



## IA Programme Assurance

### Our assurance position for managing programme failure risks

This document sets out the IA Programme assurance position against common reasons for RPA programme failure. Our position is that the main risk is not only that robots may fail technically. The bigger risk is that the programme could claim more value than it can prove, spend time and money on work that does not deliver enough benefit, or scale faster than the controls can safely support.

We therefore take a deliberately conservative assurance position: we do not count value until we can evidence it, we do not build work we cannot justify, and we do not scale faster than our controls can safely support.

### Failure risks addressed by the IA Programme

- **Benefits:** We prove benefits using live evidence once a robot is live, stable and used. We do not rely only on early estimates or project assumptions. Where a service estimate is used at discovery stage, we validate it against live data before treating the benefit as realised.
- **Cost:** We track the real cost of each automation, including licensing, discovery, build, testing, support, fixes and changes, so we can evidence value for money.
- **Low value work:** We use stage gates to stop weak ideas drifting into development where benefit is low, complexity is high or business ownership is not strong enough. For some automation builds (Example: Smart Referrals), we also assess the wider enterprise programme value rather than judging each referral automation only on individual volume or return.
- **Live robots are being used:** We demonstrate that robots are being used by comparing production activity with pre-automation data, eligible work, exceptions and any manual workarounds.
- **Governance:** We require each robot to have named business, technical, support and benefits ownership. We base decisions on value, risk, readiness, standardisation and supportability. The IA Programme operates within ISO/IEC 27001:2022 accreditation, supporting strong governance and information security controls.
- **Security and audit controls:** We apply clear access controls, audit logs, change control, exception handling and access reviews. These controls sit within the IA Programme governance and ISO accreditation approach.
- **Over-reliance on one supplier or person:** We maintain documentation, support runbooks and internal knowledge for live robots. Reliance on third-party support is minimised where possible. Where we use a third party, we apply internal audit and control requirements.
- **Honest reporting:** We separate forecast, validated and realised benefits. Where a robot is delayed, partly used, unstable, retired or producing high exceptions, we reduce or remove the reported benefit until evidence supports it.

### Best protection for the Berkshire Healthcare IA programme

- We evidence benefits with real live data.
- We track full costs bot by bot.

- 
- We prioritise high value, ready to deliver work.
  - We measure actual adoption and use.
  - We keep security, audit and support controls strong.
  - We separate forecast, validated and realised benefits.
  - We use clear stage gates so low-value or high-risk work is paused, reworked or stopped early.
  - We keep enough documentation and internal knowledge to avoid dependence on one supplier or one individual.

### Reporting principles

- **We are conservative:** we only report realised benefits when live evidence supports them.
- **We are transparent:** we separate forecast, validated and realised benefits.
- **We are auditable:** we keep source evidence, calculations and sign-off in an agreed evidence location.
- **We are honest about exceptions:** we reduce reported benefit where adoption is partial, exceptions are high or use has changed.
- **We are clear about value type:** we separate cash-releasing benefits, productivity benefits, quality improvements, risk reduction and resilience benefits.

### Review and governance

We review programme assurance annually alongside the governance review. We implement actions to mitigate any factors that may affect understanding and assurance of the IA Programme. This supports organisational confidence and credibility in relation to benefits returned by automations.

We also provide a quarterly assurance summary through IA governance to show progress against actions, evidence completeness, benefit status, cost position, adoption, exceptions, security controls and key risks.

---