



INDEPENDENT ASSURANCE

PROGRAMME/ PROJECT: **HMP Kilmarnock Transition**

Gate 0 – Strategic Assessment

Template Version	V1.0 October 2022
Report Version:	Final 1.0
Review Dates	08/03/2023 to 10/03/2023
Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):	Lorraine Roughan
Date Appointment letter issued to SRO:	
Draft report to SRO	10/03/2023
Final Report to SRO and PPPA	20/03/2023
Delivery Confidence Assessment:	Amber
Programme/ Project Director:	
Accountable Officer:	Teresa Medhurst, CEO Scottish Prison Service
Scottish Government Portfolio Accountable Officer:	
Investment Decision Maker:	
Business Case stage reached:	Outline Business Case (OBC) or equivalent
Decision/approval point this report informs:	Business Justification/Delivery Strategy
Review Team Leader:	Mark Abbs
Review Team Members:	Evelyn Aitken
Previous Review:	None

About this report

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.

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

The Kilmarnock Transition Project has been formed with a clear policy mandate to transition HMP Kilmarnock to public operation on the 17 March 2024.

An appropriately resourced Project Team has been formed with a highly regarded SRO and Project Team members who have put in-place good project management structures, processes and tools. Clear workstreams have been established. However, initiation of the Project was later than ideal, and recruitment and formation of the Project Team has been prolonged. Consequently, time is now pressing and there is anxiety amongst many involved that a robust transition is challenging in the available time.

The Project executives have, in the opinion of the Review Team, a pragmatic perspective of a phased transition which could probably be successfully achieved in the available time. However, as yet this perspective is not yet articulated in a shared delivery strategy which has been scrutinised, challenged and agreed by Project Board members and other stakeholders. There was diversity of opinion on what was required for March 2024 and what could be delivered later, and when. Workstreams are at various stages of development and priorities were not clear, there was a thirst from many of those with project responsibilities for greater clarity on delivery scope and phasing and there was some suggestion that efforts were not being focused in priority areas. This perspective is increasing anxiety on time pressures amongst some stakeholders. The Review has recommended that a Delivery Strategy that clearly defines project delivery scope, phasing and priorities, is produced, agreed and widely shared at the earliest opportunity. Prompt action to publish a Delivery Strategy should see the Project delivery confidence improve.

The Review also observed a lack of clarity on project governance, in particular resulting in a lack of challenge and clear ownership at Board and Project level and where decisions were being taken was not always clear. It is understood that SPS is in the process of developing its wider project governance capability. This, and greater clarity on project delivery strategy, should help to improve challenge, ownership and decision making in the Project, though the Review has also recommended that Project Board Terms of Reference be re-examined.

The Review also heard an almost consistent view that further effort was required on communications and engagement. The Project is soon to undertake formal engagement events with Prison staff, this is a very positive step. Further evaluation and development of project communications and engagements plans and responsibilities may be valuable.

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-base lining 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	It is recommended that the SRO instruct the generation agreement and wide publication of a Project delivery Strategy, defining project delivery scope, phasing and priorities.	Risk of uncoordinated project activities and reduced likelihood of successful delivery.	Critical	Planning	Project Delivery
2	It is recommended that the SRO direct that the TOR's of the various governance groups is re-examined to ensure clarity on roles and responsibilities, decision making and the effective use of challenge.	Risk that project governance is not fully effective.	Essential	Roles and Responsibilities	Project Delivery
3	It is recommended that, once more detail on delivery strategy, business justification and budgets are known , that the SRO direct the revision of the Project Business Case.	Risk that project governance is not fully effective.	Essential	Justification / BC	Project Delivery
4	It is recommended that the SRO shares the findings of this Review	Risk that the Project is not able to effectively demonstrate key project	Recommended	Roles and Responsibilities	Project Delivery

	with SPS executives, highlighting concerns about governance for consideration in the wider development of project governance in SPS.	decisions, delivery strategy and business justification.			
5	It is recommended that SRO consider the further development of the communications and engagement plan with detailed timescales and re-evaluates the attribution of Communications responsibility with suitable resource.	Risk that effective communications and engagement are not deployed, losing the benefits that they present to mitigate major project risk.	Recommended	Stakeholders	Communi cations
6	It is recommended that (possibly through articulation of the Delivery Strategy) that the Project Team provides clarity to all stakeholders on what constitutes TUPE requirements and what falls into term and condition harmonisation.	There is a risk that project members do not understand the delivery priorities on HR issues. There is also a risk of perpetuating mis-information.	Recommended	Stakeholders	Communi cations
7	It is recommended that the SRO consider the benefits of commissioning further assurance on HR specific issues.	There is a risk that the critical HR issues have not been fully evaluated – important issues may not have been identified.	Recommended	Knowledge and Data	Risk

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

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 [include reasoning why this cannot be resolved and provide a suggested escalation route]	Consequence if not resolved [include any critical path or key dates by which blocker MUST be resolved in order to manage or reduce impact]
1	NONE		
2			
3			

4. Comments from the SRO

SRO Comments

As SRO for the HMP Kilmarnock transition, I welcome the outcome of the report which I consider to be a fair reflection on the project's current status. I am delighted for the team that their commitment to the project and their resolve to make it a success has been recognised. In reply, I accept the findings of the review. The work on the critical recommendation is already progressing well and showing early benefit. Actions for the two essential recommendations are planned, with the remaining recommendations being considered at the next Programme Board. This has been a worthwhile and supportive process which will be repeated as this project moves closer to its conclusion.

5. Review Team findings and recommendations

1. Policy

5.1.1 The Review Team heard that the purpose of the Project is to transition the private sector operated prison into the public sector. This is the first private finance initiative (PFI) contract within Scotland to be transitioned. The contractor is Kilmarnock Prison Services Ltd (KPSL), with SERCO Justice & Immigration as the day-to-day operator. This follows a Scottish Government policy decision, announced in 2007, that all prisons in Scotland should be brought back into public sector operation. In 2016, a 'think piece' was produced to stimulate debate around the way forward for HMP Kilmarnock, post contract transition. Further option documents were produced, and considered, most recently in March 2019. In October 2021 the Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans wrote to SPS to confirm that "on expiry of the contract, the management and operation of HMP Kilmarnock will also transfer to SPS". Given the existing PFI contract expiry and this policy decision not to renew, there is a fixed date for the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) to take responsibility of HMP Kilmarnock, which is 17 March 2024.

5.1.2 Whilst a little concern about costs was expressed, interviewees were resolute that the policy decision had been taken and that SPS, should and will deliver this objective, that no further justification is required, and no question was raised that SPS would take control of Kilmarnock in March 2024.

5.1.3 We heard that advice from Scottish Futures Trust, and other agencies with experience from other transition and PFI returns, suggested that such transition projects would take 4-5 years. Given the now 12 months to the transition deadline it was not surprising that available time was the most significant point of discussion and concern from all interviewees. The level of concern about available time and the confidence on project success was varied, driven by various opinions on what

is required by March 2024 and how long subsequent harmonisation activities would take; this is further discussed under Delivery Strategy below.

Recommendations:

NONE

5.2. Governance and Project Management

5.2.1 The Review Team were heartened to hear that there was a high level of confidence in the abilities, experience and skills of the SRO and the wider Project Team. It was mentioned that the Team now has “the right people, with the right skills, in the right place”. The Review Team shared this confidence in the in the SRO and Project Team.

5.2.2 The Project Team has taken a long time to get established, the SRO started in June 2022, with other permanent members started later that calendar year; we heard that the final Team members will be joining shortly. A number of interviewees expressed frustration with the time taken to get people into place and we heard that an issue of lengthy recruitment timelines was not unique to this Project but to the wider SPS. This delay in recruitment has impacted on the Project Team being able to deliver clearly defined Project vision, plans, timelines and transitional costs in a timely manner.

5.3.4 We heard that although recruitment was slow, there was no issue with staffing resources being allocated to the Project. The Review Team were made aware that the SRO and other key Project Team personnel were not exclusively allocated to this Project; this could present an issue with competing priorities as this and adjacent projects near completion. The necessary and available resource should be closely monitored.

5.3.5 The Review Team heard mixed views on the effectiveness of the governance structure surrounding the Project. Regular, monthly Project Team and Project Board meetings are taking place. We did not see clear evidence of where decisions were being made. We read and heard that some decisions relating to the project were made at the Major Projects Management Group, some at the Project Board and others were being made outside the project management structures as part of business as usual to ensure workstreams were able to progress. It was not clear where records of these decisions were being kept. The Review Team heard that a recently set up Interface Meeting, with external stakeholders, was a valuable addition to the governance structure, however, this may further confuse decision making if responsibilities are not clearly defined. We also heard that SPS had identified a need to improve its project governance, across the organisation, and this had resulted in the formation of the Major Projects Management Group; however, we were told that development of improved governance was still ongoing. The Review Team was surprised that all SPS major projects do not get recorded for each MPMG minutes, thus demonstrating MPMG satisfaction with progress.

5.3.6 The Review Team examined the Project Board Terms of Reference and consider that they afford a lot of responsibility to the SRO to deliver, but did not articulate appropriate due diligence responsibility to other Board members. In particular we did not see evidence from the minutes of any challenge taken place. As an example, we were provided with Project Status Update reports which showed project time status as Green, but when we asked more detailed questions several of the Board Members intimated that this was not correct and Amber would be more reflective of the Project position, however, no challenge had been received.

5.3.7 The Review Team heard opinion that a lack of challenge was within the culture of SPS, where staff had worked together for long time and had strong personal relationships. Some interviewees also considered that the Project Board membership was very large, the Review Team also felt that the membership was large and that this may interfere with focused decision making and challenge. On several occasions we also heard about “lack of” or “unclear” “ownership” particularly within the Board but also across from wider Project members. This could also be due to the roles and responsibilities not being clearly articulated and understood. The Review Team also consider that a lack of clarity on the Delivery Strategy (described in Section 5.3 below) may be contributing to some of the behaviours being observed around Governance and ownership. There is a risk that critical action areas may not be captured in the project delivery plan. We recommend that the roles and responsibilities of each of the groups and the members is reviewed and clearly defined. We also recommend and that the effectiveness of governance for this Project is examined in the wider ongoing evaluation of governance of Projects in SPS.

Recommendations:

R1 It is recommended that the SRO direct that the TOR’s of the various HMP Kilmarnock related governance groups is re-examined to ensure clarity on roles and responsibilities, decision making and the effective use of challenge.

R2 It is recommended that the SRO shares the findings of this Review with SPS executives, highlighting concerns about governance for consideration in the wider development of project governance in SPS.

5.3. Delivery Strategy

5.3.1 Clearly defined workstreams have been established with appropriate resource and leadership and reporting lines into the central Project Team. These workstream are at various stages of development. Whilst some are fairly advanced in their identification of workstream requirements and issues other workstreams still at the exploration and definition stage. Workstream leads described that they were “developing project plans just now” that would be used to populate a whole project, project plan.

5.3.2 The Project currently has an initial, spreadsheet-based project schedule, but this does not provide detail on priorities and critical paths, and may not yet capture all Project requirements and activities. Members of the Project Team are undertaking MS Project training and, with support from the SPS PMO, work has been initiated to develop a full project plan for the Project.

5.3.3 As described in paragraph 5.1.3 above, initiation of the Project was later than the recommended 4-5 years by Scottish Futures Trust and other agencies. Furthermore, as described in paragraph 5.2.2 the recruitment and formation of the Project Team has been prolonged. Consequently, almost all interviewees expressed that time is now very pressing and there is anxiety amongst many involved that a robust transition is challenging in the available time.

5.3.4 Nonetheless, the Review found that the Project executives have, in the opinion of the Review Team, a pragmatic perspective of a phased transition which could probably be successfully achieved in the available time. However, as yet this perspective has not been articulated in a shared delivery strategy and plan which has been scrutinised, challenged and agreed by Project Board members and other stakeholders. The Review Team heard a varied perspective from workstream

leads and other interviewees of what the delivery scope for March 2024, and subsequent deliveries, would look like. Individuals all had different perspectives of what was necessary and what priorities would be for March 2024 and how long subsequent 'harmonisation' (otherwise described as 'transition' or 'transformation' by others) would take. This varied view changed individual perspectives of the achievement of a successful transition in the available time. There was some suggestion that without clarity on priorities some, enthusiastic, individuals were working on activities that 'could be done, rather than activities that 'needed to be done'. Many interviewees talked of a "lack of clarity" or "coherence" and were increasingly eager to understand what the delivery scope and stages were, to be able to focus their efforts.

5.3.5 A broad budget for transition had been agreed by the MPMG. However, the Review Team heard that, as workstreams were still exploring project requirements and developing solutions, detailed transition costs were not yet developed.

5.3.6 The Review Team consider that, in their experience, a phased approach to delivery, as envisaged by the Project executives is both preferable and achievable. Such a phased approach will enable the focused utilisation of resources, help significantly in the mitigation of risk, including supporting the engagement and 'buy-in' of stakeholders. It was made clear to the Review Team that HMP Kilmarnock is a well run and operating prison and as such there was benefit in limiting change and there is also potential to extract opportunities and benefits from Kilmarnock that could be applied elsewhere in SPS. These benefits would best be realised by a well-structured phased approach.

5.3.7 The Review Team believe that the prompt publication and agreement of a Delivery Strategy, for the Project would be beneficial, helping to focus efforts, engender a belief in project success, aid project governance and control and help in the engagement of stakeholders. This Delivery Strategy should simply and clearly define the delivery scope for March 2024 and subsequent phases, making clear priorities, critical, essential and desirable requirements. The delivery strategy should be shared widely and supported, in time, by a detailed project plan, which should be used to refine the strategy as detail emerges. It is also recommended that, in a traditional public project management approach, once this delivery strategy has been agreed and further detail is available, the Project Business Case should be refined to record and agree the delivery strategy, rationale for priorities and decisions and project budget.

Recommendations:

R3 It is recommended that the SRO instruct the generation agreement and wide publication of a Project delivery Strategy, defining project delivery scope, phasing and priorities.

R4 It is recommended that, once more detail on delivery strategy, business justification and budgets are known , that the SRO direct the revision of the Project Business Case.

5.4. Communications and Engagement

5.4.1 The Review Team were provided with Communications Strategy and Plan which highlighted stakeholders and communication methods. It did not include a detailed timeline or defined outputs. We were led to understand that the current responsibility for Communications sits directly with the SRO, which, if correct, is a concern to the Review Team for both capacity and conflict of

responsibilities. Communications and engagement are a vital tool for this Project and will need sufficient resource, particularly as the Project progresses toward delivery.

5.4.2 Some interviewees expressed that development of detailed workstream plans was inhibited by slow information flow from the private sector operators. We heard that a Request For Information process had been initiated between the Project and current operators and that this was working well. Some opinion was expressed that the private sector operators would be reluctant for SPS to engage with Prison staff. However, the Review Team found that, within expected commercial constraints, the current operator was behaving very cooperatively, was eager to allow staff engagement (to maintain staff motivation) and that a very positive relationship had been built between the Project Team and Operator.

5.4.3 Mixed messages around engaging with stakeholders were heard by the Review Team. Whilst a couple of the interviewees expressed caution about engaging with staff and stakeholders with limited information, most others felt that more “could have been done” and “should have been done” earlier. Many interviewees voiced concerns that misinformation was beginning to appear. We also heard concerns that engagement with the wider stakeholders may be needed now to ensure that information was available in some areas to take timely decisions. An information event will be held at Kilmarnock Prison on the 17th March 2023. We also believe that SPS intend to use the 2 operational advisors who have also been designated as Controllers within Kilmarnock Prison to ‘get out-and-about in the Prison, to understand staff opinion, communicate about the Project and use local knowledge they gain to feed back to the Project Team. These are welcome actions. The Review Team consider that effective communications and engagement done effectively and timely could mitigate some of the major risk areas in particular staff and local area stakeholders. Thus, the Review Team consider that the positive actions being taken are timely, but that a re-evaluation of the responsibilities, value and the scope of the communications task may also be valuable.

Recommendations:

R5 It is recommended that SRO consider the further development of the communications and engagement plan with detailed timescales and re-evaluates the attribution of Communications responsibility with suitable resource.

5.5 Risk Management

5.5.1 The Review Team observed awareness of good risk management within the Project, and that appropriate risk management tools are in-place and being employed. We saw from the Project Team Meeting minutes that risks are being discussed and reviewed at these meetings and further discussions are also happening at the Project Board. However, we did not see evidence of the detailed scrutiny or challenge within these meetings.

5.5.2 The Review Team heard from several interviewees that the biggest risk to the Project centred around HR issues. We heard many times the TUPE arrangements being described as “complex” and also that that SPS “may not” have extensive experience in this area. The Review Team were reassured that external legal advice had been sought and provided. During our interviews, we heard the phrase ‘TUPE’ being used to describe various aspects of the staff transfer, from it being the transfer of staff on ‘Day 1’ to also include the longer-term harmonisation of the terms and conditions. The differentiation between what is legally required for TUPE on ‘Day1’ of the transition and what is desirable in the longer-term employment terms and conditions was not understood by some stakeholders. The Review Team believe that clarity needs to be provided to ensure everyone is clear on what TUPE means and where the various phases sit on the critical path

for project delivery. Due to the complexity, possible novelty and high risk to the project that HR related issues present, additional, HR specific, assurance may be useful to build confidence for the successful delivery of the Project.

5.5.3 After HR issues, the other area of risk that was highlighted by interviewees to The Review Team, was around local area public, business and political scrutiny and awareness. Although the Review Team heard that some stakeholder engagement had already taken place and a communications strategy and plan was available (albeit without any timelines), the Review Team believe that good early communications and engagement is one of the most useful tools to help alleviate risks in this area.

Recommendations:

R6 It is recommended that the SRO consider the benefits of commissioning further assurance on HR specific issues.

R7 It is recommended that (possibly through articulation of the Delivery Strategy) that the Project Team provides clarity to all stakeholders on what constitutes TUPE requirements and what falls into term and condition harmonisation.

6. Areas of good practice

Commending delivery of [insert the classification reference from Annex E]	Describe specific details of successful delivery [include examples where possible]
Flexibility and Capability	During the review we heard repeatedly that there was a high level of confidence in the abilities, experience and skills of the SRO and the wider Project Team. The review team were able to establish that many of the project team had been recruited temporarily into the team and demonstrated a passion and commitment to ensuring the project was a success.
Resourcing	SPS has shown serious commitment to good project management by providing the Project with very suitable and sufficient resource.

7. Acknowledgement

Review Team Acknowledgement

The Review Team would like to thank the Project Team and all interviewees for their support and openness, which contributed to the Review Team's understanding of the Project the outcome of this Review. In addition, the Review Team would particularly like to thank the Project Manager and Project Administration Support for a well organised Review.

8. Next Assurance Review

Next Assurance Review

The Project may wish to consider further assurance once a delivery strategy has been embedded and most certainly should consider further assurance review suitably in advance and in preparation for readiness for service (late calendar 2023).

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

The SPS Kilmarnock Transition Project is unusual in that its aim and objectives are to deliver a policy decision to return the prison into public operation and consequently no business justification and subsequent investment decision were taken in a traditional sense. The Project has a business case based on this decision, but it is a young project and the business case is just at an Outline Business Case stage, whilst the Project is proceeding directly into the Delivery Strategy Phase.

As a consequence of this position, this Review took guidance from both the Infrastructure and Projects Authority Business Justification (Gate 1) and Delivery Strategy (Gate 2) workbooks. This was agreed with the SRO.

ANNEX B - Background

Completed by the Project Team in advance of the Planning Meeting.

Question	Answer
Describe the aims of the project/ programme	<p>The purpose of the project is to transition the contracted-out service provided at HMP Kilmarnock into the public sector. This is the first private finance initiative (PFI) contract within Scotland to be transitioned. The contractor is Kilmarnock Prison Services Ltd (KPSL), with Serco as the day-to-day operator.</p> <p>The 'hard stop' contract end date mandated by the Scottish Government is 16 March 2024, with the Scottish Prison Service taking responsibility thereafter.</p>
Reasons for the project/ programme's existence, by type and description	<p>HMP Kilmarnock was built and operates under a 25-year Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract between Scottish Ministers and Kilmarnock Prison Services Limited (KPSL), for the design, construction, finance and management of the prison. A special purpose vehicle (SPV) company was created for this contract.</p> <p>In 2007, the Scottish Government announced a policy decision that new prisons would be operated by the public sector; the Justice Secretary stated that prisons "are for public safety, not private profit, so we are drawing a line in the sand". Specifically, in regard to HMP Kilmarnock and in line with policy, the Cabinet Secretary for Justice and Veterans wrote to SPS in October 2021, to confirm that "on expiry of the contract, the management and operation of HMP Kilmarnock will also transfer to SPS".</p> <p>This position has since been confirmed in a letter to the Justice Committee.</p> <p>The project therefore supports the achievement of government policy.</p>
The impact if the project/programme fails to deliver e.g. any risks to or any material impact on citizens:	<p>If the project does not succeed, it will fail to deliver Government policy commitment, with serious public relations and political consequences for SPS and SG.</p> <p>Non-inclusion in the SPS estate would result in loss of benefits of standardisation of practices, and attendant limitations in staff usage and development.</p>
Project/programme link to Scottish Government strategies or policies:	<p>The project will deliver SG policy within the scope of prison ownership and is mandated by SG.</p>

Projects/programme interdependencies [if applicable]:	Whilst there are no known specific interdependencies, the project will be running alongside other projects that will draw on the same resource pool. As with other major projects, the project will be reviewed and monitored by SPS's Major Programmes Management Group (MPMG), a large part of whose role is to identify and help manage interdependencies. The project manager, project executive and deputy project executive perform the same roles for the build of HMP Highland, thus being able to look across resource management for both projects.
Has the SRO's letter of appointment been approved at the appropriate levels?	An SRO appointment letter has not been issued for HMP Kilmarnock. The SRO for this Project is equally SRO for the SPS HMP Highland Project, for which an SRO appointment letter has been published which recognises her time allocation for both Projects.
The procurement / delivery status:	Commercial and procurement elements are handled by experienced subject matter experts that employ current practice and participate in external networks that highlight and communicate leading practice pathways and solutions.
Funding / Business Case:	Despite pressures on SG's funding purse, the project sits within an adequately funded envelope. The business case is being finalised.
Integrated Assurance and Approval Plan (IAAP):	To be confirmed as appropriate.
Programme/Project plan:	Does the project / programme have an appropriate plan in place? Yes . Has the plan been baselined? Please include who signed it off etc. Yes – elements of the plan have been baselined against relevant workstreams. The plan has been reviewed by the project team and the project executive/SRO. It is going to the project board on 21 February.
Current position regarding previous PPPA assurance reviews:	There have been no previous PPPA assurance reviews.
Current position regarding Non-PPPA assurance reviews	The project has been reviewed through the project board, the MPMG and the Executive Management Group. SPS's Senior Portfolio Manager sits on the project board.
Current position regarding SG PPM Capability Maturity Matrix	A maturity matrix has been completed for this project.

ANNEX C – Progress against previous assurance review

There have been no previous Reviews of this Project.

Progress Against Previous Review			
Previous Review Date: None			
Priority	Summary of risks, issues and related recommendations from the original recommendation	Critical/ Essential/ Recommended	Current status - has the risk / issue been mitigated

ANNEX D – List of Interviewees

The following stakeholders were interviewed during the Review:

Name	Organisation and role
Lorraine Roughan	SRO/Project Executive
Calum Kincaid	Deputy Project Executive
Sharanne Findlay	Operations Project Board Member
David Stirling	Digital Services Workstream Lead:
Melanie Bowie	HR Workstream Lead
Stephen Homer	Project Manager
Lauren Arnott	Project Administration Support
Prince Dakpoe	Kilmarnock Prison Services Limited
Barrie Copeland	Major Project Management Group Board Member, Project Board Member
Allister Purdie	Executive Management Group Member, Project Board Member
Liz McNamee	Legal Workstream Lead
Andy Door	Procurement Workstream Lead
Debbie O'Mahoney	Finance Workstream Lead
Charles Saliba	Estates Project Board Member
Mike McKay	Serco Project Director
Phil Thomas	TUS Project Board Member
Gerry O'Donnell	Finance Project Board Member

ANNEX E – Scottish Government Project Delivery Principles

Alignment	We align our programmes and projects to corporate priorities to ensure we deliver for the people of Scotland	Recommendations related to alignment to vision, strategy and policy.
Leadership	We lead from the start by clearly communicating the vision, agreeing approaches, providing resource, collaborating across teams and setting a delivery culture.	Recommendations related to that are aimed at the clarity of what success looks like; leadership and the necessary culture to ensure success.
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.	Recommendations relate to the purpose, objectives and ongoing justification for the 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.	Recommendations related to the end-to-end procurement process including: Procurement strategy and planning, Approaches to the market, Contract negotiation and Contract management. Recommendations related to financial planning, organising, directing and controlling of financial activities.
Knowledge & Data	We ensure our projects are learning organisations from day one, we seek and use information & data for the benefit of our work.	Recommendations related to the process of capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organisational knowledge. It includes sharing knowledge and experiences or lessons.
Flexibility & Capability	Our multidiscipline teams contain flexible and skilled people who focus on required identified capabilities and outcomes, not positions.	Recommendations related to all aspects of the identification, supply, optimisation, prioritisation and maintenance of resources and appropriate skills.
Roles and Responsibilities	We assign and delegate roles and responsibilities within our projects flowing from the SRO's appointment letter/delegation/mandate	Recommendations related to the oversight, structure and decision making of a project/ programme. This theme also includes recommendations relating to alignment with pan-government priorities, strategies and controls.

Stakeholders	We identify, assess and then manage our stakeholders to leverage maximum chance of success.	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.
Benefits	We start with the end in mind, formally focussing on the intended outcomes of our investment.	Recommendations related to the identification, ownership, measurement and realisation of benefits and dis-benefits. Benefits can be either financial or non-financial
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	Recommendations related to all aspects of project, programme and portfolio management, but excludes recommendations on Risk, Issues and Dependency Management
Risk	We identify, communicate and act upon the threats or opportunities to and for our outcomes.	Recommendations related to the identification, analysis, impact assessment, response and the on-going review and management of Risks, Issues and Dependencies (i.e. outputs that are required by a project to succeed, but which will be delivered by parties not under the direct control of the project).
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.	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
Other	To be used only when one of the Principles does not apply.	