# **Project Data Summary Sheet**<sup>152</sup>

Project Number	SEA 1442 Phase 4
Project Name	MARITIME COMMUNICATIONS MODERNISATION
First Year Reported in the MPR	2014-15
Capability Type	Upgrade
Acquisition Type	Australianised MOTS
Capability Manager	Chief of Navy
Government 1st Pass Approval	Dec 10
Government 2nd Pass Approval	Jul 13
Total Approved Budget (Current)	\$432.1m
2016–17 Budget	\$61.7m
Project Stage	Detailed Design Review
Complexity	ACAT II



SEA 1442 Maritime Communications Modernisation

## Section 1 – Project Summary

## 1.1 Project Description

SEA 1442 Phase 4 will upgrade the communications capability in the eight Anzac Class Frigates and address communications system obsolescence in the Class, by modernising it with improved communications management, secure voice and tactical intercom, red/black switching, tactical radios and a high data rate line-of-sight capability. The project will also deliver support systems, a secondary Maritime Tactical Wide Area Network (MTWAN) Shore Gateway and upgrade the Anzac Combat System Trainer Communications Terminals.

#### 1.2 Current Status

## **Cost Performance**

## In-year

This year the project has spent \$56.9m of a budget of \$61.7m. The \$4.7m underspend is largely due to three major factors: 1. a favourable Foreign Exchange on the March 2017 Detailed Design Review (DDR) milestone payment, 2. delays in the ANZAC Warship Asset Management Agreement (WAMA) (previously ANZAC Alliance) expenditure and 3. contract payments slipping to Financial Year 2017-18 due to a delay in the Contractor meeting the deliverable requirement.

#### Project Financial Assurance Statement

As at 30 June 2017, project SEA 1442 Phase 4 has reviewed the approved scope and budget for those elements required to be delivered by the project. Having reviewed the current financial and contractual obligations of the project, current known risks and estimated future expenditure, Defence considers, as at the reporting date, there is sufficient budget remaining for the project to complete against the agreed scope.

Contingency Statement

The project has not applied contingency in the financial year.

#### Schedule Performance

Key milestones achieved so far include: MTWAN Secondary Shore Gateway; Prime Contract Integrated Baseline Review (IBR), System Definition Review (SDR), Preliminary Design Review (PDR) and NewGen Maritime Communications System Detailed Design Review (DDR). Following a later than originally planned completion of DDR, Support System Detailed Design Review (SSDDR) was rescheduled, from its original date in April 2017, to June 2017; with completion expected in July 2017. Initial Materiel Release (IMR) has slipped to August 2019 due to ship availability.

Anzac Midlife Capability Assurance Program (AMCAP) scheduling for Ship #1 is driving the SEA1442 Phase 4 delivery, noting that there is no change to SEA1442 Phase 4 Final Operating Capability (FOC).

## Materiel Capability Delivery Performance

The MTWAN Secondary Shore Gateway has been delivered and is operational. The first Anzac ship capability with associated support systems is scheduled for delivery in August 2019.

#### 152 Notice to reader

Forecast dates and Sections: 1.2 (Materiel Capability Delivery Performance), 1.3 (Major Risks and Issues), 4.1 (Measures of Materiel Capability Delivery Performance), and 5 (Major Risks and Issues) are excluded from the scope of the ANAO's review of this Project Data Summary Sheet. Information on the scope of the review is provided in the Independent Assurance Report by the Auditor-General in **Part 3** of this report.

# Note

Forecast dates and capability assessments are excluded from the scope of the review.

#### 1.3 Project Context

#### Background

SEA 1442 (Maritime Communications Modernisation) is a multi-phased program that will modernise the Royal Australian Navy's (RAN) communications infrastructure. The preceding phase (Phase 3) delivered an initial MTWAN and Message Handling System to the RAN's Major Fleet Units.

SEA 1442 Phase 4 will address critical obsolescence problems affecting the communication systems in the RAN Anzac Class frigates. The modernised communications system (NewGen MCS) will be highly integrated and automated to deliver more agile and faster communication and reduce operator intervention. The project scope includes upgrade of various communications systems in the eight Anzac frigates, establishment of a training system at HMAS *Stirling* and a shore integration and test capability at the prime contractor's facility for in-service support, delivery of a secondary MTWAN shore gateway, and upgrade of the Anzac Combat System Trainer Communications Terminals.

The majority of individual equipment and sub-systems is either Military Off The Shelf (MOTS) or Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS). Some development is required and involves functionality enhancements and Australianisation of the MOTS and COTS. The main complexity is in bringing the sub-systems together as a highly integrated and automated system and installation in the ships, cognisant of existing weapons, sensors, emitters, and specific platform requirements.

Government Second Pass approval was achieved in July 2013. Prime acquisition and 5-year support services contracts were awarded to Selex ES Ltd in November 2013 following an open tender process. Selex ES Ltd changed its name to Leonardo MW Ltd in September 2016.

Under the acquisition contract, Leonardo MW will: design, develop and install the NewGen MCS into the eight Anzac Class frigates; design, develop and install the support systems (training system and integration and test capability); and develop and deliver integrated logistic support products. The support services contract will become operative following acceptance of the first ANZAC frigate and the support systems.

The project is also managing the acquisition of ARC-210 Gen5 V/UHF multi-band multi-mode software defined radios through FMS with the US Government. The radios form part of the NewGen MCS.

#### Uniqueness

An advanced feature of the system includes a unique radio frequency distribution system that will allow automated and efficient switching of the multitude of radios and antennae on each ship in order to establish the most effective communications path.

The high data rate line of sight system is a new capability and will be a step towards enabling the RAN to operate in a satellite denied environment and enable more efficient ship-to-ship communication.

#### Major Risks and Issues

The key risks for this project include: platform integration matters such as varying ship configurations, inadequate power and platform services, other concurrent activities on the ships during installation, and integration into the complex electromagnetic environment of the Anzac Class Frigates; equipment obsolescence due to the length of project; availability of sufficient resources, and milestone delays due to under-estimating the time required to complete the work and prepare the training facility. Issues faced by the Project include changes to the AMCAP Program, a delay to the completion of the SSDDR and IDDR milestones, as well as incomplete analysis of the sustainment budget.

#### Other Current Sub-Projects

N/A

Note

Major risks and issues are excluded from the scope of the review.

# Section 2 – Financial Performance

Date		Description	\$n	n	Notes
		Project Budget			
Dec 10		Original Approved		11.4	
Jul 13		Government Second Pass Approval	374.3		
				374.3	
Jun 17		Exchange Variation		46.4	
Jun 17		Total Budget		432.1	
041111		. om 2 augot			
		Project Expenditure			
Prior to Ju	ul 16	Contract Expenditure – Leonardo MW	(80.5)		1
		Contract Expenditure – US Government	(9.2)		1
		Other Contract Payments / Internal Expenses	(12.4)		2
			· · · /	(102.1)	_
				(11-11)	
FY to Jun	_17	Contract Expenditure – Leonardo MW	(50.4)		1
		Contract Expenditure – US Government	(5.5)		1
		Other Contract Payments / Internal Expenses	(1.0)		3
			()	(56.9)	Ű
Jun 17		Total Expenditure		(159.0)	
oun n			1		
lun 17		Remaining Budget		273.1	
our n		Romannig Baagot			
Notes					
1	The scope of	this contract is explained further in Section 2.3 – Details	of Project Major Contr	acts.	
2	Other expend	iture comprises \$5.9m for Pre-contract work with Leona	rdo MW \$2 1m for of	ther pre Second Pas	s studies
-	and work \$0	5m for Shore Gateway West \$0.3m for legal services	\$0 2m for the Shore I	Integration Facility	1.5m for
	Viasat moder	ns and \$2.0m for other minor contract expenditure, proje	ect management costs	and travel.	
3	Other expense	diture comprises \$0.3m for AVA-20 Antennas. \$0.2r	n for WAMA suppo	rt. \$0.1m for the H	igh Data
	Rate Line of	f Sight (HDRLOS) integration Study and \$0.4m f	or other minor co	ntract expenditure	project
	management	costs and travel.			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

2.1 Project Budget (out-turned) and Expenditure History

2 2A In-year Budget Estimate Variance

E.E. Chi your Duugot	Lotimate variance		
Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Explanation of Material Movements
PBS \$m	PAES \$m	Final Plan \$m	
70.8	66.3	61.7	PBS to PAES decrease was primarily due to the re-scheduling of some initial spares procurement from 2016-17 into 2017-18. PAES to Final Plan – estimate decrease can be attributed to a revised FMS schedule and advice for from the US Government that the radios were cheaper than originally budgeted, a CASG/US Government decision that no September quarter FMS payment was required and a favourable foreign exchange rate.
Variance \$m	(4.5)	(4.6)	Total Variance (\$m): (9.2)
Variance %	(6.4)	(7.0)	Total Variance (%): (13.0)

2.2B In-year Budget/Expenditure Variance

Z.ZD III-year Duug	jet/Lxperiulture	variance		
Estimate	Actual	Variance	Variance Factor	Explanation
Final Plan \$m	\$m	\$m		
		(0.4)	Australian Industry	The underspend is largely due three
		(3.4)	Foreign Industry	major factors: 1. a favourable
			Early Processes	Foreign Exchange on the March
			Defence Processes	2017 Detailed Design Review (DDR)
			Foreign Government	milestone payment, 2. delays in
			Negotiations/Payments	WAMA support expenditure and 3.
		(0.9)	Cost Saving	Three Leonardo Milestone payments
			Effort in Support of Operations	slipping to Financial Year 2017-18
			Additional Government Approvals	due to a delay in the Contractor
61.7	56.9	(4.7)	Total Variance	meeting the deliverable requirement.
		(7.7)	% Variance	

2.3 Details of Project Major Contracts

	Signature	Price at		Type (Price	Form of	
Contractor	Date	Signature \$m	30 Jun 17 \$m	Basis)	Contract	Notes
Leonardo MW	Nov 2013	187.7	209.5	Variable	ASDEFCON Strategic	1, 2, 3
US Government (AT-P-BSH)	Dec 2014	17.0	20.4	Firm	FMS	1, 3

Ma	
ritin	
ne (	
Con	
nms	
0,	

Notes						
1	Contract value as at 30 June 2017 is based on actual expenditure to 30 June 17 and remaining commitment based on the commitment report as at 30 June 2017 from provided by CFO					
2	In addition to Note 1 above, the increase in Leonardo MW contract price at 30 June 2017 includes additional elements, namely UHF MILSATCOM Antennae, Voice Recording System, and ARC-210 mounting and remote control ancillaries.					
3	The scope of this contract is explained further below.					
Quantities as at			Seene	Nieteo		
Contractor		Signature	30 Jun 17	Scope	Notes	
Leona	rdo MW	See scope	See scope	8 ship mission systems 1 training system 1 Shore Integration and Test facility 3 deployable High Data Rate line-of-sight systems		
US Government (AT-P-BSH)		131	131	ARC-210 Gen 5 radios, technical data, and technical support.		
Major equipment received and quantities to 30 June 17						
MTWA	N Secondary Gateway has	s been accepted.				

# Section 3 – Schedule Performance

## 3.1 Design Review Progress

Review	/	Major System/Platform Variant	Original Planned	Current Planned	Achieved/For ecast	Variance (Months)	Notes
Systen Requir	า ements	NewGen MCS and Support System	Sep 14	N/A	Dec 14	3	1
Prelimi	nary Design	NewGen MCS and Support System	May 15	Sep 15	Sep 15	4	2
		MTWAN Secondary Gateway	Sep 14	N/A	Jan 15	4	3
		NewGen MCS	Oct 16	N/A	Feb 17	4	4
Dotaila	d Docian	Support System	Apr 17	Jun 17	Jul 17	3	5
Detaile	d Design	First of Class Integration Detailed Design Review (IDDR)	May 17	N/A	Aug 17	3	6
Notes							
1	Delayed from	originally planned due to slow ram	p up/contractor	performance.			
2	Contract sche the work.	edule re-baselined to reflect previo	ous (SDR) miles	tone slippage	and contractor's	improved unde	erstanding of
3	MTWAN System Requirements and Preliminary Design addressed prior to Second Pass Approval. In order to minimise risk to the operational network upon connection of the MTWAN Secondary Gateway, a demonstration of the design in the MTWAN shore integration facility was requested prior to design accentance. This required additional time to complete						
4	The Conduct of the Detailed Design Review (DDR) and its associated system demonstration occurred four months later than the contracted date. The delay in completing the DDR is not expected to adversely impact on subsequent Ship Acceptance activities. This situation is being closely monitored by the Project Office.						
5	5 The Contractor Schedule (at June 2017) indicated that the Support System DDR would occur in July 2017 (three months later than the Contract Date).						
6	6 The Contractor Schedule (at June 2017) indicated that the First of Class Integration Detailed Design Review (IDDR) would occur in August 2017 (three months later than the Contract Date).						

Part 3. Project Data Summary Sheets

## 3.2 Contractor Test and Evaluation Progress

Test a	nd	Major System/Platform Variant	Original	Current	Achieved/For	Variance	Notes
Evalua	ation		Planned	Planned	ecast	(Months)	
Systen	n	NewGen MCS	Jun 18	N/A	Aug 19	14	1
Integra	ation						
Accept	tance	MTWAN Secondary Gateway	Apr 15	N/A	Mar 15	(1)	2
		Support System - Training System	Jun 17	Apr 18	Apr 18	10	3
		Support System - Shore	Dec 16	Mar 18	Sep 18	21	4
		Integration and Test Facility (SITF)					
		Ship #1	Jun 18	N/A	Aug 19	14	1
		Ship #2	Apr 19	N/A	Sep 19	5	5
		Ship #3	Nov 19	N/A	Apr 20	5	5
		Ship #4	Jun 20	N/A	Dec 20	6	5
		Ship #5	Feb 21	N/A	Nov 21	9	5
		Ship #6	Sep 21	N/A	Jul 22	10	5
		Ship #7	Apr 22	N/A	Mar 23	11	5
		Ship #8	Sep 22	N/A	Oct 23	13	5
Notes							
1	The Co	ntractor Schedule received on 26 J	lune 2017 indic	ated that the	Ship #1 Accept	tance Date wo	ould occur in
	August	2019 (fourteen months later than	the Contract	Date). This re	evised forecast	reflects the	alignment of
	SEA144	2 Phase 4 with the planned AMCAP	dates and is th	e subject of a	Contract Chang	ge Proposal w	hich is under
	develop	ment.					
2	MTWAN	Secondary Gateway has been accept	ed and is operati	ional.			
3	The Leo	nardo MW Contract Master Schedule	received on 26 J	June 2017 indi	cated an April 20	018 date for the	e achievement
	of this Milestone (the Contract Date is June 2017). A formal contract change was agreed to move this Milestone to a more						
	appropriate stage in the life of the Project (i.e. closer to the First of Class Acceptance).						
4	SITF acceptance date initially incorrectly positioned in the contract. Correction made via a formal contract change.						
5	Ship availability and schedule is driven by AMCAP. Whilst the availability dates for the Ship #1 have been agreed,						
	the revi	sed availability dates for the remair	ning ships have	not been fina	lised. Forecas	at dates and M	AA will need
	to be up	dated to align with AMCAP changes	s once the AMC	AP schedule i	s finalised. Leo	nardo MW to b	be advised 90
	days pri	or to commencement of each ship i	nstallation.				

## 3.3 Progress Toward Materiel Release and Operational Capability Milestones

Item	Original Planned	Achieved/Forecast	Variance (Months)	Notes
Initial Materiel Release (IMR)	Jun 18	Aug 19	14	1
Initial Operational Capability (IOC)	Dec 18	Dec 19	12	1
Materiel Release 2 – Ship # 2	Apr 19	Sep 19	5	1
Materiel Release 3 – Ship # 3	Dec 19	Apr 20	4	1
Materiel Release 4 – Ship # 4	Aug 20	Dec 20	4	1
Materiel Release 5 – Ship # 5	Apr 21	Nov 21	7	1
Materiel Release 6 – Ship # 6	Dec 21	Jul 22	7	1
Materiel Release 7 – Ship # 7	Aug 22	Mar 23	7	1
Final Materiel Release (FMR)	May 23	Oct 23	5	1
Final Operational Capability (FOC)	Dec 23	Dec 23	0	1



## Note

Forecast dates in Section 3 are excluded from the scope of the review.

# Section 4 – Materiel Capability Delivery Performance

4.1 Measures of Materiel Capability Delivery Performance	
Pie Chart: Percentage Breakdown of Materiel Capability Delivery Pe	erformance
	Green: The Project expects to meet capability materiel requirements as per the Joint Project Directive, Materiel Acquisition Agreement and relevant Technical Regulatory Authority.
	Amber: N/A
100%	Red: N/A
Note	

This Pie Chart represents Defence's expected capability delivery. Capability assessments and forecast dates are excluded from the scope of the review.

4.2 Constitution of Initial Materiel Release and Final Materiel Release				
Item	Explanation	Achievement		
Initial Materiel Release (IMR)	Ship 1 acceptance, training system, shore integration and test facility, ship 1 crew training, and support arrangements in place. IMR is expected to be achieved in Aug 19.	Not yet achieved.		
Final Materiel Release (FMR)	All 8 ships accepted and all support arrangements in	Not yet achieved.		
	place. FMR is expected to be achieved in Oct 23.			

# Section 5 – Major Risks and Issues

# 5.1 Major Project Risks

Identified Risks (risk identified by standard project risk managen	nent processes)
Description	Remedial Action
Platform Integration – There is a chance that installation will be affected by site or platform issues such as insufficient power, heat and ventilation.	<ul> <li>Work collaboratively with the ANZAC System Project Office (SPO) and the AMCAP (Anzac Midlife Life Of Type Capability Assurance Program (previously Life of Type Assurance Program - LOTAP)) to develop the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)</li> <li>Continue to liaise closely with ANZAC SPO and the AMCAP through established working groups and regular meetings to monitor the progress of the installation</li> <li>Align designs accordingly and in compliance with ANZAC SPO's engineering change processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Platform Integration</b> – There is a chance that installation completion will be affected by other AMCAP activities which are being conducted on the ship concurrently with each SEA 1442 installation.	<ul> <li>Work collaboratively with the ANZAC SPO and the AMCAP to develop the IMS.</li> <li>Continue to liaise closely with ANZAC SPO and the AMCAP through established working groups and regular meetings to monitor the progress of the installation.</li> <li>In consultation and collaboration with AMCAP, manage schedule throughout the installation to limit interruptions and avoid conflicts with other activities and re-plan if necessary.</li> </ul>
Platform Integration – There is a chance that installation will be affected by unknown or late changes to ship configuration.	<ul> <li>Continue to work collaboratively with the ANZAC SPO through established working groups and regular meetings to monitor changes to ship configuration.</li> <li>In consultation and collaboration with AMCAP, ensure site surveys are conducted as late as possible prior to installation to verify ship configuration and modify installation design if necessary.</li> </ul>
<b>Platform Integration</b> – There is a chance that system performance may be affected by integration into the complex electromagnetic environment of the Anzac Class Frigates.	<ul> <li>The Contractor has conducted an Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3) program which involves co-site performance analysis, measurements and modelling.</li> <li>If issues arise leading up to IDDR, the Project Team will</li> </ul>

# Maritime Comms

	implement the recommended engineering and procedural processes to address the issues.
System Integration – There is a chance that system design will be affected by unavailability, complexity, or changing external and legacy interfaces.	<ul> <li>Continue to liaise closely with ANZAC SPO and the AMCAP through established working groups and regular meetings to monitor any changes to the external or legacy interfaces.</li> <li>Respond to any incompatibility with integrated components in a collaborative fashion with AMCAP to determine remedial action that best suits the project and the Navy.</li> </ul>
<b>Obsolescence</b> – There is a chance that some mission system equipment may become obsolete prior to system acceptance.	<ul> <li>Continue to work with the Contractor to ensure that equipment selected is contemporary and supported from the period of acquisition through to integration, support and sustainment.</li> <li>Change design if necessary and where feasible. Spare appropriately.</li> </ul>
<b>Resourcing</b> – There is a chance that the project will be affected by a lack of staff.	<ul> <li>Continue to monitor human resource requirement through the life of the SEA1442 Phase 4 project to ensure that it meets its obligations under the contract with the Contractor, its partnership with the AMCAP and its commitment to the Navy.</li> <li>Where required, continue to recruit to replace as quickly as possible and utilise contracted support as necessary.</li> </ul>
<b>Milestone Delay</b> – There is a chance that a milestone is delayed due to under-estimating the time required to complete the work.	<ul> <li>Continue to review the project's schedule and its critical path to monitor risk and areas of slippage.</li> <li>Work collaboratively with the Contractor, the AMCAP or other stakeholders as necessary to address root causes and identify relevant remediation strategies.</li> </ul>
Emergent Risks (risk not previously identified but has emerged	during 2016–17)
Description	Remedial Action
Fraining Facility – There is a chance that delays in the preparation of the Training Room may result in Contractor claims for excusable delay and lost schedule.	<ul> <li>Continue to work with the WAMA to expedite the allocation of this task.</li> <li>Concurrently assess the suitability of contracting a third party to prepare the training room to the required specifications.</li> </ul>

5.2 Major Project Issues					
Description	Remedial Action				
The Prime Contractor's under-resourcing in the lead up to the DDR milestone contributed to the delay in achieving this milestone.	<ul> <li>The Contractor has since addressed the under-resourcing issue, achieved the DDR milestone in February 2017 and is reporting sufficient capacity to meet future milestones.</li> <li>The Project Team will continue to closely monitor Contractor performance at meeting future deliverables through weekly performance review meetings.</li> </ul>				
Non-recurring Sustainment Costs not yet defined - Analysis of non-recurring sustainment costs is incomplete.	<ul> <li>Project Office will raise a submission seeking additional sustainment budget of non-recurring services if required.</li> </ul>				
The AMCAP planning for ship availability has resulted in a change of ship for Ship #1, a change of AMCAP maintenance scope and extension of the period Ship #1 is in production.	<ul> <li>The Contractor has been informed and been tasked to carry out necessary analysis and modifications to designs.</li> <li>The Project Team is working with the Contractor to develop and implement a Contract Change Proposal to include new dates in the contract.</li> <li>This issue is not expected to impact schedule, however will incur additional cost (minor) to the project.</li> </ul>				
The installation baseline will change as a result of the SEA1448 4B mast change being incorporated into the ship program.	<ul> <li>The Project Team is working with the ANZAC SPO and AMCAP to manage this change.</li> <li>The Contractor has been informed and is tasked to prepare revised installation plans.</li> <li>The Project Team is working with the Contractor to develop and implement a Contract Change Proposal to incorporate this alternative design and installation baseline.</li> <li>This issue is not expected to impact schedule, however will incur additional cost (minor) to the project.</li> </ul>				
<b>Delay in exiting SSDDR milestone</b> – The Contractor has been unable to meet the SSDDR Milestone exit criteria due to	Most of the high priority Support System Detailed Design     was completed prior to the SSDDR Milestone. In				

unforeseen amount of detailed design work required for the Support System.	<ul> <li>agreement with the Project Team, the remainder of the design work will be completed by the end of July 2017. The SSDDR exit criteria are expected to be met at this point.</li> <li>This delay is being closely managed with the Contractor and is not expected to adversely impact installation milestones as additional resources are being applied by the Contractor.</li> </ul>
Delay in exiting IDDR milestone - The milestone for exiting Integration Detailed Design Review (IDDR) will slip beyond scheduled date.	<ul> <li>The Project Office and Contractor have agreed that IDDR event will take place in July, however to enable a satisfactory review and acceptance of all IDDR documentation, IDDR exit will not occur until all exit criteria have been met.</li> <li>The assessment of the Contractor and the Project Office is that delay in exiting IDDR will not impact meeting AMCAP Ship #1 installation dates.</li> <li>This delay is being closely managed with the Contractor and is not expected to adversely impact installation milestones as additional resources are being applied by the Contractor.</li> </ul>

	Note
Major risks and issues in Section 5 are excluded from the scope of the review.	

# Section 6 – Project Maturity

6.1 Project Maturity Score and Benchmark

					Attributes				
Maturit	y Score	Schedule	Cost	Requirement	Technical Understanding	Technical Difficulty	Commercial	Operations and Support	Total
Project Stage	Benchmark	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	50
Detailed Design	Project Status	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	50
Review	Explanation	Requ desig Conce     Tech SSDE 2017. achie	irement: A n indicates ept Docum nical Unde DR is unde Once FO ved.	n Equipme all operatio ent and Fu erstanding rway, FOC C IDDR is	ent Demons onally critic nction and : Whilst Ne : IDDR is n completed	stration has al requirem Performan wGen MC ot planned I, the desir	been com ents as pe ce Specific S DDR has d to be cor red Bench	pleted and r the Oper ation can I s been co mpleted u mark scor	detailed ational be met. mpleted and ntil August re will be
70 60 50 30 20 10				53 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	<del>م</del> ه	6 	6 6 6		
	st Pass / ecide Via	nd Pass ,	reliminary	omplete : etailed D	itial Mate omplete	inal Contr inal Mate	cceptanc AA Closi	roject Co	

Final Contract Acceptance

Final Materiel Release (FMR)

MAA Closure

2016-17 MPR Status - - - -

Project Completion

Acceptance Into Service

## **Project Data Summary Sheets** ANAO Report No. 26 2017-18 2016–17 Major Projects Report

Decide Viable Capability Options

2015–16 MPR Status ----

Industry Proposals / Offers 2nd Pass Approval Contract Signature Preliminary Design Review(s) Detailed Design Review(s) Complete Sys. Integ. & Test Complete Acceptance Testing Initial Materiel Release (IMR)

1st Pass Approval

Part 3. Project Data Summary Sheets

# Section 7 – Lessons Learned

7.1 Key Lessons Learned	
Project Lesson	Categories of Systemic Lessons
It is essential to have a good set of requirements early in the life of the project. In particular, ensure requirements are clear, unambiguous, and a common understanding is established between all parties, be it the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group and the end user or Defonce and contractor.	Requirements Management
Interface management is extremely critical for integration projects. Legacy interfaces are not always defined or consistent with the documented definitions. Ensure interfaces are well understood by all parties, and where not possible, risk is recognised with adequate contingency. Attempt to address interfaces as early as possible as the longer they are left unattended, the greater their impact on cost, schedule, and possibly performance.	Requirements Management
The ASDEFCON suite of contracting template is complex and designed as a single source for all types of projects. It must be tailored well to suit individual project context and strategy to avoid unnecessary detail, resource burden, cost and schedule.	Contract Management
De-risk the project as much as possible before contract award. Spend time and resources upfront defining and understanding work and scope, schedule, risk, cost and other aspects of the contract with tenderers. This must include detailed review of the schedule to ensure all work elements have been programmed and the schedule is realistic. The de-risking activity may be through Offer Definition Activities and/or funded pre-contract work.	Contract Management
Provision of Government Furnished Material requires both parties to clearly understand and agree the serviceable status of equipment, responsibility for repair and/or replacement as well as the need to adequately manage these assets. This will help avoid future conflict.	Contract Management
Pay good attention to schedule and ensure all work is captured, logical and can form a basis for sound management post contract award. There is no substitute for good planning and a realistic schedule.	Schedule Management
Access to good and experienced resources is critical to sound project planning and management, and success. A realistic and achievable plan is more likely if a project has access to knowledgeable and experienced resources	Resourcing Schedule Management

# Section 8 – Project Line Management

8.1 Project Line Management in 2016-17

Position	Name	
Division Head	RADM Anthony Dalton	
Branch Head	Ms Myra Sefton	
Project Director	Mr Peter Henrick	
Project Manager	Mr Norm Ridgway (to Aug 16) Mr Simon Russell (Acting Aug 16–Mar 17)	
	Mr Steve Arundel (Apr 17-current)	

Part 3. Project Data Summary Sheets