

Evidence Review Summary

Showcase example | client and personal names redacted



Regional insurer | Claims modernisation programme



DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
27



EVIDENCE CONFIDENCE
Medium-High



MATERIAL GAPS
5



EXECUTIVE TAKEAWAY

The evidence base is broad but fragmented; most gaps relate to ownership, service readiness and cross-functional dependency visibility.

EVIDENCE COVERAGE



Strategy and plans

COMPLETE



Governance papers

PARTIAL



Operating model artefacts

PARTIAL



Supplier and commercial evidence

PARTIAL



Service and data controls

LIMITED

OVERALL EVIDENCE COVERAGE



2 GREEN | 3 AMBER | 1 RED

TOP EVIDENCE THEMES

IMPORTANCE

	Multiple plans exist without one integrated decision view	HIGH
	Governance papers show activity but not clear decision outcomes	HIGH
	Operational readiness evidence is partial and late	HIGH
	Supplier commitments depend on unresolved internal choices	MEDIUM
	Data ownership and reporting definitions remain inconsistent	MEDIUM

WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS NOW



- 1 Confirm decision ownership for end-to-end and key claims service outcomes.
- 2 Establish a live cross-functional dependency view to surface and resolve blockers.
- 3 Reset governance around decision quality, service readiness and delivery risk.

Felmor

Evidence Review Summary

Claims Modernisation Decision Recovery

PURPOSE A focused evidence review that shows what has been examined, what it suggests, and what still needs to be tested.

Engagement	Detail
Client	[REDACTED] UK general insurer
Context	Claims-service modernisation programme
Service	Rapid Fact Find
Document status	Illustrative customer-facing output
Date	September 2026

Names, organisations and commercially sensitive details have been anonymised. The content is fictionalised for demonstration purposes.

Executive evidence summary

The evidence base is sufficient to identify a consistent pattern: delivery is not primarily constrained by a lack of activity or funding. It is constrained by cross-functional decisions being made late, reopened across several forums, or left without a clear accountable owner. The programme has extensive reporting, but limited traceability between service outcomes, decisions and delivery dependencies.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT The programme is viable, but its next delivery horizon is exposed by unclear decision rights and incomplete dependency management. Immediate intervention should focus on decision clarity and service readiness rather than adding reporting or assurance layers.

Evidence examined

Evidence source	What was reviewed	What it contributed	Confidence
Delivery material	Increment plans, milestone reports, RAID logs and workstream updates.	Confirmed that cross-workstream dependencies are not consistently aggregated or owned.	High
Governance records	Terms of reference, recent papers and action logs.	Showed several topics returning to multiple forums without a final decision record.	High
Operational material	Claims process impacts, readiness notes and colleague feedback.	Highlighted late operational involvement and unclear ownership of service readiness.	Medium
Technology and data material	Architecture decisions, integration notes and data issue logs.	Indicated decisions are often escalated after local design choices have been made.	Medium
Supplier material	Integrated plans, responsibility views and issue logs.	Showed that ambiguous internal choices are weakening supplier challenge.	Medium

What the evidence suggests

Theme	Evidence pattern	Practical implication
Decision rights	Important choices on service design, data and supplier obligations do not have one consistently recognised owner.	Decisions are revisited and delivery teams work around uncertainty.
Governance friction	Existing forums provide extensive visibility but do not consistently separate decisions, assurance and reporting.	Leadership effort is absorbed by re-discussion rather than resolution.
Operational readiness	Operations are contributing late to design and release decisions.	Customer and colleague impacts risk being discovered after build commitments are made.
Dependency management	Dependencies are recorded within workstreams but not consistently managed end to end.	Critical links appear as late risks, creating reactive escalation.
Supplier accountability	Supplier issues are often raised before internal ownership and requirements are settled.	Commercial challenge is weakened and change-control disputes are more likely.

Evidence gaps and validation priorities

Question still to test	Why it matters	Recommended validation route
Who is accountable for end-to-end claims-service readiness at each increment?	The current evidence shows several contributors but no single accountable service owner.	Focused sponsor and operations discussion, confirmed through the decision map.
Which data decisions are material to the next two increments?	Data issues are listed as technical risks, but the business decisions behind them are not explicit.	Joint session with data, operations and programme leads.
Which supplier dependencies require a client decision before contractual challenge?	This separates supplier under-performance from unresolved internal choices.	Review of live dependency and change-control items with supplier management.
Which governance forum has authority to close cross-functional decisions?	The escalation route is not clear in current documents.	Sponsor confirmation and review of forum remits.

Evidence quality assessment

Area	Assessment	Reason
Strategic outcomes	Clear but not consistently translated into increment-level decision criteria.	Programme objectives are visible, but links to live decisions are weak.
Delivery reporting	Detailed but fragmented.	Several reports cover progress, risks and milestones with inconsistent dependency treatment.
Decision records	Insufficient for a complex change programme.	Actions are recorded more consistently than decisions, authority and rationale.
Operational impacts	Material but unevenly integrated.	Readiness concerns exist, but are not always influencing design and release sequencing.

RECOMMENDED NEXT STEP Use the evidence base to validate and close the priority decisions, rather than commission further general analysis. The Decision and Ownership Map should become the central working asset for the next 90 days.