Project-Framing Questions

Nigeria Local Content Readiness Partnership

This project captures the formation of a possible Nigeria-based Local Content Readiness service or consultancy partnership. The immediate purpose is to define the opportunity, clarify roles, capture early evidence, identify requirements, and assess whether a viable service can be developed with PHC Service support.

PROGRAMME DEFINITION AND GOVERNANCE

BIQ01 - What is the official project or programme name, who is the sponsoring organisation, and who is the accountable executive contact?

Working project name: Nigeria Local Content Readiness Partnership. Originating contact: Michael-Ubini Oluseyi, based in Lagos, Nigeria. PHC support lead: David Winter / PHC Service. Sponsoring organisation and accountable executive contact are to be defined. NCDMB has been mentioned by Michael as the intended consultancy target, but no formal sponsor, appointment, or client authority has yet been evidenced.

BIQ02 - What strategic need or business problem is the project intended to address?

The emerging need is to turn early local content / consultancy intentions, raw internal data, and possible tracker-based requirements into a credible, governed, evidence-based service proposition. The likely business problem is that local content capability, readiness, team structure, requirements, and assurance evidence need to be made clear before management, NCDMB, or other stakeholders can confidently engage.

BIQ03 - What are the principal project objectives, and how will success be measured?

Initial objectives are to define the opportunity, clarify Michael's role and intended team, review any raw data he shares, identify missing requirements, create a management-ready scope/service proposition, and establish a controlled PHC record. Success will initially be measured by clear answers to founding questions, production of usable definition documents, agreement on roles, and evidence that the opportunity is viable enough to proceed.

BIQ04 - What is included within the approved scope, and what is explicitly excluded?

Included at this stage: early opportunity definition, PHC governance support, questions, concerns, assumptions, evidence capture, possible Local Content Readiness document creation, and light proposal/service framing. Excluded until further agreement: formal representation to NCDMB, legal/company formation advice, unpaid open-ended delivery work, public claims of official affiliation, binding commercial commitments, or any assurance/certification claim.

BIQ05 - What lifecycle stage is the project currently in, and what are the next formal decision or approval gates?

The project is at formation / discovery stage. The next decision gates are: receipt of Michael's answers to the seven initial questions; receipt and review of any raw tracker/data; clarification of intended team and company structure; agreement on unpaid/deferred support boundaries; and decision whether to prepare a formal service proposal.

BIQ06 - What governance structure applies, including boards, delegated authorities, decision rights and escalation routes?

No formal governance structure exists yet. Early governance should be lightweight: Michael as local opportunity originator, David/PHC as service-definition and governance support, with decisions recorded in PHC. Decision rights, authority to contact or represent NCDMB, escalation routes, and involvement of others are to be defined before external commitments are made.

BIQ07 - Which legal, regulatory, contractual, safety, security or policy obligations most strongly shape the project?

Likely obligations may include Nigerian local content requirements, NCDMB expectations, public-sector procurement rules, confidentiality, anti-corruption standards, data protection, professional ethics, and any client-specific policies. Exact legal, regulatory, contractual, and policy obligations are to be defined and should not be assumed without evidence.

BIQ08 - What are the most important assumptions, constraints and external dependencies?

Current assumptions include: Michael has some credible route into a local content/NCDMB-related opportunity; a small local team may be formed; PHC can provide valuable early structure; payment may only become possible after contract/revenue; and a Local Content Readiness service could be viable. Constraints include no current payment structure, unclear authority, uncertain client access, and incomplete scope. External dependencies include Michael's data, his network, NCDMB engagement, and possible local collaborators.

BIQ09 - What approved baselines currently exist for scope, schedule, cost, risk and benefits, and when were they last reviewed?

No approved baselines currently exist. Baseline evidence currently consists of the LinkedIn message thread, David's seven initial questions, Michael's statement about possible consultancy services to NCDMB, and PHC's emerging project setup. Scope, schedule, cost, risk, and benefits baselines are to be

BIQ10 - What are the three most important decisions or control improvements required in the next 90 days?

The three most important near-term decisions/control improvements are: define Michael's intended role, route to NCDMB, and team structure; set a cap and record method for unpaid/deferred PHC support; and create the initial PHC definition/evidence pack so the opportunity is controlled from the start.

DELIVERY MODEL AND ASSURANCE

PSQ01 - What delivery model is proposed, and how is the programme divided into workstreams, projects or major packages?

The delivery model is not yet approved. The emerging model appears to be a small Nigeria-based local content consultancy or service partnership, originated by Michael, with PHC providing remote service architecture, governance, assurance review, documentation, and possibly training/support methods. Workstreams may include service definition, governance, commercial model, local team formation, readiness assessment, and proposal development.

PSQ02 - What are the principal deliverables, and what acceptance criteria will demonstrate that each is complete and fit for purpose?

Principal early deliverables are likely to be: project definition, business case, Local Content Readiness quality document, governance/funding/procurement readiness notes, questions and concerns registers, evidence log, time/deferred-cost log, and a draft service proposal. Acceptance criteria: factual, evidence-based, clearly caveated, useful to Michael, and not overstating client authority or commercial certainty.

PSQ03 - What are the key milestones, schedule drivers and current critical or near-critical paths?

Key milestones are to be defined. Early candidate milestones: Michael answers the seven founding questions; raw data/tracker is received; initial PHC project setup completed; Local Content Readiness document drafted; possible team members identified; commercial/deferred support principle agreed; and decision made whether to approach or prepare material for NCDMB/management.

PSQ04 - How are risks and opportunities identified, assessed, quantified, owned, treated and escalated?

Risks and opportunities should be captured in PHC. Early risks include unclear client authority, no payment structure, excessive unpaid work, reputational overclaiming, confidentiality issues, and dependence on one local contact. Opportunities include a repeatable Local Content Readiness service, entry into Nigerian local content work, local training/capability development, and PHC Service demonstration.

PSQ05 - How are scope, design, schedule, cost and organisational changes proposed, assessed, approved and incorporated into the baseline?

Change control is not yet formal. Until the project matures, scope changes should be captured as comments, actions, decisions, and concerns in PHC, especially when new information arrives from Michael, raw data, prospective team members, or client contacts. Material scope expansion should trigger a review of time, payment, authority, and risk.

PSQ06 - What assurance reviews, stage gates, peer reviews or independent challenges are required, and who has authority to accept the findings?

Early assurance should include PHC review by David, careful evidence checking, challenge on assumptions, and possibly later review by a trusted associate such as Victor if his role becomes relevant. Authority to accept findings is currently informal and to be defined; no external assurance claim should be made yet.

PSQ07 - How will quality requirements, verification, validation, inspection, testing and non-conformance be controlled?

Quality requirements should focus on clarity, evidence traceability, restrained claims, role clarity, confidentiality, and practical usefulness. Verification should check that statements are backed by messages, documents, tracker data, or recorded assumptions. Non-conformance at this stage means unsupported claims, unclear scope, or uncontrolled commitments.

PSQ08 - What are the most important technical, organisational and contractual interfaces, and how are they managed?

Important interfaces include Michael-to-PHC, Michael-to-local team, Michael-to-NCDMB/board contacts, PHC-to-possible collaborators, and future consultancy/training/procurement partners. These are currently informal and need to be mapped before the opportunity is represented externally.

PSQ09 - What procurement and supply-chain strategy applies, particularly for specialist, long-lead or safety-significant items?

A procurement/supply-chain strategy is to be defined. If the service develops, it may cover local supplier readiness, consultant engagement, training providers, assessment support, capability evidence, and supplier participation. Specialist or long-lead items are not known at this stage.

PSQ10 - How will commissioning, handover, operational readiness and benefits realisation be planned and evidenced?

Commissioning/handover is not yet applicable. For the first phase, operational readiness would mean Michael and PHC have a clear opportunity definition, known roles, a first service proposition, a controlled evidence base, and an agreed decision on whether to proceed to proposal or hold.

SYSTEMS, INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE CONTROL

PEQ01 - Which systems are the authoritative sources for scope, schedule, cost, risk, actions, changes, documents and evidence?

Authoritative sources should initially be the PHC project record, LinkedIn thread evidence, emails to/from david.winter@order-efficiency.com, any raw tracker/data Michael shares, and later meeting notes. The single source of truth is to be defined but should be anchored in PHC.

PEQ02 - How are documents numbered, reviewed, approved, revised, distributed, retained and withdrawn from use?

Document control is to be defined. Early documents should use PHC project naming, version dates, clear draft/final status, and comments or actions for unresolved assumptions. Approval is currently informal and should be recorded as Michael/David agreement where applicable.

PEQ03 - What evidence is required to substantiate reported progress, completed actions, accepted deliverables and closed risks or concerns?

Evidence required includes Michael's messages, his answers to founding questions, raw data/tracker files, any management or NCDMB-related request evidence, team member details, role confirmations, and records of decisions or commitments. Progress should not be claimed without linked evidence.

PEQ04 - How are configuration, version and baseline changes controlled so that teams know which information is current?

Configuration/version control should be handled through dated PHC exports and document versions. Material changes to scope, role, commercial assumptions, or external positioning should be recorded as decisions and reflected in updated documents.

PEQ05 - What data-quality rules apply, and who is responsible for checking completeness, consistency, timeliness and accuracy?

Data-quality rules are to be defined once raw data is received. Likely checks include completeness, source, date, ownership, duplicates, confidentiality status, consistency of fields, and whether the data supports the intended management/service requirements.

PEQ06 - How are confidentiality, security classification, access permissions and personal or commercially sensitive information managed?

Confidentiality is important. Michael's raw data, personal details, potential client information, NCDMB-related claims, commercial assumptions, and unpaid support arrangements should be treated as private unless explicitly cleared for wider or public use. Open Concerns visibility should remain off for now.

PEQ07 - What reporting cycle is used, which dashboards or reports are produced, and who relies on each output for decisions?

Reporting cycle is to be defined. A light weekly PHC update would be suitable during formation, covering new evidence, open questions, actions, concerns, time spent, and whether the opportunity is becoming more or less viable.

PEQ08 - How are schedule, cost, risk, actions, changes, decisions and evidence linked so that impacts can be traced across the programme?

Links should be made through PHC between questions, concerns, actions, decisions, evidence, people, and time chunks. Particular attention should connect commercial assumptions to time spent, and external claims to source evidence.

PEQ09 - What backup, disaster-recovery, cyber-resilience and business-continuity arrangements protect project information?

Backup/disaster recovery is to be defined. Initial protection should include keeping copies of LinkedIn/email evidence, storing received files in controlled PHC locations, and avoiding reliance on informal message history alone.

PEQ10 - What current information gaps, duplicated systems or manual workarounds create the greatest control risk?

Current gaps include Michael's exact role, whether a Nigerian company will be formed, target client authority, team members, revenue model, premises, funding route, scope of support, raw data content, and what NCDMB or management actually needs.

ORGANISATION, CAPABILITY AND INTERFACES

PQ01 - Who holds the principal accountable roles, and what are their responsibilities and delegated authorities?

Principal roles are not yet formal. Michael appears to be the local opportunity originator and possible lead. David/PHC is potential service support, governance, proposal and assurance lead. Other roles, delegated authority, and any accountable client/sponsor roles are to be defined.

PQ02 - What organisation structure is currently in place, and which key posts are vacant, interim, duplicated or unclear?

No formal organisation structure currently exists. The opportunity appears to be a one-person local formation effort led by Michael, with possible future trusted friends/colleagues and possibly Victor. Vacant/unclear posts include commercial lead, delivery lead, local content technical expert, administrator, and client sponsor/contact.

PQ03 - What capabilities and experience are essential for the current phase, and where are the most significant gaps?

Essential capabilities likely include Nigerian local content knowledge, NCDMB/procurement understanding, project controls, requirements capture, evidence management, training/capability development, commercial development, and governance. Significant gaps are to be defined once Michael identifies his team and shares data.

PQ04 - What resource plan exists, including mobilisation dates, demand peaks, scarce skills and reliance on contractors or secondees?

No resource plan exists yet. Initial resources are Michael's time and David/PHC support. Mobilisation, demand peaks, contractor/secondee reliance, and scarce skills are to be defined. PHC time should be recorded as deferred/pending revenue if agreed.

PQ05 - How are contractors, consultants, delivery partners and suppliers selected, instructed, supervised and held accountable?

No contractors, consultants, partners or suppliers have been selected yet. Future selection should be based on role clarity, competence, trust, local credibility, evidence of capability, and commercial fairness. PHC should avoid uncontrolled informal commitments.

PQ06 - Which organisational interfaces are most vulnerable to gaps, duplication, delay or conflicting authority?

Vulnerable interfaces include Michael/PHC expectations, local team formation, client/NCDMB access, future company authority, and any involvement of Victor or other associates. These could create duplication, misunderstanding or conflicting authority if not recorded early.

PQ07 - What is the formal meeting, review and decision-making rhythm, and how are actions and decisions recorded?

No formal meeting rhythm exists. Early rhythm could be ad hoc messaging plus a short PHC update whenever new data arrives, moving toward weekly review. Actions and decisions should be recorded in PHC rather than left only in LinkedIn or email.

PQ08 - What escalation routes and thresholds apply when safety, cost, schedule, quality, commercial or regulatory limits are threatened?

Escalation thresholds are to be defined. Early triggers should include any request to claim NCDMB affiliation, commit delivery, spend substantial unpaid time, share confidential data, involve third parties, or agree payment terms without written basis.

PQ09 - What workload, continuity, succession or key-person risks could weaken delivery or assurance?

Key-person risk is high because the opportunity currently depends on Michael locally and David/PHC remotely. Continuity and succession are to be defined by identifying trusted collaborators, clarifying roles, and keeping a clear project record.

PQ10 - What behaviours, incentives or cultural factors may discourage challenge, delay escalation or distort reporting?

The project needs behaviours of transparency, evidence discipline, careful wording, prompt clarification, respect for local leadership, commercial fairness, and willingness to pause if facts or authority are unclear. These principles should be made explicit early.

COMMERCIAL, FUNDING AND COST CONTROL

FQ01 - What funding sources, approvals and financial commitments currently support the project?

No funding is currently in place. Michael has stated there is no payment structure until the local team is set up and a contract is signed, after which payment may be expected from the board. The board, contract route, amount, and timing are to be defined.

FQ02 - What is the current estimate or budget, what is its basis, and what level of confidence or maturity does it have?

No estimate or budget currently exists. Basis is currently very low maturity: LinkedIn dialogue and opportunity intuition only. A rough order-of-magnitude model could later consider PHC time, local team costs, proposal work, readiness reports, training packages, and any office/admin costs.

FQ03 - How are the cost baseline, contingency, management reserve and quantified risk exposure established and controlled?

No cost baseline, contingency, reserve or quantified risk exposure exists. A simple early control should be a cap or review point for deferred PHC time, plus a visible record of time chunks and assumptions pending future revenue.

FQ04 - How are actual cost, commitments, accruals, forecast outturn and variance reported and reconciled?

Actual cost/commitment reporting is to be defined. For now, David and Michael could record time chunks as informal IOUs/deferred cost, clearly marked as subject to future agreement and revenue. Expenses should not be incurred without explicit agreement.

FQ05 - Which contract and commercial models are proposed, and where do liability, incentive or risk-allocation concerns remain?

Commercial model is to be defined. Options include deferred PHC service fees, revenue share, subcontract support, joint proposal, local company engagement, per-report fees, training/package fees, or retainer after contract. Liability and risk allocation are not yet defined.

FQ06 - What major procurement commitments or long-lead decisions must be made before full certainty is available?

Major commitments should not be made before full certainty. Avoid committing to deliver services to NCDMB, hiring local staff, incurring expenses, promising payment to others, public claims of affiliation, or extensive unpaid PHC work before authority and commercial basis are clearer.

FQ07 - What current or foreseeable changes, claims, disputes or commercial exposures could materially affect the project?

Foreseeable commercial exposures include unpaid time not recovered, unclear ownership of documents/service model, informal promises, public-sector procurement sensitivity, reliance on a future contract, unclear tax/company arrangements, and reputational risk if official status is overstated.

FQ08 - How are value, affordability, whole-life cost and alternative options challenged before major commitments are approved?

Value/affordability should be challenged by defining a minimum viable first phase: answer founding questions, review raw data, create a short definition/service note, and decide whether to proceed. Alternatives include pausing, limiting support, or converting to a formal paid proposal stage.

FQ09 - What financial controls, segregation of duties, audit rights and record-keeping requirements apply?

Financial controls are to be defined. Early controls should include time records, deferred-cost log, no uncontrolled expenses, written agreement before invoicing/revenue sharing, audit trail for commercial assumptions, and clear separation between private formation work and any public/client representation.

FQ10 - What affordability, cash-flow or funding thresholds could cause delay, rephasing or loss of project viability?

Cash-flow and viability thresholds are to be defined. The project should pause or narrow if no credible client route emerges, Michael cannot form a team, raw data is not shared, payment remains too vague, or PHC time reaches the agreed deferred-support cap.

STAKEHOLDERS, COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

MQ01 - Who are the principal internal and external stakeholders, and what authority, influence or exposure does each have?

Principal stakeholders currently known or possible: Michael-Ubini Oluseyi, David Winter/PHC, possible trusted friends or colleagues of Michael, possibly Victor, possible NCDMB contacts/board, Nigerian local suppliers/workers, training providers, consultants, and future client/project sponsors.

MQ02 - What are the principal expectations, concerns and potential points of conflict among those stakeholders?

Expectations are not yet fully known. Michael may expect partnership support before payment. David/PHC expects clarity, evidence, governance and deferred recovery if revenue comes. Possible conflicts include payment timing, role authority, ownership, scope, client access, and how public/official the project can appear.

MQ03 - What communication and engagement channels are used, and how is feedback converted into controlled actions or decisions?

Current communication channels are LinkedIn messages and email. Important feedback, decisions, files and promises should be converted into PHC records. Future channels may include calls, shared documents and PHC comments/actions.

MQ04 - How are regulatory, governmental and local-authority relationships coordinated and documented?

Government/NCDMB relationships must be described cautiously. Current wording should say 'potential consultancy services connected with NCDMB' or 'NCDMB-related opportunity indicated by Michael' unless documented authority, invitation, or contract is provided.

MQ05 - What impacts, benefits or burdens may be experienced by communities, workers, customers and the local economy?

Potential impacts include stronger local capability, better evidence of local content readiness, improved supplier/workforce development, practical training, clearer procurement readiness, and more credible management decision-making. These impacts remain prospective until service scope and client need are confirmed.

MQ06 - What consultation commitments, undertakings or stakeholder promises have been made, and how are they tracked?

Existing commitments are limited. David has offered to review/share a proposal basis and possibly provide early PHC support with no upfront payment but time recorded pending future revenue. Michael has indicated possible partnership interest and no current payment structure. These should be clarified in writing.

MQ07 - What reputational risks, misinformation or unresolved public concerns could undermine confidence in the project?

Reputational risks include appearing to claim NCDMB endorsement, overpromising certification/assurance, implying guaranteed work or payment, mishandling confidential data, or presenting an immature service as established. The main control is careful caveating and evidence discipline.

MQ08 - What information should be transparent, and what information must remain restricted for legal, commercial, privacy or security reasons?

Transparent later: general service concept, PHC Local Content Readiness method, non-sensitive lessons, and public-facing proposition once approved. Restricted now: Michael's raw data, client/board contacts, commercial terms, personal data, internal messages, assumptions, and any unverified NCDMB connection.

MQ09 - How are lessons learned, stakeholder feedback and operating experience captured and incorporated into future decisions?

Lessons should be captured through PHC comments, questions, concerns, actions and document revisions. Michael's answers, raw data review, and any team discussions should directly refine the Local Content Readiness document and service proposition.

MQ10 - What concise evidence-based update could be issued regularly to demonstrate project health without overstating certainty?

A concise weekly internal update could state: evidence received, questions answered, open concerns, actions due, time recorded, current viability