



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

INDEPENDENT ASSURANCE

M8 Woodside Viaducts

Project Assessment Review (PAR)

| | |
|---|--|
| Template Version | V 2.1 December 2024 |
| Report Version: | Final |
| Review Dates | 28 th to 30 th April 2025 |
| Senior Responsible Owner (SRO): | Redacted - 38 (1)(b) (Director of Major Projects Directorate, TS) |
| Date Appointment letter issued to SRO: | 13 July 2023 |
| Draft report to SRO | 30 th April 2025 |
| Final Report to SRO and PPPA | 9 th May 2025 |
| Delivery Confidence Assessment: | Amber |
| Programme/ Project Director: | Redacted 38 (1)(b) |
| Accountable Officer: | Redacted 38 (1)(b) (TS CEO) |
| Scottish Government Portfolio Accountable Officer: | Redacted 38 (1)(b) (DG Net Zero) |
| Investment Decision Maker: | Redacted 38 (1)(b) (TS CEO) |
| Business Case stage reached: | Propping: post Full Business Case (FBC) or equivalent (IDM - 6 th May 2021) Permanent Repairs: pre Outline Business Case (OBC) "Delivery strategy" |
| Decision/approval point this report informs: | Completion of emergence propping contract |
| Review Team Leader: | Redacted - 38 (1)(b) |
| Review Team Members: | Redacted - 38 (1)(b) |
| Previous Review: | 10 th to 12 th April 2024 (Amber) 10 th to 12 th January 2023 (Amber) |

About this report

This report is an evidence-based snapshot of the programme's/project's status at the time of the review. It reflects the views of the independent review team, based on information evaluated over the review period, and is delivered to the SRO immediately at the conclusion of the review.

This assurance review was arranged and managed by:

Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub
Scottish Government Directorate of Internal Audit and Assurance
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

More information about the Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance Hub and guidance on the requirements for integrated assurance and approvals is available from:

PPPAssurance@gov.scot

1. Gateway Review Conclusion/ Stage Gate Assessment (SGA)

Stage Gate Assessment

Amber

Successful delivery of the Woodside Viaduct propping contract appears feasible, but a significant issue exists that requires attention.

- The currently published completion date is unachievable and the revised completion date tabled at the March board meeting appears unachievable.
- A revised programme needs to be agreed by the programme board. This will take the completion of the contract into 2026/27, when it is likely to run in parallel with the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow.

It is recognised that significant risks remain relating to unforeseen ground conditions. These will not be fully mitigated until construction is above ground with the completion of the piles and bases, which is scheduled for July this year.

The review team pressed all those interviewed as to whether they were aware of any new mitigations that could realistically deliver the works closer to the original proposed deadline. No proposals were forthcoming.

There is an adequately resourced & managed client team supported by the appropriate advisors in place working well with the contractor and the various subcontractors.

The review team also make recommendations in relation to: -

- the need to improve the confidence of the board in the information presented. This can be facilitated by the instigation of a High-level Oversight Group, the preparation of a Mitigations Register (albeit an informal register already exists as of 20 February 2025) clearly outlining all feasible steps taken and improving communications generally.
- The need to have a consistent approach to the quoting of risk (e.g. as float, (P50) etc.) with the schedule in the same manner as used with the cost estimate.
- The importance of ensuring that any dependencies between the propping contract and the future repair contract are recognised and taken account of asap.

The Stage Gate Assessment RAG status should use the definitions below.

| <u>RAG</u> | <u>Criteria Description</u> |
|--------------------|---|
| Green | <p>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.</p> <p>Recommendation: The programme/project is ready to proceed to the next stage.</p> |
| Amber/Green | <p>Successful delivery appears probable. However, constant attention will be needed to ensure risks do not materialise into major issues threatening delivery.</p> <p>Recommendation: The programme/project is ready to proceed to the next stage.</p> |
| Amber | <p>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.</p> <p>Recommendation: This programme/project can proceed to the next stage with conditions but the programme/project must report back to the PPPA on the satisfaction of each time bound condition within an agreed timeframe.</p> |
| Amber/Red | <p>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.</p> <p>Recommendation: This programme/project should not proceed to the next phase until these major risks or issues are managed to an acceptable level of risk and the viability of the project/programme has been re-confirmed.</p> |
| Red | <p>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-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed.</p> <p>Recommendation: This programme/project should not proceed to the next phase until these major issues are managed to an acceptable level of risk and the viability of the project/programme has been re-confirmed.</p> |

2. Summary of concerns, evidence and recommendations

| Priority | Recommendation | Risk and issue identified with evidence | Status | Classification | Aligned with Profession |
|----------|---|---|--------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Re-baseline the project schedule and ensure a consistent expression of the level of risk used in any dates quoted to the Board Pars 5.2.11 | The lack of a commonly agreed schedule is likely to cause further delays and be detrimental to client, contractor and external stakeholder relationships | C | Contract management | Project Delivery |
| 2 | Prepare an agreed Mitigation Register collating all options identified together with outputs Para 5.2.8 | The efficacy of project governance will be adversely impacted, if the board loses confidence in the steps being taken to mitigate project delays and the quality of information presented. This could cause delays to decisions and approvals | C | Contract management | Operations |
| 3 | Prepare an initial strategy to cover the interface between the propping contract and the repair contract to ensure that all dependencies and contract interactions are fully understood Para 5.4.6 | a misunderstanding of the dependencies between the propping maintenance and repair contracts could cause delays and cost over runs | E | Contract management | Procurement |
| 4 | the project team prepare a dynamic dashboard to summarise board paper information, with references to reports as required para 5.6.2 | the lack of a consistent understanding of project parameter across key stakeholders could cause delays and increased cost | R | Contract management | Finance |
| 5 | Develop enhanced communication to increase the confidence of the board in the information presented. Para 5.2.9 | The efficacy of project governance will be adversely impacted, if the board loses confidence in the steps being taken to mitigate project delays | R | Leadership capability | Operations |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | and the quality of information presented. This could cause delays to decisions and approvals | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

All recommendations should be categorised as Critical, Essential or Recommended:

- **Critical (Do Now):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome it is of the greatest importance that the programme/project should take action immediately.
- **Essential (Do By):** To increase the likelihood of a successful outcome the programme/project should take action in the near future. *[Note to review teams – whenever possible Essential risk based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]*
- **Recommended:** The programme/project should benefit from the uptake of this recommendation. *[Note to review teams – if possible Recommended risk based recommendations should be linked to programme/project milestones e.g. before contract signature and/or a specified timeframe e.g. within the next three months.]*

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 Scottish Government Portfolio 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 appropriate Officer should inform the relevant Minister/s.

3. Blockers to delivery

| Ref No: | Blocker | Describe specific nature of blocker | Consequence if not resolved. |
|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | none | | |

4. Comments from the SRO

SRO Comments

I accept the findings of the report and would like to thank the review team for their helpful comments and their recommendations. The Amber status is appropriate for the project given its complexity and associated issues.

5. Review Team findings and recommendations

5.1. Introduction

5.1.1. The M8 Woodside Viaduct Temporary Propping and Permanent Repair Works Project referred to in the SRO's appointment letter was originally considered as one project. It has now been split into two discrete projects: the temporary propping contract under the NMC and the permanent repairs project, which will be procured separately. This review focuses on the current state of the Temporary Propping contract.

5.1.2. The current position of the propping contract as articulated on Transport Scotland website on 24th May 2025 is: the temporary propping work is now expected to be fully completed in early 2026. However, the contractor is working towards delivering the eastbound carriageway sooner, in Summer 2025 with a cost range for the project of £126-£152 million.

5.1.3. While the project remains within the proposed cost range the current schedule is now unachievable.

5.2. Project Schedule

5.2.1. At the last board meeting on 27th March 2025 the project schedule showed the eastbound carriageway complete on 16th February 2026 and the westbound on the 16th April 2026. These dates are deterministic e.g. P(0) with no float. There was also insufficient allowance for final reinstatement and re-surfacing of the carriageways.

5.2.2. The board did not accept this and instigated a series of meetings with the contractor to find mitigations to meet the published dates. An additional constraint of a potential roadworks moratorium for the Commonwealth Games in summer 2026 was also noted.

5.2.3. The review team focused on the robustness of the scheduling. During the review it was established that the P(0) Completion date for all works including the proposed Carriageway Reinstatement is in fact now mid-June 2026 and not April 16 due to an additional allowance for reinstatement being included in the latest programme. The P(80) figure with a contingency float allowance is October/November 2026.

5.2.4. The schedule is developed by Amey and reviewed by Transport Scotland's cost consultants Turner & Townsend and the TS project team. The review team probed extensively and found a universal acceptance that in the opinion of those interviewed this represented the best estimate of the time required to complete the project.

5.2.5. The key ongoing risks to the schedule are;

- The unknown ground conditions and inaccurate as built drawings. This major risk will continue until the piling is complete and the project is "out of the ground" in July this year. Indeed, during the review, a void was discovered with the zone of influence of the SPT tunnel. This is highly likely to have an impact on the dates quoted above.

- The fact that, due to the emergency nature of the job, the design of the supporting steelwork and foundations is being carried out concurrently with their construction and installation is a situation that is exacerbated by the iterative nature of the necessary independent checking, as set out in National Standards.
- The extensive liaison with key stakeholders, such as SPT, who need to satisfy themselves as to the suitability of proposals and grant permissions.
- The technical difficulty and uniqueness of many of the structures required to support the motorway such as the triangular cross heads necessitated by the SPT tunnel.
- The scoping and phasing of the final reinstatement and surfacing of the motorway carriageways on completion of the propping, which has yet to be agreed.

5.2.6. The review team heard that, while with hindsight, many of these issues could have been managed better, lessons had been learnt and at this stage of the job as many mitigations as possible were in place.

5.2.7. The review team also probed as to the mitigations available to enable the programme to be shortened or accelerated. At the last board meeting Amey tabled a list of 19 mitigations of which 14 had been implemented. T&T also proposed ten, although the review team heard that these were unlikely to have an overall impact. It is evident that the board did not accept the revised schedule and is seeking additional mitigations.

5.2.8. It is important for the board to have confidence in the information that they are receiving and, to this end, the review team would endorse the proposed production of a Mitigation Register that collates all the options considered together with their outcomes enabling all parties to be sure that all necessary steps to minimise delays are considered.

Risk: The efficacy of project governance will be adversely impacted, if the board loses confidence in the steps being taken to mitigate project delays and the quality of information presented. This could cause delays to decisions and approvals.

Recommendation 1: Prepare an agreed Mitigation Register collating all options identified together with outputs

5.2.9. The lack of confidence of the board in the data presented has resulted in an extended chain of letters and meetings with the contractor. This has resulted in the proposal for a high-level oversight group. The review team would endorse this and any other initiatives that improve communications and enhances the confidence of the board in the delivery of the project.

Risk: The efficacy of project governance will be adversely impacted, if the board loses confidence in the steps being taken to mitigate project delays and the quality of information presented. This could cause delays to decisions and approvals.

Recommendation 2: Develop enhanced communication to increase the confidence of the board in the information presented.

5.2.10. The review team found nothing to suggest that the latest schedule tabled by the project team does not represent a pragmatic estimate. They also did not hear of or uncover any new mitigations that are likely to have a significant effect on the programme. They did however observe that, while costs estimates quoted include contingencies (e.g. P50 estimates), the schedule dates quoted are inevitably deterministic (P0) dates with no float. This could lead to misunderstandings and unrealistic expectations.

5.2.11. Successful delivery of the project to the dates currently in the public domain appears to be unachievable. The project schedule needs to be re-confirmed with the appropriate risk allowances, agreed by the board and used as a baseline going forward.

Risk: The lack of a commonly agreed schedule is likely to cause further delays and be detrimental to client, contractor and external stakeholder relationships

Recommendation 3: Re-baseline the project schedule and ensure a consistent expression of the level of risk used in any dates quoted to the Board.

5.3. Cost

5.3.1. The project cost has increased considerably since the inception. Redacted - 38 (1)(b)

5.3.2. The ongoing cost escalation has been driven principally by the unforeseen ground conditions aggravated by inaccuracies in as built drawings. This position is expected to improve once the works are "out of the ground" with the completion of the piles and foundations currently scheduled for July 2025.

5.3.3. The costs remain within the previously agreed range of £126-152m although there is currently no budget allowance for the works in 2026/27 out with a maintenance allowance for the props. This will have to be addressed, given the extended timeline for the project.

5.4. Procurement

5.4.1. The need for propping to the M8 viaducts results from surveys that identified that urgent repairs are required to ensure the safety and integrity of the existing structure. To respond to the urgent nature of the repairs, Transport Scotland has utilised the ongoing network maintenance contract (NMC) with Amey and associated sub-contractors as appointed "as of right" to fulfil the design, build and execution of the jacking and propping project.

5.4.2. Transport Scotland recognises that this is not the optimal position, given the magnitude and cost of the undertaking, but it provides the only practical solution given the need to act quickly.

- 5.4.3. However, the review team has heard that the NMC also provides constraints that would not be present if the project had been separately procured, for example: the NMC is a cost plus contract that does not offer the types of controls, incentives and liabilities, change management processes and governance structures that may have been included in a contract specifically designed for this purpose and it does not allow for a separately contained baseline on programme and costs from which to work. This results in the project becoming more deterministic than Transport Scotland would wish to see.
- 5.4.4. The contract to carry out the repairs/permanent works has been separated out to the Major Projects Directorate, and, in conjunction with WSP, is moving toward preparing a Business Case, design and procurement. At this point, the gap between propping completion and start of permanent works cannot be quantified, nor can the programme to complete the permanent works. It is recognised that propping could be in place for an extended period (noting the propping hire period of ten years) and will require ongoing inspection and maintenance during this period. This will need to be taken into account during procurement of the permanent works, and any interface between Amey as propping contractor and the Principal Contractor for permanent works clearly specified.
- 5.4.5. Alternatively, the permanent works contractor may be required to assume responsibility, but the level of risk for them within this may be prohibitive. Redacted - 38 (1)(b)
- 5.4.6. It will be important that any dependencies or interactions between the propping and repair contracts are fully understood as soon as possible to ensure that they can be taken into account in the development of a repair business case and that they do not impact adversely on any future procurement.

Risk: A misunderstanding of the dependencies between the propping maintenance and repair contracts could cause delays and cost over runs.

Recommendation 4: Prepare an initial strategy to cover the interface between the propping contract and the repair contract to ensure that all dependencies and contract interactions are fully understood

5.5. Governance and resources

- 5.5.1. The review team heard that project governance is well constructed and effective and demonstrates good practice by the inclusion of an independent technical advisor and a non-executive director to the board. The review team noted that the Project Execution Plan (PEP) includes a steering group is not constituted. However, this does not appear to detract from the project's progress. A high-level 'oversight group' consisting of TS representatives and the primary maintenance contractor will be constituted with a view to clearing any potential blockages quickly, employing time mitigation opportunities and expediting progress.
- 5.5.2. The board has now increased meeting frequency to monthly, from previously eight weeks and this is suitable for the next crucial stages of completion of below ground

works and the emphasis moving to the jacking and preparation of transfer to the repairs contract phases.

- 5.5.3. The review team also heard that there are frequent (weekly) project meetings that are not minuted, although an action list is produced, but are nevertheless a valuable component of the governance process.
- 5.5.4. Leadership of the project remains strong with key resources across TS maintaining regular involvement and familiarity with issues that affect the project in terms of cost, time and resources and the review team heard that there are productive relationships throughout the management structure.
- 5.5.5. TS has had some resource issues, with people moving on to other projects or external employments. This is not something that could be anticipated to any realistic degree and the review team heard that TS has responded well recently to recruitment requirements with three posts now filled and full resourcing attained.
- 5.5.6. The review team heard consistently that at project level, there is an ongoing commitment to collaborative working between TS, the main contractor, its sub-contractors and independent check contractors. This is true over all elements of the project. It represents good practice and, in the review team's view, contributes well to the adoption of many practical mitigations that collectively provide advantages that would individually seem insignificant.
- 5.5.7. The review team noted that the impact on design of uncharted sub terranean assets has led to several unexpected complexities and multiple design iterations before certification and approval. As this includes external agencies, especially in the influence zone of existing tunnels, and independent checks, it is an area that review team suggest requires close management and any opportunities to safely expedite process explored.

5.6. Reporting

- 5.6.1. The review team heard that board reports are prepared by the project team and contractors in several forms, including reports of the activities, actions and decisions of the un-minuted weekly project meetings. Although these reports are comprehensive, the review team recognises that there is limited time for the board to digest full reports and information and reach conclusions on the day.
- 5.6.2. The review team notes that there are no ongoing 'dashboards' that would assist the board to review the main and tracked issues quickly, whilst having the opportunity to deep dive into specific reports/issues as required to gain a clearer understanding of the underlying complexities. The use of dynamic dashboards would enable efficient process and provide greater support to the board to make informed decisions and provide proactive direction.

Risk: the lack of a consistent understanding of project parameters across key stakeholders could cause delays and increased cost

Recommendation 5 – the project team prepare a dynamic dashboard to summarise board paper information, with references to reports as required.

6. Areas of good practice

| Area (reference Annex E) | Specific details of successful delivery |
|------------------------------|---|
| Use of skilled personnel (7) | Appropriately qualified and experienced core team members including independent technical and non-executive representation on the board |

7. Acknowledgement

Review Team Acknowledgement

The Review Team would like to thank the Project/Team for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Project and the outcome of this review.

8. Next Assurance Review

Next Assurance Review

For the propping contract, the next review will be a Gate 4 "readiness for service". This will be prior to the opening of the first carriageway in 2026.

The permanent solution will require a Gateway 2 "delivery strategy" prior to the approval of the OBC currently scheduled for late 2025.

9. Distribution of 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 it can identify and share the generic lessons from Independent Assurance Reviews. The PPPA will copy a summary of the report recommendations to the Scottish Government Portfolio 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 PPPA 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 Report will be directed to the SRO.

ANNEX A - Terms of Reference for Hybrid Review

This Project Assessment Review (PAR) follows the Scottish Government's Directorate of Internal Audit and Assurance Portfolio, Programme and Project Assurance [Guidelines](#) for a [Gateway/Healthcheck Review](#) with the overall aim of assessing the M8 Woodside Viaduct propping contract.

Specifically, it will build upon the last review of April 2024 to assess the success of the temporary propping solution and investigate progress towards meeting the government's target dates for all lane running in early 2026.

ANNEX B - Background

| Question | Answer |
|--|--|
| Describe the aims of the project/ programme | The aim of the project is to install temporary props at the M8 Woodside Viaducts in Glasgow. The structures load will be transferred from the deteriorated half joints onto the newly installed temporary propping system. Its completion will allow for the removal of temporary lane restrictions on the M8 above and commencement of permanent repairs. |
| Reasons for the project/ programme's existence, by type and description | <p>A load-carrying assessment of the Woodside viaducts, located on the M8 motorway between junctions 16 and 17, was carried out in early 2021. The assessment showed the viaducts had less than the required 40 tonne capacity.</p> <p>Planned detailed intrusive inspections showed the condition was worse than expected, with significant concrete spalling and corrosion of reinforcement in critical locations, which reduced the load-carrying assessment further. As a result, lane restrictions were implemented on the M8 to reduce traffic loading on the viaducts on 12 March 2021 to ensure public safety.</p> |
| The impact if the project/programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on citizens: | In order to remove restrictions from the M8 and allow repairs to be carried out, the structures require to be propped. Not proceeding with the project will result in the structure continuing to deteriorate, likely additional repairs, permanent restriction or closure leading to significant disruption and reputational damage to Transport Scotland. Therefore, the installation of propping is critical to ensure public safety and minimise disruption. |
| Project/programme link to Scottish Government strategies or policies: | The project is aligned with Government and Transport Scotland strategic transport and climate change policies by making best use of existing assets. |
| Projects/programme interdependencies [if applicable]: | No interdependencies identified. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Has the SRO's letter of appointment been approved at the appropriate levels? | Yes – The most recent letter was issued by TS CEO to the Director of Major Projects on 13 July 2023 and was filed with the Business Support Officer from SG Directorate for Internal Audit & Assurance. |
| The procurement / delivery status: | The project is being delivered by Amey through the South West Unit Network Management Contract (NMC). Legal advice sought at the start of the project confirmed this was permissible, would provide value for money and was thought to provide the quickest solution. |
| Funding / Business Case: | <p>The propping works are being funded from within existing roads maintenance budgets. A procurement Strategy was approved in April 2021. For the 2024/25 financial year onwards, M8 Woodside Viaduct has been given its own budget line.</p> <p>Due to the emergency nature of the works, no business case in advance of the procurement strategy was prepared. Justification for the project and value for money principles are set out in the procurement strategy, which was approved by Deputy Director of Purchasing, Redacted - 38 (1)(b).</p> <p>IDM approval was sought and approved by Redacted - 38 (1)(b) and Redacted 38 (1)(b).</p> |
| Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP): | No IAAP is in place. |
| Programme/Project plan: | <p>Does the project / programme have an appropriate plan in place?</p> <p>Yes – A Project Execution Plan is in place and updated regularly. Programme Board meetings take place 8-weekly and provides strategic oversight and assurance of both the temporary propping works and the permanent repair procurement development.</p> <p>Has the plan been baselined? Please include who signed it off etc.</p> <p>Yes – The Board reviews and monitors the progress of key objectives associated with these work streams.</p> |
| Current position regarding previous PPPA assurance reviews: | <p>Gateway Reviews have previously been held in January 2023 and April 2024. A number of actions were identified in these reviews, and progress against these is highlighted at each Programme Board meeting which is held 8-weekly.</p> <p>Outstanding actions from January 2023 Gateway Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Prepare an Outline Business Case (OBC) for the Permanent Repair contract including a solutions & timing options appraisal as well as a procurement and management strategy.” → Delivery team has |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>awarded a technical advisory services contract to WSP UK Limited on 18 February 2025. The team is undertaking an Inception Workshop on 2 April 2025 to agree the initial steps and to set the direction of the project. Particular focus will be on the programme and cost taking cognisance of risk. The timescales for the Outline Business Case will be agree with the technical advisors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Investigate the feasibility of establishing lessons learnt and Benchmark costs from similar projects.” → Requested cost and programme estimates from comparable schemes. Information given and passed to Turner & Townsend. Benchmarking being progressed by external Commercial resource (Turner & Townsend). Expected initial report anticipated April/May 2025. <p>Outstanding actions from April 2024 Gateway Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Identify the scale of costs, and source of funding, for the maintenance of the propping solution following completion.” → With the appointment of technical advisors, the works to developing a business case and permanent works design commenced on 18 February 2025. The business case will consider the cost of the ongoing temporary propping works and associated maintenance. • “Recognise the M8 Woodside viaduct propping as a component of a wider Programme for permanent works for the viaducts and set up the governance & delivery of the constituent projects accordingly.” → WSP technical advisors appointed on 18 February 2025. They will consider and develop the strategic and outline business case, allowing the Strategic Purpose of the Woodside Viaduct to be considered in detail. <p>A summary of recommendations, progress and status from the previous assurance review can be found in Annex C.</p> |
| <p>Current position regarding Non-PPPA assurance reviews</p> | <p>Transport Scotland corporate and procurement procedures have been followed. A Programme Board meets regularly (8-weekly) to provide strategic oversight and assurance of both the temporary propping works and the permanent repair procurement development. The Board reviews and monitors the progress of key objectives associated with these work streams.</p> |
| <p>Current position regarding SG PPM Capability Maturity Matrix</p> | <p>Have you completed the SG PPM Capability Maturity Matrix?</p> <p>Yes – this was completed and issued to the SRO for review on 25 March 2024 for approval and filing. A further update was completed and issued on 10 January 2025.</p> |

ANNEX C – Progress against previous assurance review

| Progress Against Previous Review | | | |
|---|---|-------------|---|
| Previous Review Date: 12 TH to 17 TH April 2024 | | | |
| Priority | Summary of risks, issues and related recommendations from the original recommendation | C E R | Current status - has the risk / issue been mitigated |
| 1 | Ensure a consistent and commonly understood approach is used in the development & dissemination of the project cost range | C | Complete. Project costs regularly reviewed, issued to the Board via board papers, and discussed at as part of programme board held 8-weekly. |
| 2 | Identify the scale of costs, and source of funding, for the maintenance of the propping solution following completion. (Essential – by Repair project business case completion) | E | Maintenance costs received and under Project Team review. WSP technical advisors appointed on 18 February 2025 will undertake further consideration of costs to consider the optimal solution subject to budget availability. |
| 3 | Use the revised QSRA-based project schedule to inform the stakeholder communications and public expectations | E | Complete. QSRA iteration was used to inform public announcement of project dates issued in May 2024. Any further announcements will utilise a revised QSRA taking into account most up to date programme and project risks available. |
| 4 | Recognise the M8 Woodside viaduct propping as a component of a wider Programme to repair the viaduct and set up the governance & delivery of the constituent projects accordingly | E | WSP UK Ltd appointed as Technical Advisors on 18 February 2025, this will enable the governance and delivery of the permanent works to be developed. |

ANNEX D – List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the review:

| Name | Role on Programme/Project Position in organisation Department/Division Organisation |
|----------------------|---|
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Senior Responsible Officer & Chair of Board Director of Major Projects Major Projects Directorate Transport Scotland |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Project Owner Head of Network Maintenance Roads Directorate Transport Scotland |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Project Owner Chief Bridge Engineer & Head of Structures Roads Directorate Transport Scotland |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Board Member/Finance Head of Finance Business Partnering (Capital & Technical Policy) Finance & Corporate Services Transport Scotland |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Project Director M8 Bridges – Special Projects Manager Roads Directorate Transport Scotland |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Deck Assessor and Technical Assistance Associate, WSP |
| Redacted 38 (1)(b) | Independent Technical Adviser to the Board Director - Redacted - 38 (1)(b) |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Cost & Risk Adviser Senior Cost Manager Turner & Townsend |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Business Director, Amey |
| Redacted 38 (1)(b) | Head of Commercial, Amey |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Design Manager Project Director, Amey |
| Redacted - 38 (1)(b) | Project Manager, Freyssinet |
| Redacted 38 (1)(b) | Director, Millar Callaghan |

ANNEX E – Scottish Government Project Delivery Principles

| Principle | Definition | Ref | Classification | Description |
|------------------|--|------------|--|--|
| 1. Alignment | Recommendations related to the clarity of the change to be implemented. It covers alignment to vision, strategy, and policy; the purpose, objectives, justification and description of the change; and the determination of success and the necessary environment to ensure success. This theme also includes recommendations relating to alignment with pan-government priorities, strategies and controls. | 1.1 | Alignment to Strategy | Recommendations related to the strategic nature of the solution and its alignment with business & technology strategies, e.g. tactical versus strategic considerations, etc. |
| | | 1.2 | Vision, Aims & Objectives | Recommendations related to alignment with Government and Departmental Priorities & Strategies and the clarity and understanding of what is to be achieved and why. |
| | | 1.3 | Critical Success Factors | Recommendations related to the clear understanding and definition of those factors that will be essential to enable successful delivery. |
| | | 1.4 | Effective across Organisational Boundaries | Recommendations related to key relationships with other parts of Government (excluding those referenced in theme 11 Risk). |
| 2. Leadershi | Recommendations related to that are aimed at the clarity of what success | 2.1 | Leadership Capability | Recommendations related to the experience, qualifications and commitment of key leadership roles. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----|-------------------------|--|
| p | looks like; leadership and the necessary culture to ensure success. | 2.2 | Commitment & Engagement | Recommendations related to the effectiveness of the behaviours of those involved in the Governance Processes. |
| 3. Justification/ Business case | Recommendations related to the purpose, objectives and ongoing justification for the work | 3.1 | Scope | Recommendations related to specific controls to cater for changes to scope, clear description, and control of the work to be undertaken to deliver the project with the required outcomes. |
| | | 3.2 | Business Case | Recommendations related to all aspects of the construction, iteration and maintenance of the Business Case in ensuring a firm understanding of the Costs, Benefits and Risk Profile of the Project or Programme. |
| 4. Sustainability | Recommendations related to the end-to-end procurement process including: procurement strategy and planning, approaches to the market, contract negotiation and contract management, and recommendations related to financial planning, organising, directing and controlling of financial activities. | 4.1 | Sourcing Strategy | Recommendations related to the end-to-end procurement process including: Procurement strategy and planning, Approaches to the market and Contract negotiation. |
| | | 4.2 | Contract Management | Recommendations related to the implementation, administration and processes involved from when the contract is awarded to when the work is completed. The function ensures the delivery of the supplies and services outlined in the contract and that the contract is successful. |
| | | 4.3 | Supply Chain Management | Recommendations related to the oversight of products and services to be delivered by suppliers, particularly the end to end coordination and integration of suppliers in a multi-supplier environment. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | 4.4 | Financial Planning and Management | Recommendations related to financial planning and management, organising, directing, controlling financial activities, and contingency funding. |
| | | 4.5 | Integration | Recommendations related to the approach to managing multiple suppliers of services and integrating them to provide a single business solution i.e. the seamless integration of interdependent services from various internal and external service providers into end of life. |
| 5. Knowledge and Data | Recommendations related to the process of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organisational knowledge. It includes sharing knowledge and experiences or lessons. | 5.1 | Lessons identified | Recommendations related to the sharing of knowledge acquired from an innovation or an adverse experience that results in improvements to a process. |
| | | 5.2 | Security | Recommendations related to the processes, methodologies and documentation involved with keeping information confidential, available, and assuring its integrity including Access Controls, Protection of information in transit and the Detection and Remediation of security. |
| | | 5.3 | Information Management | Recommendations related to the management and application of processes to collect information, communicate it and process it to enable effective decision making. |
| 6. Flexibility | Recommendations related to all aspects of the identification, supply, | 6.1 | Capacity Planning & Management | Recommendations related to the estimation, prioritisation recruitment and availability of resources. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----|--|---|
| and Capability | optimisation, prioritisation and maintenance of resources and appropriate skills. | 6.2 | Skills Assessment & Management | Recommendations related to the assessment and acquisition of the appropriate skills for all stages of the project or programme. |
| | | 6.3 | Succession Planning & Management | Recommendations related to the retention and sustainability of the key resources required. |
| 7. Roles and Responsibilities | Recommendations related to the oversight, structure and decision making of a project/ programme. | 7.1 | Robust Governance Structures & Processes | Recommendations related to Structures & Processes, e.g. Board Terms of Reference, Independent Assurance, etc. |
| | | 7.2 | Organisation | Recommendations related to the clarity of roles and responsibilities. |
| 8. Stakeholders | Recommendations related to relationships with all parties with an interest in the outcome of the project/programme, whether internal to the agency, internal to government or external. | 8.1 | Engagement Strategy & Planning | Recommendations related to Stakeholder Engagement Strategy & Planning. |
| | | 8.2 | Effective Engagement | Recommendations related to the effective delivery of the Strategy or Plan, i.e. the review of and commitment to engagement. |
| | | 8.3 | Communications | Recommendations related to how the project's stakeholders are kept informed. |
| 9. Benefits | Recommendations related to the identification, ownership, | 9.1 | Benefits Management & | Recommendations related to benefits management and |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|---------------------------------|---|
| | measurement and realisation of benefits and dis-benefits. Benefits can be either financial or non-financial. | | Realisation | realisation. |
| | | 9.2 | Alignment of Delivery to Policy | Recommendations related to the outcomes of the project when compared to the original policy intent. |
| 10. Planning | Recommendations related to all aspects of project, programme and portfolio management, and planning. 'Planning' here is used in the broad sense, to encompass the detailed proposals for various types of activities that will lead to a successfully executed programme or project. but excludes recommendations on Risk, Issues and Dependency Management (Theme 11) and Flexibility & Capability Management (Theme 10) | 10.1 | Controls | Recommendations related to the efficacy of monitoring and reviewing progress against project plan, business case, aims, vision, and objectives. |
| | | 10.2 | Quality Management | Recommendations related to the quality system, quality assurance, quality planning or quality control. |
| | | 10.3 | Requirements Definition | Recommendations related to the process for understanding user needs. This includes processes used in an Agile environment. |
| | | 10.4 | Methodology & Standards | Recommendations related Methods and Standards. This theme covers the use of structured proven approaches to programme and project management methodologies such as: MSP, Prince2, etc. The theme also covers recommendations relating to the use of agile and iterative approaches and methods. |
| 11. Risk | Recommendations related to the identification, analysis, impact | 11.1 | Framework & Process | Recommendations related to the processes, techniques and resources involved. |

| | | | | |
|----------------|--|------|---------------------------|--|
| | assessment, response and the on-going review and management of Risks, Issues and Dependencies (i.e. outputs that are required by a project to succeed, but which will be delivered by parties not under the direct control of the project). | 11.2 | Active Risk Management | Recommendations related to the genuine engagement of project, stakeholders and wider organisation in the consideration and response to Risks, Issues and Dependencies. |
| | | 11.3 | Contingency Planning | Recommendations related to Contingency Planning to mitigate business impact. |
| 12. Transition | Recommendations related to the Management of Business Change – all the work required with and in the business and with the customer to make ready for the initiative, in terms of changes to business processes including: business continuity planning, changes to work processes and resourcing, changes to organisational structures and staffing to support transformational or process changes to business delivery to ensure a smooth transition to BAU. | 12.1 | Organisational Culture | Recommendations related to the cultural and behavioural changes in an organisation necessary to the successful transformation of the business or service. |
| | | 12.2 | Organisational Capability | Recommendations related to the capability of the organisation to successfully implement the change. |
| | | 12.3 | Operational Readiness | Recommendations related to operational readiness. Operational readiness is defined as all those activities and processes that must be designed and established before a project can be signed off and considered part of the organisation's business-as-usual. |
| | | 12.4 | Customer Engagement | Recommendations related to the preparedness of members of the public or enterprises to understand and cope with the change, e.g. transformed or new services, changes in legislation, etc. |
| | | 12.5 | Go-live | Recommendations related to activities, processes, and documented procedures (including Testing) that must be |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----|-------|--|
| | | | | designed and established before the solution can be transitioned into and subsequently maintained in "Live". |
| 13. Other | To be used only when classifications 1 to 12 do not apply. | 13. | Other | To be used only when classifications 1 to 12 do not apply. |