

PROGRAMME RECOVERY · INTERNAL CASE

The Case for Acting Now

Recovery is commissioned late because nobody can point at the moment it became necessary. This page is built to be put in front of a director. Section one establishes whether the programme has passed the point where effort alone closes the gap. Section two sets out what the exercise involves. Section three states what each month of delay removes from the table.

1 The triggers that justify the exercise

- ☐ **The critical path has not changed since mobilisation.** On a live job the driving sequence moves. A static critical path means the programme has stopped tracking the work.
- ☐ **Progress shows delay but the completion date has not moved.** The two cannot both be true. One of them is being held in place by hand.
- ☐ **Compensation events have stopped appearing in the programme.** Events are still being notified, so either they are not being assessed or the assessments are not reaching the programme.
- ☐ **Nobody can explain from the programme why a specific activity starts when it does.** If the logic cannot be talked through, it is not being maintained.

State it: which triggers are present, and the date each was first observable.

2 What the exercise involves

- ☐ **The honest position first.** Actual status from records rather than from the last update, the real state of information, procurement and approvals, and which constraints are genuinely fixed.
- ☐ **A rebuilt network, not a compressed one.** Logic that reflects how the remaining work will actually be done, given where design, procurement and site have got to.
- ☐ **The options priced.** Re-sequencing, method change, overlapping what was planned in series, resource where it will help. Each with what it does to the completion date.
- ☐ **The contractual position separated.** What slippage is the Contractor's and what belongs to events already notified, so the recovery does not quietly concede entitlement.

State it: who owns each step and when the honest position will be available.

3 What every month removes

- ☐ **While the gap is weeks, recovery is mostly re-sequencing.** It costs agreement and some programme rework. Almost no money changes hands.
- ☐ **Once the gap exceeds what sequence can absorb, you are buying time.** Additional resource, extended hours, out-of-sequence working, preliminaries running beyond what was priced.
- ☐ **Once the date has gone, it is no longer recovery.** It is a demonstration of entitlement, which is a different discipline with a different cost base and an open-ended one.
- ☐ **The records that a later assessment depends on are created or lost now,** during the period in which nobody is acting.

State it: which stage this project is at today, and which stage it reaches by the next board.

Compressing the bars until the date fits is not a recovery plan.

4 What the output should be

- ☐ **A statement of the position at a stated date**, with the source of each actual recorded, so it can be defended rather than asserted.
- ☐ **A programme with rebuilt logic**, not the previous one with dates typed over it. Ask to be shown why the driving sequence is what it now is.
- ☐ **Options with a completion date against each**, including the option of doing nothing, so the decision is a choice rather than a recommendation.
- ☐ **A revised programme fit to submit under the contract**, since an internal recovery programme has no contractual standing until it goes in.

State it: the deliverables and the date each is due, agreed before the work starts.

5 Why it should not be run in-house

- ☐ **Nobody marks their own homework under pressure.** Somebody who has reported eighty per cent for three months cannot easily write down that it was sixty, and the exercise depends on exactly that.
- ☐ **The team is busy delivering the work being examined.** Recovery done alongside delivery is recovery done last, and the triggers above are already telling you time matters.
- ☐ **An independent position is easier to present to the client** than one produced by the party whose reporting is in question.
- ☐ **The reporting cadence has to change too**, or the same process that produced the drift will produce it again within a quarter.

State it: who will produce the position, and whether they produced the last one.

Before the next progress meeting

The three answers that decide whether this gets commissioned or deferred again.

- ☐ Which of the four triggers are present, and since when.
- ☐ What the honest position is, as distinct from the reported one.
- ☐ Which stage the project reaches by the next board if nothing is commissioned.

Programme drifting and the reporting no longer matching site? We establish the honest position and set out the options, independent of whoever produced the last one.

Roman Bazelchuk · Director, NEC Planning Solutions Ltd · info@necplanningsolutions.co.uk · 0330 223 7709