

REGRET MINIMISATION

CHECKLIST

ALQABBAT ADVISORY · SAUDI INDUSTRIAL EDGE COMPLIANCE SERIES ·
CHAPTER 3 TOOLKIT RESOURCE

PURPOSE

What does this checklist evaluate?

Saudi industrial buyers are anti-regret, not anti-foreign. This checklist evaluates whether your submission minimises buyer regret risk across the five dimensions that determine whether a procurement committee will defend selecting you.

Before submitting any Saudi industrial bid, run every section of your proposal through this checklist. Each unchecked item is a source of regret risk the buyer will identify — even if your team does not.

Scoring

Check each item that is TRUE of your current submission. Each unchecked item is a regret risk. Target: 25 of 25 checked before submission. Below 20: remediate before sending.

A: REGULATORY ALIGNMENT

Can the buyer verify your compliance posture without interpretation?

☐ **A.1 Saudi framework mapping is explicit**

Compliance claims reference NCA/OTCC/ECC by domain, not “applicable regulations.”

☐ **A.2 Evidence is current-cycle**

All compliance documentation dates fall within the current NCA enforcement cycle.

☐ **A.3 No certification substitution**

International certifications support credibility but do not replace Saudi-specific evidence where required.

☐ **A.4 Supply chain security addressed**

Third-party components are named, risk-classified, and assessed against Saudi supply chain criteria.

☐ **A.5 Incident response is Saudi-mapped**

NCA notification timelines are referenced. Documented response procedure maps to those timelines.

B: ACCOUNTABILITY CLARITY

Can the buyer identify who owns compliance immediately?

☐ **B.1 Named compliance lead on page one**

Named individual with qualifications, role scope, and direct Saudi contact details.

☐ **B.2 Saudi escalation path documented**

Escalation from Saudi operations to executive leadership. Not a global compliance function.

☐ **B.3 Post-award ownership defined**

Who owns compliance after contract signature is specified, not deferred.

☐ **B.4 Accountability not delegated to partner**

Compliance responsibility remains with your entity. Partner role is support, not substitution.

☐ **B.5 Review cycle tied to framework updates**

Governance documentation includes a defined update process when NCA/OTCC frameworks are revised.

C: OPERATIONAL CONTEXT

Does the submission demonstrate Saudi operating understanding?

☐ **C.1 Saudi operating conditions acknowledged**

Submission references the specific industrial operating environment, not generic international contexts.

☐ **C.2 OT sensitivity addressed**

Operational technology environments are treated with Saudi-specific control evidence, not IT-only frameworks.

☐ **C.3 Delivery model signals commitment**

Long-term engagement posture, not project-based in-and-out positioning.

☐ **C.4 Knowledge transfer structured**

Transfer plan names Saudi personnel or role definitions, timelines, and competency targets.

☐ **C.5 Buyer work minimised**

The submission delivers confidence in usable form. The buyer does not need to assemble it manually.

D: LOCALISATION CREDIBILITY

Does localisation signal commitment or convenience?

☐ **D.1 Saudi partners named**

Legal entity names, relationship type, and scope — not “in discussions with several Saudi partners.”

☐ **D.2 Saudisation rate specific**

Current percentage, named target roles, timeline, and improvement plan.

☐ **D.3 SCV score current and verifiable**

LCGPA-audited SCV score with a 12-month improvement roadmap. Not “in the process of registering.”

☐ **D.4 Nitaqat band named**

Current Nitaqat classification supports the staffing plan. Not an HR afterthought.

☐ **D.5 Etimad registration active**

Active registration with current pre-qualification. Bidding entity matches registered entity.

E: PRESENTATION SEQUENCE

Does your submission lead with safety, not capability?

☐ **E.1 Compliance before capability**

Submission opens with compliance posture and accountability. Technical capability follows.

☐ **E.2 Tone is calm, not theatrical**

No overclaiming, no superlatives, no innovation-first language. Specific, documented, defensible.

☐ **E.3 Commitments are realistic**

Everything promised can be delivered. No aspirational language disguised as commitment.

☐ **E.4 Public presence is consistent**

Website and LinkedIn do not contradict the compliance claims in the submission.

☐ **E.5 The submission is internally defensible**

A procurement committee member can use this submission to justify selecting you to their oversight chain.

Total Checked: _____ / 25

SCORE	STATUS	ACTION
25/25	Submit	Submission minimises buyer regret across all dimensions. Proceed.
20–24	Remediate	Address unchecked items before submission. Each gap is a question the committee will ask.
15–19	Hold	Significant regret risks remain. Remediation required — submitting now risks Stage 2 disqualification.
<15	Do Not Submit	Submission creates more risk than it resolves. Complete a repositioning sprint before your next bid.