME, Cat A, GMPP• MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP, Cat A, GMPP (pending)• ANOTHER PROGRAMME, Cat A, non-GMPP
Has the SRO's Osmotherley letter (letter of appointment) been approved at the appropriate levels?	<p>No</p> <p>The SRO took over the role in XXX 2022. A draft letter is waiting release.</p>
The procurement / delivery status:	<p>The programme cleared Main Gate in XXX 2012. The programme has been re-approved via Review Notes in 2015, 2016, 2019, and 2021. At each stage, the full range of scrutiny was applied appropriate to a Cat A Business Case ensuring that best practice was applied and that the business case is robust.</p>
Funding / Business Case:	<p>The project is funded for its current phase. The Main Gate (Full Business Case) was approved by the MOD and HMT in XXX 2012. The current approval is through the ANOTHER PROGRAMME OBC and RN approved in XXX 2021.</p>
Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP):	<p>An IAAP is in place, dated XX XXX 2023</p>
Programme plan:	<p>Does the project / programme have an appropriate plan in place? Yes / No [delete as appropriate].</p> <p>Has the plan been baselined? Please include who signed it off etc. Yes / No [delete as appropriate].</p> <p>Re-baselined plan awaiting issue, for Programme Board sign off</p>



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

Current position regarding previous
IPA Assurance Reviews:

The most recent reviews are:

- Gateway 0 / 3 – XX XXX 22 (ID No. XXXX)
- AAP – XX XXX 22 (ID No. XXXX)

Most recommendations have been fully implemented. A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous assurance review can be found in Annex D.

The previous GW was closed out by the IPA on XX XXX 22, following a 'case conference' on XX XXX 22.



Infrastructure
and Projects
Authority

ANNEX D: Progress against previous assurance reviews

AAP XXX 22

Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
1	Recommendation 15. The SRO and PD shall make an immediate and very visible step change in leadership focus on opportunity and risk management, and commit dedicated resources in TLB NAME, DELIVERY ORGANISATION and CONTRACTOR to work collaboratively on this.	Critical	Complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See narrative for Recommendation 5 (below). • New risk focus appointed within the XXXXXX Team who has reviewed risk, issue and opportunity management along with registers in concert with CONTRACTOR. • Refreshed joint CONTRACTOR/DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX Risk & Opportunities Mgt Plan produced and RIO registers are reviewed/used to drive agendas at DELIVERY ORGANISATION/CONTRACTOR progress meetings plus Monthly Programme Progress Meetings (with TLB NAME) and briefed to the Programme Board. • XXXXXX team directly supporting CONTRACTOR in delivery of new baseline schedule as a result of schedule review.
2	Recommendation 16. The PD shall arrange for those individuals associated with the management and influence of CONTRACTOR to have a refresher on the existing contract provisions.	Recommended	Complete.



Gate 0/3 Review XXX 22 (update on Ongoing actions since XXX 22 AAP)

Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
2	Recommendation 2. The SRO should commission a comprehensive Schedule review supported as necessary by independent experts. NB. This review should not delay ongoing Programme delivery activity.	Critical	Completed in XXX 22. Recommendations from the review, including production prioritisation between DIFFERENT EQUIPMENT and manufacturing schedule re-baselining are currently in hand and will be complete by Spring of 2023.
3	Recommendation 3. The SRO working with CONTRACTOR and other key stakeholders should ensure that the EQUIPMENT delivery team are “protected” from other distractions or additional resources rapidly deployed.	Critical	Complete. EQUIPMENT manufacturing activity and the DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX programme team were protected from MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP-related activity.



Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
4	Recommendation 4. The SRO should ensure that Phase 2 is appropriately led, focused, resourced and enabled to ensure that the new facilities are fit for purpose, for the short and long term.	Essential within 3 months (by XXX 22)	<p>On hold due to impact of MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP/Technical Insertion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CONTRACTOR has appointed a new lead for Regeneration work and a new independent Programme Board member with infrastructure experience has also been appointed. DELIVERY ORGANISATION review has confirmed that the DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX programme team is adequately resourced to drive current XXXXXX infra work plans. Overall Regen resourcing will be confirmed once the regeneration schedule is re-baselined following confirmation of plans to deliver Tech Insertion for MULTINATIONAL PARTNERSHIP (prob Autumn 2023)



Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
5	Recommendation 5. The SRO working with CONTRACTOR should ensure that the current Programme Risks, Issues and Opportunities (RIO) management arrangements are effective and focused primarily on driving the EQUIPMENT Schedule as well as the remaining Regeneration scope (including Phase 2).	Critical	Complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new risk lead has been appointed to the DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX Programme Team who has reviewed key risk, issue, and opportunity processes and documented these in a revised DELIVERY ORGANISATION/CONTRACTOR Programme Risk & Opportunities Management Plan (briefed to the SRO and Programme Board). Programme risks, issues, and opportunities have been reviewed by the programme team and CONTRACTOR to ensure consistency etc. Key risks, issues and opportunities were reviewed by the Programme Board at end XXX and thereafter every quarter. Monthly DELIVERY ORGANISATION/TLB NAME Programme Progress Reviews also review progress on responses to key issues, risks and opportunities.
6	Recommendation 6. The SRO should task DELIVERY ORGANISATION to review the existing arrangements and work with TLB NAME and CONTRACTOR to restate the XXXXXX delivery and governance arrangements by developing and implementing a delivery manual for XXXXXX.	Essential within 2 months (by XXX 22)	Complete. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A revised Programme Management Plan has been produced. This includes governance and other delivery arrangements. This has been reviewed by IPA.



Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
7	Recommendation 7. The SRO should commission a review of XXXXXX resourcing within TLB NAME and DELIVERY ORGANISATION to ensure both organisations can deliver their accountabilities.	Essential with 3 months (by XXX 22)	Completed in XXX 2022. <ul style="list-style-type: none">As a result the DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX Programme team headcount has increased to 19 from 16. (17 posts are filled with recruitment in hand for one and action in hand for a recent departure). The DELIVERY ORGANISATION XXXXXX Programme Team sit within the OTHER PROGRAMME resourcing ringfence and prioritisation.TLB NAME resourcing has been reviewed and is currently judged adequate for its Sponsorship role.
9	Recommendation 9. The SRO should require the development of a common and consistent workforce plan by CONTRACTOR which supports the Schedule, is updated, and structured to include the resource required for the proactive management of risks, issues and opportunities and is capable of being proactively challenged by the key experts.	Essential	Initial version of the workforce plan was delivered in Dec 2022. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Manufacturing resourcing data was reviewed during the schedule review drawing on workforce and skills data provided by CONTRACTOR.Awaiting a final version of the workforce plan following schedule re-baselining work.
10	Recommendation 10. The SRO should sponsor a discussion with the DELIVERY ORGANISATION on options for Enterprise-wide solutions including on; recruitment, training and career development for key skills.	Essential with 9 months ideally within 6 (by XXX 22 ideally XXX 22)	Ongoing. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Engagement with the TLB NAME Sponsored Skills Programme has commenced and will proceed once a final Workforce Plan has been received from CONTRACTOR.Wider work by CONTRACTOR to address resourcing risks (including a new Skills Academy) are summarised in the initial version of the Workforce Plan.



Priority	Recommendation	Critical, Essential, Recommended	Status/ Update
12	Recommendation 12. Review all contract deliverables and requirements and ensure that they are being appropriately provided.	Critical	Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linked to Rec 16 – Contract Refresher. DELIVERY ORGANISATION has confirmed that all current contract deliverables are being met.
13	Recommendation 13. The SRO shall sponsor a Go/No Go review of ANOTHER PROGRAMME and in particular consider whether it is appropriately defined, structured, resourced and capable of being delivered alongside existing priorities. If a Go decision is approved, then the project should be formally relaunched with appropriate governance.	Essential within 6 months ideally within 3 (by XXX 22 ideally XXX 22)	Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being pursued by ANOTHER PROGRAMME. Action is closed.
14	Recommendation 14. A hold point should be introduced into ANOTHER PROGRAMME on the “Agreement in Principle” by CONTRACTOR confirming their willingness to enter into negotiations on a common set of critical principles.	Essential with 9 months ideally within 6 (by XXX 22 ideally XXX 22)	Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being pursued by ANOTHER PROGRAMME. Action is closed.



ANNEX E: List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

[illegible]



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.

Ref	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.]