

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

# **INDEPENDENT ASSURANCE**

**PROGRAMME: Cladding Remediation**

**Gateway Review 0**  
**(Strategic Assessment)**

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

---

<b>Report Status:</b>	<b>FINAL</b>
<b>Date/s of Review</b>	18/10/2021 to 20/10/2021
<b>Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):</b>	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
<b>Draft report issued to SRO</b>	20/10/2021
<b>Final report issued to SRO and copied to PPPA:</b>	27/10/2021
<b>Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA):</b>	AMBER
<b>Accountable Officer:</b>	Sean Neill
<b>Scottish Government's (SG) Portfolio Accountable Officer:</b>	«Insert Name»
<b>Investment Decision Maker:</b>	«Insert Name»

---

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the 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.

## Gateway Review Conclusion

<b><u>Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA):</u></b>	AMBER
<p>The DCA of Amber reflects the Review Team’s assessment that whilst the key findings of the Ministerial working groups have been reflected in the planning and actions of the programme, significant issues already exist that will require management attention to mitigate the risks to progressing the enablement of property transactions in a manner that maintains the primary aim of the safety of people, whilst enabling people to buy, sell and re-mortgage properties in buildings with external wall cladding.</p> <p>The Review Team acknowledges and endorses the strategic approach to place primacy on the safety of people. However, the Review Team finds that there needs to be increased focus on the actions needed to enable property transactions in a manner which supports the delivery of the primary objectives.</p> <p>The Review Team acknowledges that the approach planned can ensure that the primary aim is maintained through the implementation of Single Building Assessment. The data gathered through this process will support both improvements to the safety of people and the implementation of processes that can lead to the enablement of property transactions.</p> <p>A key finding of this review is that there is now a potential for confusion of scope, between, what we consider to be, strategic programme level aims and the need to develop required short-term approach to enabling transactions and remediating the buildings blighted by the cladding issues. The initial assessment is that there are 780 buildings over 18m with cladding. These need urgent action to categorise and assess for remediation. The Review Team considers that there is a need to define a project with the explicit aim of assessing buildings which can be ‘Green-Lighted’.</p> <p>Good work has been done with stakeholders and all are positively engaged, though all have differing objectives.</p> <p>It is not clear to the Review Team what the success criteria are and what measures will be used to agree progress. The timescale set out, following the election, in the ‘first 100 day’s’ plan, as stated that the process of Single Building Assessment surveys would be commenced. Whilst this has driven the focus of the programme and can be seen to be successful, the Review Team considers the activities and progress to date to reflect a feasibility study which has gone some way to scope the size of the problem. The programme should now be baselined and scoped and we make recommendations to support the programme to this end.</p> <p>The current Governance and organisational location for the programme is suited to the development of the SBA as this relates to Building Standards, however, the</p>	

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

governance of an operational delivery project, which is what is required for delivering a rapid set of assessments needs to be within an operationally focussed management structure.

The delivery of a package of remediation measures is contingent on the stakeholder community agreeing the parameters for insurance and lending to be secured. At present there is no resolution to the inability of RICS surveyors and Fire Engineers to secure Professional Indemnity Insurance for the SBA and EWS1 surveys. This is a blocker to further progress.

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

<b>RAG</b>	<b><u>Criteria Description</u></b>
<b>Green</b>	Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery.
<b>Amber/Green</b>	Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.
<b>Amber</b>	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.
<b>Amber/Red</b>	Successful delivery of the project 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.
<b>Red</b>	Successful delivery of the project appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The project may need re-base lining and/or overall viability re-assessed.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

## Summary of Report Recommendations

A summary of the report recommendations are as follows :

Ref. No.	Report section	Recommendation	Status	Aligned with SG PPM Principle	Aligned with profession
1.	1	<b>Define outcomes and measures of success for the Programme.</b>	C.	Business case	Policy
2.	2	<b>The SRO should determine the means required to support the Minister in discussions with the UK Government on the Professional Indemnity Insurance issues.</b>	C.	Approach	Risk
3.	3	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit undertakes an exercise to baseline the programme and associated projects at the activity based level required to support PPM and agrees this with the Programme Board.</b>	C.	Planning	Project Delivery
4.	3	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop a Project Initiation Document for enabling buying selling and re-mortgaging. The objectives and deliverables should be confirmed to aligned with and underpin the programme level aims on the safety of people.</b>	C.	Roles and responsibilities	Project Delivery
5.	3	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop and implement a pipeline management process to support the ‘Green-Lighting’ of properties and buildings</b>	C.	Approach	Project Delivery
6.	4	<b>The RAID log is developed and populated in a series of workshops with stakeholders.</b>	E.	Risk	Risk
7	4	<b>Assumptions are documented and agreed and contingency plans agreed.</b>	E	Risk	Risk

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

Each recommendation has been given Critical, Essential or Recommended status.

The definition of each status is as follows:

**Critical (Do Now)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the project should take action immediately.

**Essential (Do By)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the project should take action in the near future.

**Recommended** – The Project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.

Each recommendation has been aligned with one of the SG's PPM Principles and the SG Head of Profession.

**Annex A** lists the principles.

**ACTION PLAN** - You must within three weeks of the final report provide your intended actions for addressing each recommendation. You should then share it with the relevant SG's Accountable Officer and copy it to the SG's Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub (PPPA). Thereafter, you are responsible for implementing the actions in response to the recommendations. If the review has identified serious deficiencies or difficulties (including probable failure to meet the planned budget) within the programme the Accountable Officer should inform the relevant Minister/s.

### **Purpose of the Gateway Review**

**Annex B** gives the full purposes statement for a Gateway Review 0.

### **Acknowledgement**

The Review Team would like to thank the SRO [Redacted under Regulation 11(2)] the Programme Team and all interviewees for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the project and the outcome of this review. **Annex C** lists the people who were interviewed during the review.

### **Background**

#### **Aims of the programme:**

1. Implement the Single Building Assessment (SBA) as a standard across Scotland for assessing the Cladding and Fire risks for buildings across Scotland, as set out by the Ministerial Working Group on mortgage lending and cladding

## **Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**

### **An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

2. Create an inventory of buildings across Scotland affected by unsafe cladding including a list of safe buildings that have been classified as safe or buildings where remediation work has been completed.
3. Utilise the Cladding Remediation Fund to support the roll out of the SBA Programme and to provide a financial contribution to the remediation and/or mitigation of buildings identified as being at most risk.

#### **Driving force for the programme:**

- The Scottish Government received £97.1m in Barnett consequentials following the UK Government's announcement in March 2020. Ministers announced that this will be made available in full for the Single Building Assessments and to support urgent remediation work that these identify.

#### **Procurement/delivery status:**

- The Cladding Remediation Unit with its current complement aims to deliver a grant funding programme to approximately 800 high rise (above 18m) buildings and an estimated 10,000 low rise (11-18m) buildings across Scotland.
- The £97.1m fund will be used to deliver building assessments and provide some support for remediation on a grant funding basis.
- With no delivery partner and no contract in place the 7.27 FTE staff within the unit will deliver tailored support to the public on a building by building basis.
- Based on the above information the timescales for delivery will be 5 years for assessing (not including remediation) the 780 high rise buildings and low rise buildings, assuming that:
  - the number of fire engineers remains static
  - the number of qualified fire risk surveyors is 50
  - each building will take 1 week to assess
  - and the Cladding Unit resources remain static.

#### **Current position regarding previous assurance reviews:**

- A previous assurance review was conducted to support the review of outcomes from the Ministerial Working Group and was focused on the drivers for setting up the programme.

## **Review Team findings and recommendations**

### **1. Policy and business context**

The report issued by the Ministerial Working Group on Mortgage Lending and Cladding in March 2021 clearly sets out the need to address the difficulties faced by individuals and families who live in flatted residential properties in buildings that have external wall cladding when they try to buy, sell or re-mortgage these properties.

The difficulties have arisen because of the safety concerns arising from the tragic incident at Grenfell Tower in 2017 which have not only generated real safety concerns for residents, but also, due to the issues of securing lending, valuations and insurance, there is a consequential inability to transact to buy, sell or re-mortgage their properties. Accordingly, the Review Team acknowledge that progressing the findings of the report is wholly consistent with government policy, a positioning which was confirmed with reference to commencing the process of Single Building Assessments (SBA) in the 'first 100 days' document following elections in Scotland in May 2021.

The importance of delivering against both the need for the remediation of properties and the affected properties and also enabling the ability to buy, sell and re-mortgage properties also reflects the priorities of the UK Government. Financial services, including insurance are matters reserved to UK Government and as a result, there has been discussions and joint planning with the UK Government on the actions required to support homeowners, leading to the availability of funding to support the initiatives.

The Review Team acknowledges the holistic approach taken by Scottish Government in bringing forward the need for SBAs which will address the issues specific to Scotland generated where flatted buildings in Scotland have multiple ownership. The strategic approach will lead to identifying and addressing a whole range or safety issues that impact the buildings, rather than just those directly related to cladding.

The Review Team comment elsewhere in this report on the urgency behind the initiative has led to the team moving from policy direct to delivering the commencement of undertaking of SBAs without the normal level of mobilisation and planning. This is an issue that must be corrected if the policy and delivery aims are to be successfully delivered.

The MWG Report identified 7 key stages but did not develop outcomes or means of delivery or the measurement of progress or success of any associated programme. That now needs to be done with some urgency.

### **Recommendation 1: Define outcomes and measures of success for the Programme CRITICAL**



## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

### 2. Business case and stakeholders

The Programme Team have brought forward a Business Case for the Cladding Remediation Programme. The document is at Final Draft stage and closely reflects the aims and challenges set out in the MWG on Mortgage Lending and Cladding. The Review Team considers that the document meets the need to set out the policy drivers and an outline of the outcomes sought. The Review Team acknowledges that the format is consistent with the best practice of the Treasury 5-case model and this provides confidence that there is experience within the team to progress the further development of the document.

The Review Team heard through interviews that the urgency placed on commencing SBAs has led straight to a limited level of delivery without the appropriate planning and preparation for a programme of this scope and value. The Review Team acknowledges the pressures that have caused this approach and agree with the views we heard that as the programme enters the next phase there will be a need for appropriate planning to be undertaken, which will be a pre-requisite for the Business Case to be developed from an Outline Business Case into a Final Business Case.

The Review Team emphasises that the experience of many initiatives that have continued to progress with delivery without appropriate planning demonstrates their vulnerability to common causes of failure. The Review Team found evidence that potentially significant issues are already emerging due to a lack of clarity regarding programme and project level outcomes. We suggest that consideration is given to the programme undertaking a further independent assurance review at a point when there has been sufficient progress on planning to baseline the programme and inform the further development of the Business Case to progress.

#### Stakeholders

Key stakeholders include, Surveyors, Fire Safety Engineers, Lenders, Home Owners, Developers and the Insurance Industry. All are represented on the Programme Board. The Review Team found that stakeholders were engaged and informing the programme. Stakeholders represent industry and community groups. All stakeholders want to make progress however, progress is stalled by the inability of surveyors and Fire Safety Engineers to obtain Professional Indemnity Insurance (PII) to cover their work.

Insurance cover has become a blocker to progress on all fronts as not only is PII an issue, the insurers will not insure some high rise buildings with exceptional cladding and insulation risks. The Review Team heard that there are announcements to be made by the UK Government to help resolve the blocker. Until this blocker is removed it is unlikely that any progress to scope the problem or to move on, will be made. The Programme would best be served by Scottish Government working with the UK Government at a Ministerial level to drive resolution of this blocker.

The stakeholders have different requirements from the process: the lenders want to be sure that their loans are secured against building loss, owners want to be able to re-mortgage and insurers want to have more ability to evaluate the risk.

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

At present there is an inability to agree the role and purpose of the SBA, or EWS1, by the insurance sector. Although the insurance sector is made up of many diverse players with differing risk appetites, it should not be beyond all players to agree the factual basis and state of a building on which risk can then be calculated, thus allowing for different views on the size of the risk and the appetite. This is what happens in other insurance sectors, e.g. holiday insurance and hazardous sports. The approach the Review Team would suggest is that of conflict resolution: first agree what everyone agrees on and then work through the disagreements until some middle ground can be reached.

**Recommendation 2: The SRO should determine the means required to support the Minister in discussions with the UK Government in the Indemnity Insurance issues. CRITICAL**

### 3. Management of intended outcomes

The key finding of this Gateway 0 review is that there needs to be clarity and stakeholder agreement on the intended outcomes at both the programme and project level, and whilst these must be appropriately aligned to ensure no compromise with the bigger picture focus on the safety of people, they should be capable of being progressed separately and managed against the achievement of pre-determined success criteria.

The Review Team acknowledges and commends the strategic approach being taken through the SBA process, that will lead to identifying and addressing a whole range or safety issues that impact the buildings and the safety of people, rather than just those directly related to cladding.

The concern for the Review Team is the need to be able to progress the management of intended outcomes at the 'programme level', whilst in parallel providing an appropriate focus on project level challenges that led to the establishment of the MWG on Mortgage Lending and Cladding – *'to enable people to buy, sell and remortgage properties and buildings with external wall cladding'*.

To achieve that enablement will undoubtedly need the SBA process to be further developed and for the conditions, including delivery and funding models, required for assessments to undertaken to be established. Further, there will be a need for 'known issues', such as those associated to the market for professional indemnity insurance to be progressed, the Review Team also share the concerns we heard expressed with regard to the progression of SBAs being through responses to Expressions of Interest.

The Review Team are concerned that the current approach is characterised by being reactive to known issues and a level of over-dependency on already identified solutions, e.g. the state-backed scheme regarding indemnity insurance. The Review Team considers that the current approach will unnecessarily limit the pace and number of properties and buildings where property transactions could progress, whilst also delivering against the broader focus of safety of people.

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

The MWG on Motgaging and Cladding report sets out a summary routemap containing 7 steps to resolving the current issues. The Review Team acknowledges that these are well-considered and recommends that the need is for them to be reflected in a delivery management approach under Programme and Project Management (PPM) controls that will lead to optimum progress in the undertaking of SBAs and securing 'Green Light' status for property transactions. Together these conditions will provide appropriate confidence in progress and improve the quality and certainty of communications to all stakeholders.

- The Review Team recommends that a project level focus is established regarding a 'pipeline management' approach that would secure, amongst other controls:
  - The placing of the current, circa 780, buildings within scope under change control to contain scope creep
  - Determine appropriate categorisation that reflects a tiered level of challenge towards achieving Green-Light status
  - Identifies requirements, conditions and actions to progress each category to achieve Green-Light
  - Informs the priorities for stakeholder action and funding.

Such a pipeline management approach, under appropriate governance to ensure alignment with the strategic priority of the safety of people, will support effective management reporting and decision making.

The Review Team do not consider that the adoption of such a pipeline management approach will be a significant challenge for the programme. Action has been taken recently to secure resources that are experienced in working within programmes that have adopted such approaches and enjoys the support of key stakeholders who are particularly well placed to provide a conduit between the project/programme to inform on the conditions required to support categorisation of properties within the 'GreenLight' pipeline.

**Recommendation 3: The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit undertakes an exercise to baseline the programme and associated projects at the activity based level required to support PPM and agrees this with the Programme Board.**

**Recommendation 4: The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop a Project Initiation Document for enabling buying selling and re-mortgaging. The objectives and deliverables should be confirmed to be aligned with and underpin the programme level aims on the safety of people.**

**Recommendation 5: The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop and implement a pipeline management process to support the 'Green Lighting' of properties and buildings**

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

#### **4. Risk Management**

The Review Team saw a RAID log, however, this was sparsely populated. This needs completing with some urgency. The formal definition of risks is those things which could impact the programme but which are outside the control of the programme and therefore they need to be mitigated.

The programme has a number of key assumptions, for example, surveys can be done in sufficient time and to a suitable quality, which need to be documented and agreed. It is important to realise, that once the assumptions change, or prove to be invalid, not only do the risks change but the programme needs to be re-baselined.

As part of risk management, contingency plans need to be developed now and enacted when risks materialise. The Review Team consider that contingency plans should be developed.

The key risk to the programme is the inability of stakeholders to agree the basis of assessing risk to buildings and the ability of the surveyors and Fire Engineers to obtain PII.

**Recommendation 6: the RAID log is developed and populated in a series of workshops with stakeholders. ESSENTIAL by end of Baselining of programme**

**Recommendation 7: Assumptions are documented and agreed and contingency plans agreed. ESSENTIAL By baselining of programme.**

#### **5. Review of current outcomes**

The programme has been focussed upon agreeing a SBA to overcome the complexities of Scottish Property Law relating to multiple ownership buildings. There exists an EWS1 form adopted by RICS and agreed with lenders to assess the risks associated with cladding which is in use throughout the UK where co-ownership of blocks of flats does not exist. The SBA is a wider assessment than the EWS1 and goes into the wider aspects of fire safety.

The Programme was set-up with a Ministerial commitment to a '100 days' target for commencement of delivery of the SBA and remediation. This timescale was clearly heroic and an impossible timescale to achieve.

The Review Team were told that there are 780 buildings over 18m. These should be treated as a priority at this stage. A pilot approach has been adopted to test the market and to establish some base data to enable the problem to be structured. Expressions of interest from management groups/owners of buildings over 18m high have been received from 123 buildings/owners whittled down to 25 parties for the pilot.

The Programme Team have worked well and managed to get real collaboration amongst the key stakeholders.

## **Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**

### **An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

The key block to progress, as identified earlier in the report, is the inability of the inspection community (Fire Engineers and RCIS Surveyors) to get PII and therefore at present it is not possible to commission surveys to establish the risk profile of the at-risk buildings. Without the ability to commission surveys progress is unlikely. There is a further problem in the inability of factors and owners to get insurance cover for buildings.

There is a need now to restructure and re-baseline the programme, as identified earlier and to separate the strategic from the urgent operational issues.

#### **6. Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes**

To progress to the next stage, the programme needs to be redefined and rescoped. Outcomes need to be defined, deliverables and a realistic timescale agreed for delivery. Stages of delivery and appropriate outcomes for each must be defined and agreed as identified in the sections earlier.

The whole issue of remediation and removing uncertainty and worry for flat dwellers is now at a crisis stage with the public calls for action becoming louder. A crisis management approach to tackling the 780 buildings over 18m now needs to be adopted and the project to tackle the remediation separated from the SBA programme and being vested in an operational organisational setting.

#### **Previous Gateway Review Recommendations**

No previous gateway Review has taken place.

#### **Next Independent Assurance Review**

Approaching end of financial year, March 2022.

#### **Distribution of the Gateway Review Report**

The contents of this report are confidential to the SRO and their representative/s. It is for the SRO to consider when and to whom they wish to make the report (or part thereof) available, and whether they would wish to be consulted before recipients of the report share its contents (or part thereof) with others.

The Review Team Members will not retain copies of the report nor discuss its content or conclusions with others.

A copy of the report is lodged with the PPPA so that it can identify and share the generic lessons from Independent Assurance Reviews. The PPPA will copy a summary of the report recommendations to the SG's Accountable Officer, and where appropriate, to the Organisation's Accountable Officer where the review has been conducted on behalf of one of the SG's Agencies, NDPBs or Health Sector organisations.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

The PPA will provide a copy of the report to Review Team Members involved in any subsequent review as part of the preparatory documentation needed for Planning Meetings.

Any other request for copies of the Gateway Report will be directed to the SRO.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

## **ANNEX A**

### **Scottish Government - Programme and Project Management Principles**

#### 1. Approach

- Our approach to managing programmes and projects is proportionate, effective and consistent with recognised good practice.

#### 2. Business Case

- We secure a mandate for our work; identify, record and evaluate our objectives and options for meeting them; and ensure that we secure and maintain management commitment to our selected approach.

#### 3. Roles and Responsibilities

- We assign clear roles and responsibilities to appropriately skilled and experienced people and ensure their levels of delegated authority are clearly defined.

#### 4. Benefits

- We record the benefits we seek, draw up a plan to deliver them and evaluate our success.

#### 5. Risk

- We identify, understand, record and manage risks that could affect the delivery of benefits.

#### 6. Planning

- We develop a plan showing when our objectives will be met and the steps towards achieving them, including appropriate assurance and review activities, and re-plan as necessary.

#### 7. Resource Management

- We identify the financial and other resources, inside and outside the organisation, required to meet our objectives.

#### 8. Stakeholder Management

- We identify those affected by our work and engage them throughout the process from planning to delivery.

#### 9. Transition

- We ensure that the transition to business as usual maximises benefits and that operational delivery is efficient and effective.

#### 10. Lessons

- We record lessons from our programmes and projects and share them with others so they may learn from our experience.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

## **ANNEX B**

### **Purposes of the Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment**

Gateway Review 0 Strategic Assessment is a programme-only Review that sets the programme in the wider policy or corporate context. This Review investigates the direction and planned outcomes of the programme, together with the progress of its constituent projects.

It can be applied to any type of programme, including policy and organisational change. The Review is repeated throughout the life of the programme from start-up to closure; an early Gateway Review 0 is particularly valuable in that it helps to confirm that the way forward is achievable, before plans have been finalised.

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



**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**ANNEX C**

**Review Team:**

Review Team Leader:	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
Review Team Member:	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
Review Team Member:	

**List of Interviewees:**

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

«Add or delete rows as required»

**External Stakeholders**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation/Role</b>
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Association of British Insurers
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Institution of Fire Engineers
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	UK Finance
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Homes for Scotland
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	UK Finance/Nationwide

**Internal Stakeholders**

Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Head of Cladding Remediation Unit
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Cladding Technical Team Leader
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Cladding Policy Team Leader
Sean Neill	Director for Local Government and Communities
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	SRO

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**ANNEX D**

**Progress against previous Gateway Review** «Insert review dates»  
**recommendations:**

«Add or delete rows as required»

<b>Ref No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Progress/Status</b>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		

# INDEPENDENT ASSURANCE

PROGRAMME: Cladding Remediation

**Gateway Review 0**  
**(Strategic Assessment)**

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

---

<b>Report Status:</b>	FINAL
<b>Date/s of Review</b>	27/06/2022 - 29/06/2022
<b>Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):</b>	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
<b>Draft report issued to SRO</b>	29/06/2022
<b>Final report issued to SRO and copied to PPPA:</b>	7/07/2022
<b>Delivery Confidence Assessment (DCA):</b>	AMBER/RED
<b>Accountable Officer:</b>	Sean Neill
<b>Scottish Government's (SG) Portfolio Accountable Officer:</b>	«Insert Name»
<b>Investment Decision Maker:</b>	«Insert Name»

---

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the 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.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

**Gateway Review Conclusion**

<b><u>Delivery Confidence Assessment:</u></b>	AMBER/RED
<p>The Review Team finds that work has progressed on the SBA and six pilot buildings are near to completion. This pilot stage could be considered as a feasibility stage from which a programme can now be properly formulated. There has been a change in approach from grant funding to direct commissioning of the SBAs as result of early experience.</p> <p>Management of external stakeholders is good and there is clear agreement with the approach taken.</p> <p>The Review Team was disappointed to learn that recommendations from the previous report had still not been implemented. Notably, the need to plan and create programme artefacts and develop a business case which will enable options to be properly evaluated and a value for money option chosen. These remain urgent priorities. Work has been commissioned from MACE consulting which should form the input to the FBC.</p> <p>Resources are scarce, particularly with budget concerns around the ability to scale up staffing, this is common across SG with competition for key staff. This is compounded by the lack of clear priorities and appropriate planning. There is an element of reacting to the latest Ministerial initiative and not planning in all of the work.</p> <p>Portfolio Management with an investment committee at the highest level of SG could arbitrate on the use of resources and define SG priorities across competing programmes. Although beyond the powers of the SRO and their management, this is something which should be taken to a higher level of authority.</p> <p>The programme has evolved into a large scale delivery undertaking as opposed to one which contracts out most of its work. The planned development of an Accord with developers is an additional significant tranche of work which adds to the current scale of the programme. The programme is on any measure large and complex with significant external dependencies to be managed and with a complex stakeholder environment. Some of the issues are unique to Scotland because of the building ownership legal context. The Review Team consider that the programme needs more dedicated executive level support [Redacted under Regulation 11(2)] and we have made a recommendation to this end.</p> <p>Significant challenges remain which will require management attention, good programme management and clear focus on priorities.</p>	

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

<b>RAG</b>	<b><u>Criteria Description</u></b>
<b>Green</b>	Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery.
<b>Amber/Green</b>	Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

<b>Amber</b>	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.
<b>Amber/Red</b>	Successful delivery of the project 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.
<b>Red</b>	Successful delivery of the project appears to be unachievable. There are major issues which, at this stage, do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The project may need re-base lining and/or overall viability re-assessed.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**Summary of Report Recommendations**

A summary of the report recommendations are as follows :

Ref. No.	Report section	Recommendation	Status	Aligned with SG PPM Principle	Aligned with profession
1.	1	<b>The SRO makes representations to SG executive that a portfolio approach is required.</b>	R.	Leadership	Project Delivery
2.	1	<b>A brief delivery options paper should be created from the emerging MACE report for consideration by the Programme Board to encourage constructive challenge and feedback.</b>	C.	Justification / BC	Project Delivery
3.	2	<b>A short-term plan should be produced that sets out the immediate priorities and tasks up to approval of the Full Business Case(FBC) and lays the groundwork for a long-term programme plan.</b>	C.	Planning	Project Delivery
4.	2	<b>Work should commence on producing a full programme plan that sets out the key milestones up to programme completion, with dependencies, deliverables and resource requirements at appropriate levels of detail as the timespan moves out.</b>	C.	Planning	Project Delivery
5.	3	<b>A fully developed workforce and resource plan will be required detailing who, what, when and where to confirm core team requirements, including specialist commercial and procurement support. Resource planning will also need to factor in external dependencies for qualified surveyors and capacity of partners such as</b>	C.	Planning	Project Delivery

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

		<b>the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and others to support the programme.</b>			
6.	4	<b>Treat developing the Accord as a priority and properly plan it and resource it.</b>	C.	Transition	Project Delivery
7	5	<b>Consideration should be given to separating the delivery team and its management from the BAU assurance team as part of full programme mobilisation on approval of the FBC.</b>	E	roles and Responsibilities	Project delivery
8	5	<b>Redacted under Regulation 11(2)</b>	C	Leadership	Project Delivery

Each recommendation has been given Critical, Essential or Recommended status.

The definition of each status is as follows:

**Critical (Do Now)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the project should take action immediately.

**Essential (Do By)** – To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the project should take action in the near future.

**Recommended** – The Project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation.

Each recommendation has been aligned with one of the SG’s PPM Principles and the SG Head of Profession.

**Annex A** lists the principles.

**ACTION PLAN** - You must within three weeks of the final report provide your intended actions for addressing each recommendation. You should then share it with the relevant SG’s Accountable Officer and copy it to the SG’s Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub (PPPA). Thereafter, you are responsible for implementing the actions in response to the recommendations. If the review has identified serious deficiencies or difficulties (including probable failure to meet the planned budget) within the programme the Accountable Officer should inform the relevant Minister/s.

### **Purpose of the Gateway Review**

**Annex B** gives the full purposes statement for a Gateway Review 0.

### **Acknowledgement**



## **Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**

### **An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

The Review Team would like to thank the SRO, the Cladding Remediation Programme Team and all interviewees for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the project and the outcome of this review. **Annex C** lists the people who were interviewed during the review.

## **Background**

### **Aims of the programme:**

1. Implement the Single Building Assessment (SBA) as a standard across Scotland for assessing the Cladding and Fire risks for buildings across Scotland, as set out by the Ministerial Working Group on mortgage lending and cladding
2. Create an inventory of buildings across Scotland affected by unsafe cladding including a list of safe buildings that have been classified as safe or buildings where remediation work has been completed.
3. Utilise the Cladding Remediation Fund to support the roll out of the SBA Programme and to provide a financial contribution to the remediation and/or mitigation of buildings identified as being at most risk.

### **Driving force for the programme:**

- The Scottish Government received £97.1m in Barnett consequentials following the UK Government's announcement in March 2020. Ministers announced that this will be made available in full for the Single Building Assessments and to support urgent remediation work that these identify.

### **Procurement/delivery status:**

The initial grant funding model (Pathway1) has supported the testing of the SBA process. The key lesson learned was, Property Managers do not have the professional capability to conduct specialist construction project management activity which requires knowledge of fire safety inspections of an external wall. To mitigate this issue, Pathway 2 was implemented and this enables Scottish Government to step into the commissioning role. This reduces overall SBA timescales and will ensure consistency in the scope of assessments.

### **Current position regarding previous assurance reviews:**

A Gate 0 strategic assessment occurred in October 2021. Its recommendations are listed in Annex D

## **Review Team findings and recommendations**

### **1. Policy and business context**

The original mandate was to undertake SBAs and to identify the number of buildings in Scotland at risk. This was to be followed by support for remediation.

The overall programme mandate remains sound but the scope of the programme is expanding following a reset arising from early feedback from the pilot where the grant funding approach was found to be onerous for factors who act on behalf of buildings in co-ownership and as a result progress was slow. Under the reset, SBAs will be directly commissioned by SG. Options are being considered for how the remediation work identified by the SBAs should be delivered. The review team understands that this ranges from remediation being funded and carried out by the original developer at one end of the spectrum, to work being funded and potentially carried out by SG in cases where a building is 'orphaned' and use of public funds can be justified. This could potentially yield a programme spanning 10 to 15 years, with over 100 staff and a total cost approaching £1.5bn. This is an order of magnitude larger than originally envisaged and will need to be carefully evaluated alongside other high priority SG commitments.

#### **Portfolio Management**

There are a number of very large SG programmes underway at present, and at least two of these relate to buildings: Heat in Buildings and Cladding Remediation. In addition, there is also the net zero suite of programmes which have an impact on buildings. These programmes could cover some of the same ground as each other and compete for many of the same resources and all have been subject to a recruitment freeze. In times of scarcity the issue becomes one of priority and decision making.

Many organisations utilise a portfolio approach to manage the overall organisational approach to separate initiatives. This prevents repeating the same work for different programmes, and enables sharing of common functions, for example a PMO. Portfolio management has with it an investment committee at the highest level of the organisation which decides on the relative priorities and asset allocations between programmes. This programme would benefit from being part of a portfolio. Although it is beyond the remit of the SRO to create a portfolio management approach at a higher level, the Review Team consider that the SRO should take this point to senior management. The Review Team has made a recommendation below on the basis that this report receives a wider circulation within Scottish Government.

**Recommendation 1: The SRO makes representations to SG executive that a portfolio approach is required.**

### **2. Business case and stakeholders**

The Review team heard that stakeholders are onboard and the Single Building Assessment approach adopted by the programme to address Scotland's unique

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

requirements arising from multiple ownership of blocks has gone down well with stakeholders. It is recognised however that this brings with it significant challenges to ensure there are sufficient levels of appropriately qualified survey staff to carry out the assessments.

Work is ongoing to create a 'Safer Buildings Accord' with the house building sector, including Homes for Scotland which is a members' body for house builders and is comprised of all sizes of developers. Engagement with all is taking place to agree an accord. The Home Owners Association are also being consulted and the Review Team heard positive feedback on the efforts being undertaken by the programme in this regard. The Accord is similar in kind to the UK Government's *Developers' Pledge* where the Developers take responsibility for survey and remediation of the buildings they have built and which are at risk.

The Review Team understands that creation of a Business Case is awaiting completion of work currently being done by MACE Consulting. The Review Team consider that creation of a compliant business case is needed urgently to provide clarity of the options being considered and to facilitate agreement on way forward.

As the work being undertaken by MACE Consulting reaches its conclusion in the next month it will be important for the emerging options to be reviewed by a wider group. This will enable constructive challenge to take place at a point when there is still time to modify the approaches under consideration before report finalisation. This will help to ensure that senior stakeholders are fully warmed up to the choices being put forward and allay any concerns that:

- the available budget envelope may not fit the evolving programme shape;
- they are realistic and achievable;
- represent value for money;
- are affordable at a time when other number of high-profile initiatives are vying for limited Scottish Government resources.

The final report should be structured such that it can form the basis of a Full Business Case but not pre-select an option. The Review Team consider that a FBC should be developed and agreed as soon as possible once the executive management has agreed the options. The FBC must then be taken through the governance process to allow fast and effective decisions to be made on the preferred delivery option. A short-term plan to generate the FBC and complete the sign-off process is needed now so that work priorities can be set for the team and scarce project resources can be focused on achieving the task without undue delay.

**Recommendation 2: A brief delivery options paper should be created from the emerging MACE report for consideration by the Programme Board to encourage constructive challenge and feedback.**

**Recommendation 3: A short-term plan should be produced immediately that sets out the immediate priorities and tasks up to approval of the FBC and lays the groundwork for a long-term programme plan.**

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

The Review team heard that the current programme team is stretched and working long hours to meet the demands being placed upon them. Stakeholders have spoken positively about the efforts of the team to cope but this will not be sustainable over an extended period, nor will it be healthy. This further cements the need for a short term plan that clearly sets out the immediate priorities up to approval of the FBC and lays the groundwork for a long term programme plan which should consider what will need to happen post sign-off to mobilise for the chosen option.

### 3. Management of intended outcomes

A PMO has been set-up and is starting to implement the requisite processes and documentation to help the programme leadership track and manage the overall programme once it is fully scoped and the boundaries set. The Review Team was given access to a number of documents which set out good practice processes to be followed and these will need to be refined with programme specific content.

A Programme Plan on a Page (POAP) was provided but this was at a very early stage and the majority of activities were shown as having no dates agreed. The Review Team was not shown a detailed programme plan which would normally be expected at this stage including current activities, tasks, dependencies, resources, budgets etc.

The full programme plan should be produced which sets out the key milestones up to programme completion, with dependencies, deliverables and resource requirements at appropriate levels of detail as the timespan moves out.

A fully developed workforce and resource plan will be required detailing who, what, when, where to confirm core team requirements, including specialist commercial and procurement support. Resource planning will also need to factor in external dependencies for qualified surveyors and capacity of partners such as Fire Service Scotland and contractors with specialist skills to support the programme.

A clear benefits plan is also be needed together with benefits tracking measures.

The Review Team has seen evidence of early work carried out by the core PMO team since they came on-board in April to create the requisite suite of programme tools and datasets necessary to support effective programme delivery. Currently these focus on best practice processes and work now must begin to feed-in programme specific content from the emerging MACE report and establish a regular heartbeat of progress tracking, risk and issue management, etc. with escalation processes to ensure issues are addressed in a timely manner.

A programme organisation chart with clear roles and responsibilities for each team member is needed ASAP.

### **Recommendation 4: Work should commence on producing a full programme plan that sets out the key milestones up to programme completion, with**

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**dependencies, deliverables and resource requirements at appropriate levels of detail as the timespan moves out.**

**Recommendation 5: A fully developed workforce and resource plan will be required detailing who, what, when and where to confirm core team requirements, including specialist commercial / procurement support. Resource planning will also need to factor in external dependencies for qualified surveyors and capacity of partners such as the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and others to support the programme.**

The Lead for Communications and Engagement is also the lead for developing the Accord. The timescale for this has been set by the Cabinet Secretary. It is planned to have an Accord ready for September this year (2022). This can only be considered an heroic timescale given the resource requirements and the amount of work involved and the time required by some of the prospective work packages, such as policy, legal and contractual.

Developing the Accord and the associated processes needed to go with it, cost recovery, potential enforcement and so on, is a large project. It has been accurately described as developing a service delivery function. It sits logically within the programme but needs to be treated as a project in its own right. It needs to be planned and the deliverables and timescales for each deliverable agreed. It could have significant potential benefits compared with its set up costs.

**Recommendation 6: Treat developing the Accord as a priority and properly plan it and resource it. Critical**

#### **4. Risk Management**

The risk log provided did not appear to have been updated since October 2021 although the Review Team were informed that risks and issues are reviewed on a weekly basis by the project team. The Review Team were assured that weekly reviews of the risks are now undertaken. A risk manager is in place and the Review Team are content at this stage that risks are being managed.

The Review Team consider that the risk log should be brought up-to-date as part of the overall review of PMO processes.

#### **5. Review of current outcomes**

A pilot comprising grant funded SBAs for an initial 26 buildings is underway. The Review team heard that there is currently a very restricted supply of suitably qualified surveyors with the requisite professional indemnity insurance to be able to carry out the SBAs in the pilot. This is slowing down the pace of delivery of the pilot, which is not expected to complete until the end of 2022. The Review Team heard that six

## Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub

### An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

assessments are nearing completion, of which one is expected to be green-lighted. The 26 chosen for the pilot were considered to be high risk and so only one being green-lighted is not unexpected.

Thereafter, the lack of specialists will be insufficient to support wider roll-out of the programme. It is expected that a UK Government scheme will address this situation, but it will not be operational until the end of 2022. This was raised as a blocker in the previous Gateway review and remains so.

## 6. Readiness for next phase – delivery of outcomes

It is not clear at this stage what the next stage is as there is no business case and no accompanying plan.

Regardless of the option chosen, the scale of the delivery task will be significant as evidenced by the circa £400m of public funding already earmarked to which will be added developer funds, levies etc. Such a large-scale delivery undertaking does not sit naturally as part of the business-as-usual assurance work of the Building Standards Division and will in many important respects require a different delivery-focused skillset. The Review Team feel that serious consideration should be given to separating the delivery team and its management from the BAU assurance team.

### **Recommendation 7: Consideration should be given to separating the delivery team and its management from the BAU assurance team as part of full programme mobilisation on approval of the FBC. Essential by FBC approval**

The programme is now larger than the original scope, which was to deliver a pilot to identify the scale of the problem and how to tackle it. In many ways the programme early phase could be considered as a feasibility study or a discovery phase. Indeed there is still more data required to define the scale of the problem. Work on the Accord should help move some of the buildings from SG responsibility and its development will alleviate future work and ease pressure from blighted homeowners. In the context of a £400M budget, the programme is large

[Redacted under Regulation 11(2)].

### **Recommendation 8: [Redacted under Regulation 11(2)]**

There will need to be an engagement plan for dealing with the public as well as the existing stakeholders. There will also be a requirement to manage expectations especially at the Cabinet Secretary level.

Skills and capabilities remain an issue and obtaining scarce resources will remain one of the key determinants of future success.

## **Previous Gateway Review Recommendations**

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous Gateway Review can be found at **Annex D**.

### **Next Independent Assurance Review**

A Gateway 0 should be commissioned at the completion of the FBC.

### **Distribution of the Gateway Review Report**

The contents of this report are confidential to the SRO and their representative/s. It is for the SRO to consider when and to whom they wish to make the report (or part thereof) available, and whether they would wish to be consulted before recipients of the report share its contents (or part thereof) with others.

The Review Team Members will not retain copies of the report nor discuss its content or conclusions with others.

A copy of the report is lodged with the PPPA so that it can identify and share the generic lessons from Independent Assurance Reviews. The PPPA will copy a summary of the report recommendations to the SG's Accountable Officer, and where appropriate, to the Organisation's Accountable Officer where the review has been conducted on behalf of one of the SG's Agencies, NDPBs or Health Sector organisations.

The PPA will provide a copy of the report to Review Team Members involved in any subsequent review as part of the preparatory documentation needed for Planning Meetings.

Any other request for copies of the Gateway Report will be directed to the SRO.

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider

**ANNEX A**

**Scottish Government - Programme and Project Management Principles**

Alignment	We align our programmes and projects to corporate priorities to ensure we deliver for the people of Scotland
Leadership	We lead from the start by clearly communicating the vision, agreeing approaches, providing resource, collaborating across teams and setting a delivery culture.
Justification / BC	We secure a mandate for our work and ensure an ongoing justification is made by the benefits for the cost, or, stop any unjustified work.
Sustainability	We understand our impacts on people place and value and ensure whole life value and whole life cost are central to decision making.
Knowledge & Data	We ensure our projects are learning organisations from day one, we seek and use information & data for the benefit of our work.
Flexibility & Capability	Our multidiscipline teams contain flexible and skilled people who focus on required identified capabilities and outcomes, not positions.
Roles and Responsibilities	We assign and delegate roles and responsibilities within our projects flowing from the SRO's appointment letter/delegation/mandate
Stakeholders	We identify, assess and then manage our stakeholders to leverage maximum chance of success.
Benefits	We start with the end in mind, formally focussing on the intended outcomes of our investment.
Planning	We consider all aspects of our projects and continuously plan; managing dependencies, agreeing and refining evidence-based assumptions and reporting on progress against milestones throughout
Risk	We identify, communicate and act upon the threats or opportunities to and for our outcomes.
Transition	We provide focus and resource to understand the end needs from the supplier side and a commitment and capability to learn, manage and own the benefits/outcomes from the customer side.



## **ANNEX B**

### **Purposes of the Gateway Review 0: Strategic Assessment**

Gateway Review 0 Strategic Assessment is a programme-only Review that sets the programme in the wider policy or corporate context. This Review investigates the direction and planned outcomes of the programme, together with the progress of its constituent projects.

It can be applied to any type of programme, including policy and organisational change. The Review is repeated throughout the life of the programme from start-up to closure; an early Gateway Review 0 is particularly valuable in that it helps to confirm that the way forward is achievable, before plans have been finalised.

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

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**ANNEX C**

**Review Team:**

Review Team Leader:	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
Review Team Member:	Redacted under Regulation 11(2)
Review Team Member:	

**List of Interviewees:**

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation/Role</b>
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	SRO
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Programme Director
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Home Owner Stakeholder
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	SG legal
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Business Finance Partner
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Head of Cladding Remediation Unit
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Head of PMO
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Programme Team Risk Manager
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Cladding Technical Team Leader
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Cladding Policy Team Leader
Sean Neill	Director for Local Government and Communities
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Nationwide Building Society/ UK Finance
Redacted under Regulation 11(2)	Communications and Engagement

**Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub**  
**An authorised full-service OGC Gateway™ provider**

**ANNEX D**

**Progress against previous Gateway Review October 2021 recommendations:**

<b>Ref No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Progress/Status</b>
1.	<b>Define outcomes and measures of success for the Programme.</b>	Not complete
2.	<b>The SRO should determine the means required to support the Minister in discussions with the UK Government on the Professional Indemnity Insurance issues.</b>	Done
3.	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit undertakes an exercise to baseline the programme and associated projects at the activity based level required to support PPM and agrees this with the Programme Board.</b>	There has been a reset but still no plan evident
	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop a Project Initiation Document for enabling buying selling and re-mortgaging. The objectives and deliverables should be confirmed to aligned with and underpin the programme level aims on the safety of people.</b>	No artefacts currently exist. The Review Team heard there is a lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities
4.	<b>The Head of Cladding and Remediation Unit should develop and implement a pipeline management process to support the ‘Green-Lighting’ of properties and buildings.</b>	Some progress
5.	<b>The RAID log is developed and populated in a series of workshops with stakeholders.</b>	A RAID log exists in need of updating
6.	<b>Assumptions are documented and agreed and contingency plans agreed.</b>	In place, but no contingency plans.

Risk Category	Risk ID	Risk Description	Controls In Place	Current Impact	Current Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Actions Planned	Controls Confidence Level	Target Impact	Target Likelihood	Target Risk Score	Target Date	Risk Owner	PrG Commitment Y/N	Change to Risk Explanation
Operational	CRU- R2	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Reasonable	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Operational	CRU- R5	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Reputational	CRU- R6	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Commercial	CRU- R7	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Commercial	CRU- R8	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Reputational	CRU- R9	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Legal	CRU- R10	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Operational	CRU- R11	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Reputational	CRU- R12	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Reasonable	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		stephen Garvin	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
People	CRU- R13	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
People	CRU- R14	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Reasonable	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR

Risk Category	Risk ID	Risk Description	Controls In Place	Current Impact	Current Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Actions Planned	Controls Confidence Level	Target Impact	Target Likelihood	Target Risk Score	Target Date	Risk Owner	PrG Commitment Y/N	Change to Risk Explanation
Information	CRU- R15	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Reputational	CRU- R16	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Reputational	CRU- R17	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Reasonable	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
People	CRU- R18	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Reasonable	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Property	CRU- R19	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
financial	CRU- R20	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Property	CRU- R21	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Financial	CRU- R22	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR Sean Neill	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Financial	CRU- R23	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Insufficient	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Legal	CRU- R25	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR
Legal	CRU- R26	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR

Risk Category	Risk ID	Risk Description	Controls In Place	Current Impact	Current Likelihood	Current Risk Score	Actions Planned	Controls Confidence Level	Target Impact	Target Likelihood	Target Risk Score	Target Date	Risk Owner	PfG Commitment Y/N	Change to Risk Explanation
Governance	CRU-R27	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Limited	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR		Redacted under 11(2) EIR	No	Redacted under 10(4)e EIR