

SOW AUDIT REPORT

GoTechnology UKCS and Penguins hub2 Migration Proposal.pdf

22.2% Overall Compliance Score

Report Generated: January 09, 2026 at 10:58 AM IST

Total Pillars	9
Met Requirements	2
Partial Compliance	2
Not Met	5
Critical Issues	3
High Risk Issues	3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This comprehensive SOW (Statement of Work) audit report evaluates compliance against nine mandatory divestment pillars. The analysis resulted in an overall compliance score of 22.2%, with 2 pillars fully compliant and 5 areas requiring remediation. Key Findings:

- 2 of 9 pillars meet all requirements
- 2 pillars show partial compliance
- 5 pillars require immediate remediation
- 3 critical issues identified
- 3 high-risk items requiring action

COMPLIANCE PILLAR SUMMARY

#	Pillar	Status	Risk	Key Finding
1	Pricing Model	Met	Low	"The cost for this scope of work is USD \$37,000 lumpsum." and "Proposed invoice milestones are: Milestone Invoice % of PO value Invoice Value Hold Kick-off Meeting 30% \$11,100 Go live with new hub2..."
2	Responsibilities	Partial	Medium	Responsibilities are described narratively (e.g., "Wood will work collaboratively...", "Provide test users with access...") but not in a structured RACI matrix. Some tasks are clear (Wood migrates ...)
3	Schedule	Not Met	Critical	Document states: "Wood have been advised of a provisional go-live by end of September 2025/first week of October 2025." The provided Gantt chart shows months (July-Oct 2025). This conflicts with th...
4	Licensing	Not Met	Critical	Under Assumptions: "Licensing is not included." No mention of temporary licenses for Build, Test, or Cutover phases, their duration, or cost.
5	Master Contract Reference	Met	Low	"The work will be completed under contract GF44616 between Wood Group UK and SHELL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INT'L B.V."
6	Sign-off Blocks	Not Met	High	Not Found. The document ends with a page number. No signature blocks for authorized representatives of Shell and Wood are present.
7	Change Management	Not Met	High	Not Found. No process described for handling changes to scope, schedule, or cost.
8	Risk & Terms Mitigation	Not Met	Critical	Not Found. The SOW contains no specific terms on liability, warranties, or risk allocation. It relies solely on the master contract.

#	Pillar	Status	Risk	Key Finding
9	Data Handling	Partial	High	Process described: "Migrate all Shell data on a like-for-like basis...", "Projects UAT the new instance", "Projects validates new instance". However, there is no explicit, mandatory step for a form...

DETAILED PILLAR ANALYSIS

1. Pricing Model

Status: Met | Risk Level: Low

Key Finding:

"The cost for this scope of work is USD \$37,000 lumpsum." and "Proposed invoice milestones are: Milestone Invoice % of PO value Invoice Value Hold Kick-off Meeting 30% \$11,100 Go live with new hub2 at end of cutover period. 50% \$18,500 Deletion of Penguins and UKCS data in Shell 20% \$7,400 instance."

Evidence:

"The cost for this scope of work is USD \$37,000 lumpsum." and "Proposed invoice milestones are: Milestone Invoice % of PO value Invoice Value Hold Kick-off Meeting 30% \$11,100 Go live with new hub2 at end of cutover period. 50% \$18,500 Deletion of Penguins and UKCS data in Shell 20% \$7,400 instance."

Recommendation:

Confirm the 'lumpsum' is a firm fixed price with no pass-through costs. Ensure the final SOW explicitly states 'Fixed Price' and that payment is contingent on Shell's formal acceptance of each milestone deliverable.

2. Responsibilities

Status: Partial | Risk Level: Medium

Key Finding:

Responsibilities are described narratively (e.g., "Wood will work collaboratively...", "Provide test users with access...") but not in a structured RACI matrix. Some tasks are clear (Wood migrates data), but accountability for UAT success and final validation is ambiguous.

Evidence:

Responsibilities are described narratively (e.g., "Wood will work collaboratively...", "Provide test users with access...") but not in a structured RACI matrix. Some tasks are clear (Wood migrates data), but accountability for UAT success and final validation is ambiguous.

Recommendation:

Insert a RACI matrix appendix. Clearly define Shell's responsibility for UAT execution and formal sign-off, and Wood's responsibility for providing a defect-free environment and remediating any migration errors.

3. Schedule

Status: Not Met | Risk Level: Critical

Key Finding:

Document states: "Wood have been advised of a provisional go-live by end of September 2025/first week of October 2025." The provided Gantt chart shows months (July-Oct 2025). This conflicts with the mandatory project timeline (Build End: 2026-01-15, Test End: 2026-02-15, Cutover End: 2026-03-31).

Evidence:

Document states: "Wood have been advised of a provisional go-live by end of September 2025/first week of October 2025." The provided Gantt chart shows months (July-Oct 2025). This conflicts with the mandatory project timeline (Build End: 2026-01-15, Test End: 2026-02-15, Cutover End: 2026-03-31).

Recommendation:

Redline the schedule section. Replace all references to 2025 with the mandated 2026 dates. The SOW must explicitly list the hard deadlines: Build Phase Complete by 2026-01-15, Test Phase Complete by 2026-02-15, Cutover Complete by 2026-03-31.

4. Licensing

Status: Not Met | Risk Level: Critical

Key Finding:

Under Assumptions: "Licensing is not included." No mention of temporary licenses for Build, Test, or Cutover phases, their duration, or cost.

Evidence:

Under Assumptions: "Licensing is not included." No mention of temporary licenses for Build, Test, or Cutover phases, their duration, or cost.

Recommendation:

This is a critical gap. Add a 'Licensing' section. Specify that Wood will provide all necessary temporary software licenses for the new hub2 instance for the Build, Test, and Cutover phases at no additional cost, with defined start and end dates aligned to the project timeline. This must be a contractual obligation.

5. Master Contract Reference

Status: Met | Risk Level: Low

Key Finding:

"The work will be completed under contract GF44616 between Wood Group UK and SHELL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INT'L B.V."

Evidence:

"The work will be completed under contract GF44616 between Wood Group UK and SHELL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INT'L B.V."

Recommendation:

Verify that contract GF44616 is the active and appropriate master agreement governing this SOW and that all its terms (especially liability, indemnity, and termination) apply.

6. Sign-off Blocks

Status: Not Met | Risk Level: High

Key Finding:

Not Found. The document ends with a page number. No signature blocks for authorized representatives of Shell and Wood are present.

Evidence:

Not Found. The document ends with a page number. No signature blocks for authorized representatives of Shell and Wood are present.

Recommendation:

Add a formal signature page at the end of the SOW with blocks for Printed Name, Title, Signature, and Date for both Shell and Wood authorized signatories.

7. Change Management

Status: Not Met | Risk Level: High

Key Finding:

Not Found. No process described for handling changes to scope, schedule, or cost.

Evidence:

Not Found. No process described for handling changes to scope, schedule, or cost.

Recommendation:

Add a 'Change Management' clause. State that any change must be documented in a written Change Order, signed by both parties, referencing this SOW and master contract GF44616, before any work on the change commences.

8. Risk & Terms Mitigation

Status: Not Met | Risk Level: Critical

Key Finding:

Not Found. The SOW contains no specific terms on liability, warranties, or risk allocation. It relies solely on the master contract.

Evidence:

Not Found. The SOW contains no specific terms on liability, warranties, or risk allocation. It relies solely on the master contract.

Recommendation:

Insert key protective terms: 1) Wood warrants the migrated data will be complete and accurate. 2) Wood is liable for all costs arising from its errors during migration. 3) All delays are subject to liquidated damages as per the master contract. 4) Shell's approval is required for all milestones before payment.

9. Data Handling

Status: Partial | Risk Level: High

Key Finding:

Process described: "Migrate all Shell data on a like-for-like basis...", "Projects UAT the new instance", "Projects validates new instance". However, there is no explicit, mandatory step for a formal Data Verification or Quality Check report signed off by Shell before cutover.

Evidence:

Process described: "Migrate all Shell data on a like-for-like basis...", "Projects UAT the new instance", "Projects validates new instance". However, there is no explicit, mandatory step for a formal Data Verification or Quality Check report signed off by Shell before cutover.

Recommendation:

Amend the UAT/Cutover phases. Insert a mandatory deliverable: 'Data Verification Report' confirming record counts, data integrity, and functional parity. Cutover (Milestone 2 payment) must be conditional on Shell's written approval of this report.

RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX

Risk Level	Count	Percentage
Critical	3	33.3%
High	3	33.3%
Medium	1	11.1%
Low	2	22.2%

ACTION ITEMS & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Responsibilities [Medium Risk]

Insert a RACI matrix appendix. Clearly define Shell's responsibility for UAT execution and formal sign-off, and Wood's responsibility for providing a defect-free environment and remediating any migration errors.

2. Schedule [Critical Risk]

Redline the schedule section. Replace all references to 2025 with the mandated 2026 dates. The SOW must explicitly list the hard deadlines: Build Phase Complete by 2026-01-15, Test Phase Complete by 2026-02-15, Cutover Complete by 2026-03-31.

3. Licensing [Critical Risk]

This is a critical gap. Add a 'Licensing' section. Specify that Wood will provide all necessary temporary software licenses for the new hub2 instance for the Build, Test, and Cutover phases at no additional cost, with defined start and end dates aligned to the project timeline. This must be a contractual obligation.

4. Sign-off Blocks [High Risk]

Add a formal signature page at the end of the SOW with blocks for Printed Name, Title, Signature, and Date for both Shell and Wood authorized signatories.

5. Change Management [High Risk]

Add a 'Change Management' clause. State that any change must be documented in a written Change Order, signed by both parties, referencing this SOW and master contract GF44616, before any work on the change commences.

6. Risk & Terms Mitigation [Critical Risk]

Insert key protective terms: 1) Wood warrants the migrated data will be complete and accurate. 2) Wood is liable for all costs arising from its errors during migration. 3) All delays are subject to liquidated damages as per the master contract. 4) Shell's approval is required for all milestones before payment.

7. Data Handling [High Risk]

Amend the UAT/Cutover phases. Insert a mandatory deliverable: 'Data Verification Report' confirming record counts, data integrity, and functional parity. Cutover (Milestone 2 payment) must be conditional on Shell's written approval of this report.

SOW CONTENT SUMMARY

Document Overview

This Statement of Work (SOW) outlines a critical IT divestment project for the migration of specific Shell UK Continental Shelf (UKCS) and Penguins project data from a shared Shell-hosted hub2 database to a new, dedicated instance. The vendor, Wood Group UK, will leverage its existing familiarity with the data and the GoTechnology® platform to execute a 'like-for-like' migration, ensuring continuity for the divested assets. The project is essential for cleanly separating the designated assets' data from Shell's central systems as part of the divestiture process, with a provisional target for operational cutover by the end of September or early October 2025. The work is governed under an existing master contract between the parties.

Parties Involved

Vendor:	Wood Group UK
Client:	SHELL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INT'L B.V. (for Shell UKCS & Penguins)
Vendor Role:	Provide end-to-end migration services including planning, instance setup, data migration, UAT support, cutover execution, and post-migration support and data cleanup.
Client Role:	Collaborate on scope agreement, provide named test users for UAT, agree on cutover timing, and validate the new instance. The client contract holder is Karthick K. Gopalaswamy.

Scope Highlights

- Configuration and setup of a new, functionally equivalent hub2 instance for the UKCS and Penguins projects.
- Migration of all Shell data on a 'like-for-like' basis, followed by the deletion of all non-UKCS/Penguins data from the new instance.
- Execution of a controlled cutover with a planned outage (typically under 48 hours) impacting only the migrating projects.
- Provision of a 30-day read-only reference period for the data in the original Shell instance post-migration, followed by its deletion or archiving.
- Explicit exclusions: Data cleaning, data archiving (though it can be performed), licensing, and any updates to the hub2 platform itself.
- Collaborative User Acceptance Testing (UAT) with named Shell test users to validate the new instance before go-live.

Key Deliverables

- New hub2 Instance: A fully configured and populated database instance for the UKCS and Penguins projects.
- Detailed Configuration Plan: To be produced after scope agreement and purchase order issuance.

- UAT Completion Confirmation: Formal validation of successful user testing.
- Migration Success Confirmation: Official notification of a successful cutover and go-live.
- Post-Migration Support: Includes a 'Hypercare' period and execution of the final data deletion/archiving from the Shell instance.

Project Timeline

The project is scheduled to commence upon receipt of a Purchase Order, with key activities spanning from July through October 2025. An indicative timeline outlines phases for Review/Planning & Setup, User Acceptance Testing (UAT), the Migration Cutover, and Post-Migration activities. The vendor has been advised of a provisional target for go-live by the end of September or within the first week of October 2025. The final schedule will be confirmed and updated regularly following the project kick-off meeting.

Cost Structure

The project is offered on a fixed-price, lump-sum basis of USD \$37,000. Payments are structured across three milestone-based invoices: 30% (\$11,100) upon holding the project kick-off meeting, 50% (\$18,500) upon successful go-live at the end of the cutover period, and the final 20% (\$7,400) upon deletion of the Penguins and UKCS data from the original Shell instance.

Technology Stack

GoTechnology® hub2 database platform

Document Structure

- Requirements and Scope: Defines the four-phase project approach (Review/Planning, UAT, Cutover, Post-Migration) and specific technical activities.
- Assumptions: Clarifies included assets, exclusions like data cleaning and licensing, and foundational project parameters.
- Proposed Schedule: Provides an indicative timeline from July to October 2025, mapping key tasks to months.
- Commercial: Details the fixed-price cost structure and associated invoice milestones tied to project progress.
- Contract: References the governing master agreement and identifies the Shell contract holder.

Special Terms & Conditions

- **Migration is strictly 'like-for-like'; any updates or upgrades to the hub2 platform must be handled separately, either before or after the migration project.**
- **User access levels and names will remain unchanged throughout the migration process.**
- **The cutover outage will be contained, not impacting any other Shell projects, which will maintain access to the existing database.**
- **The work is to be performed under the existing master contract GF44616 between Wood Group UK and SHELL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INT'L B.V.**

■ The final domain name for the new instance is to be confirmed at the project kick-off.

Key Assumptions & Constraints

- Included Shell assets are specifically listed: Shell UKCS (Gannet, Nelson, Shearwater, Gannet GF04, Penguins, West of Shetland) and Shell Penguins (Penguins FPSO).
- Data cleaning and archiving services are explicitly excluded from the quoted price.
- Software licensing for the new instance is not included in this SOW and is a separate consideration.
- The project timeline is indicative and will be finalized after project kick-off.
- A Purchase Order is required to initiate the work.