Journal Homepage: -www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/24458
DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/24458

RESEARCH ARTICLE

PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY CHAIN OPTIMIZATION IN SAUDI OIL & GAS MEGAPROJECTS

Olawale Bishi

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History
Received: 14 August 2026
Final Accepted: 16 September 2026
Published: October 2026

Key words:-
Procurement Optimization; Supply Chain Management; Oil and Gas; Saudi Arabia; Megaprojects; Materials Management; Vision 2030; Supplier Localization.

Abstract

Saudi oil and gas megaprojects depend on globally distributed engineer ing,fabrication, transport and construction networks. Their performance is often constrained less by isolated purchasing decisions than by misalignment among design maturity, contracting schedules, supplier capacity, shipping, site readiness and project controls. This review examines procurement and supply chain optimization through an integrated project-delivery perspective relevant to Saudi Arabia under Vision 2030. It synthesizes recent megaproject scholarship, supply chain resilience research, professional guidance and Saudi industrial-development policies. The analysis distinguishes procurement efficienc y from supply chain effectiveness and examines how early market engagement, package design, supplier assurance, digital expediting, inventory segmentation and interface governance can improve predicta ble delivery. A conceptual optimization framework connects demand planning to commercial strategy, supplier execution, logistics and performance learning.The evidence supports coordinated, risk-informed procurement, rather than an exclusive focus on lowest initial purchase price. The proposed framework is intended as a basis for future testing with anonymized project data; it does not present simulated savings as observed results. Policy implications include supplier capability develo pment, responsible localization and stronger integration of procurement with project schedule and cost systems.

"© 2026 by the Author(s). Published by IJAR under CC BY 4.0. Unrestricted use allowed with credit to the author."

Introduction:-

Saudi Arabia's energy infrastructure depends on extensive networks of engineering contractors, fabricators, specialized equipment manufacturers, logistics providers and construction teams. A terminal extension, processing facility or pipeline program can contain thousands of material lines and services packages, many subject to stringent technical specifications and long manufacturing lead times. A late valve, electrical component or control-system package can delay testing and commissioning even when the item represents a small proportion of total capital expenditure. Consequently, procurement performance cannot be assessed solely through purchase-order price or purchase-order cycle time. It must be understood through the effect of sourcing decisions on installation readiness, reliability, safety and life-cycle value.Traditional procurement is often organized as a sequence: design produces requisitions, commercial teams solicit quotations, vendors manufacture equipment, logistics providers deliver, and construction receives material. This sequential picture understates how information and constraints move backward

Corresponding Author:- Olawale Bishi

through the system. Supplier quotations can reveal design gaps; material shortages can require engineering substitutions; site access can dictate delivery timing; and contracting decisions can transfer risks that neither party can manage effectively. The review by Stefano et al. (2023) characterizes megaproject supply chains as multilevel networks requiring coordination across firms and project boundaries. This perspective is particularly pertinent where multiple EPC packages and owner-managed interfaces operate simultaneously.

Saudi Vision 2030 adds a national industrial-development dimension. The National Industrial Development and Logistics Program seeks to strengthen industry, energy, mining and logistics capabilities, while Aramco's in-Kingdom Total Value Add initiative encourages domestic value creation and supplier development (NIDLP, 2024; Saudi Aramco, n.d.). However, localization should not be treated as a substitute for technical qualification, ethical procurement or competitive lifecycle economics. A realistic strategy builds local capability without compromising safety-critical delivery. This paper therefore asks how procurement design, digital visibility and cross-organizational governance can jointly improve cost, schedule resilience and sustainable domestic value.

Aim and Research Objectives:-

The aim is to develop an evidence-informed framework for optimizing procurement and supply chain performance in Saudi oil and gas megaprojects. The objectives are to: identify recurrent procurement bottlenecks; distinguish strategic sourcing choices from operational expediting; evaluate approaches to supplier assurance, inventory and logistics; connect procurement metrics with schedule and cost outcomes; and describe a practical governance model that incorporates Saudi localization objectives. Rather than asserting that any single software system or contract form eliminates delay, the review treats optimization as the continuous management of interdependent decisions under uncertainty.

Literature Review:-

Megaproject Supply Chains as Interdependent Networks:-

Large infrastructure projects create temporary supply networks around relatively permanent industrial assets. Owners, EPC contractors, engineering consultants, original equipment manufacturers, specialized subcontractors, inspection agencies and freight forwarders make decisions using different priorities and information systems. Stefano et al. (2023) identify procurement, governance, collaboration, production and logistics, and risk management among the principal strategic domains. Their synthesis is useful because it challenges the assumption that supply chain improvement can be confined to the purchasing department. A package can meet its contractual delivery date yet still arrive too late for a changed construction sequence, or too early for constrained laydown space.

The systems challenge is compounded by uncertainty. Tendering may commence with incomplete specifications; fabrication slots are influenced by competing global orders; shipping routes and customs requirements can change; and suppliers depend on lower-tier sources. The megaproject literature emphasizes that interfaces and institutional arrangements shape project outcomes alongside technical complexity (Cottafava et al., 2024). Procurement teams should therefore classify interdependencies before selecting contract packages. A package boundary that appears commercially convenient may create costly handoffs among engineering, testing and commissioning teams.

Early Market Intelligence and Procurement Planning:-

Effective procurement begins before a formal invitation to tender. Market intelligence should establish the availability of technically compliant suppliers, anticipated manufacturing capacity, geographic concentration of critical inputs, transport restrictions, and the realism of required delivery dates. Owner and EPC teams can use supplier engagement to test packaging strategies without compromising fairness or confidentiality. Forecasting demand at the portfolio level may also reveal opportunities to combine standard commodities across projects while retaining project-specific specifications for specialized equipment.

A procurement plan should integrate the work breakdown structure, equipment lists, critical path schedule, engineering deliverables, contracting milestones and inspection requirements. It should distinguish early procurement packages from ordinary materials and establish a date by which specifications must be frozen. The value of this integration lies in making assumptions explicit: the planned purchase-order date must reflect engineering readiness, bid duration, approvals, vendor data, manufacturing, inspections, shipment and site receipt. A nominally short purchase cycle becomes meaningless if the preceding technical documentation is late.

Package Strategy and Contracting Choices:-
Packaging determines which organization coordinates interfaces and bears responsibility for performance. A single large EPC package can simplify owner interfaces but may limit competitive access or obscure lower-tier risks. Multiple specialist packages can increase competition and technical flexibility, while imposing stronger owner-side coordination demands. Neither arrangement is universally optimal. Decisions should consider technical integration, market depth, local supplier capabilities, contract administration resources and the capacity to resolve interfaces. The key is matching the delivery model to the asset and organizational context instead of automatically repeating the last project's commercial structure.

Bid evaluation should examine lifecycle value rather than price alone. Technical conformity, delivery credibility, service support, reliability, warranty obligations, spare parts availability, ethical standards and financial health may be material to total cost. For safety-critical equipment, a quotation offering an attractive headline price may carry unacceptable exposure if vendor quality documentation or manufacturing traceability is weak. Clear weighting and auditable assessments help procurement teams justify decisions while reducing the risk of post-award ambiguity. Contractual incentives should reward verifiable outcomes rather than merely accelerating paperwork.

Supplier Qualification and Manufacturing Assurance:-
Oil and gas infrastructure makes specialized demands on materials and equipment, including pressure integrity, hazardous-area compliance, corrosion resistance and operational reliability. Supplier prequalification should therefore examine quality systems, production capability, track record, capacity loading, subcontracting arrangements and conformity with relevant project specifications. Approval is a starting point rather than proof that every subsequent order will be executed successfully. Qualification needs to be linked to purchase-order-specific surveillance and escalation.

Manufacturing assurance works best when the supplier's inspection and test plan is connected to project milestones. Procurement, engineering, quality and construction representatives should agree which hold points are mandatory, who witnesses them and how nonconformities affect release. Routine inspection activity does not add value if it repeats assurance already established elsewhere, but missing a critical hold point can threaten acceptance and commissioning. Vendor data schedules should also be managed as deliverables because late drawings and manuals can delay equipment integration before the physical goods are shipped.

Logistics Coordination and Site Readiness:-
International transportation introduces dependencies beyond vendor manufacturing. Export documentation, heavy-lift planning, import procedures, marine schedules, inland routes and storage restrictions all influence the actual availability of materials for installation. Procurement visibility should therefore extend from the factory to the workface. An item is not truly available when it clears customs if site receipt, identification, preservation or release for installation remains unresolved. This distinction is important in remote or congested energy-project locations where laydown space and handling equipment are finite.

Logistics plans should consider consolidation opportunities while preserving criticality. Consolidating low-risk shipments may reduce transport cost, whereas an emergency shipment of a critical item can be justified when the avoided downstream delay substantially exceeds the freight premium. Such decisions require reliable information on the schedule value of the item, not intuition alone. Digital milestone tracking can make exception handling more consistent, provided teams verify data accuracy and assign responsibility for responding to deviations.

Inventory Segmentation and Materials Control:-
Inventory policy for capital projects differs from steady-state manufacturing. Excess material increases working capital, storage and deterioration risks, but inadequate contingency can halt construction. Procurement optimization therefore benefits from segmentation by criticality, replacement lead time, uncertainty, interchangeability and preservation requirements. Commodity materials with stable replenishment may be managed through scheduled call-offs, whereas bespoke equipment and critical spares require carefully timed orders and traceable control. The appropriate inventory level is an economic and operational decision, not a universal percentage.

Materials management should reconcile purchase-order status, packing lists, receipt reports, inspection releases, warehouse records and construction issue transactions. Poor item identification can conceal shortages even where financial systems show full delivery. Serial-number traceability, preservation inspections and surplus reconciliation

should therefore remain visible through commissioning and handover. A robust material-availability report distinguishes ordered, fabricated, shipped, received, accepted, allocated and installed quantities, avoiding the false confidence created by a single "delivered" field.

Digital Procurement and Risk Visibility:-

Digital platforms may combine tender records, supplier schedules, inspection releases, shipment milestones, inventory and cost commitments. Their principal contribution is not automation itself but timely identification of contradictions. A supplier may report an on-time order while the project schedule indicates that vendor drawings are needed weeks earlier. Integrated dashboards can highlight such exceptions and enable accountable decisions. However, data standards, ownership and audit trails are necessary; poorly defined status fields can spread uncertainty more quickly than disconnected spreadsheets.

Analytics should prioritize transparent and operationally meaningful signals. Examples include required-on-site date variance, manufacturing float consumption, late vendor-data percentage, material readiness by work package, nonconformity closure age and exposure of high-risk suppliers. Predictive tools can supplement expert judgment when supported by sufficient historical data, but unexplained model outputs should not become automatic grounds for commercial penalties. Digital maturity depends equally on governance, training and disciplined updates.

Research Methodology:-

Review Design and Evidence Base:-

This paper adopts a structured narrative review with thematic synthesis. It is a secondary research study, not a field experiment or survey. The design is appropriate because procurement optimization involves diverse forms of evidence: peer-reviewed research on megaproject networks and resilience, professional standards concerning procurement and project controls, industry reports, and official Saudi industrial-development publications. The synthesis focuses on mechanisms connecting practices to project outcomes rather than pooling incompatible numerical results. No project savings, supplier scores or hypothetical trial outcomes are presented as measured evidence.

Sources, Eligibility and Search Logic:-

The literature basis emphasizes materials published from 2020 to 2025, supplemented where necessary by foundational international standards and official program documents. Searches and source checking used combinations of "megaproject supply chain," "procurement strategy," "EPC materials management," "supplier risk," "construction logistics," "supply chain resilience," "Saudi localization," and "oil and gas procurement." Relevant sources were assessed for direct applicability to procurement decisions, methodological transparency, institutional credibility and distinction between descriptive claims and established causal findings. The references include both academic and policy sources; institutional documents are not presented as equivalent to peer-reviewed empirical studies.

Analytical Approach and Limitations:-

Evidence was organized into seven decision domains: demand and package planning, market engagement, bid and contract strategy, supplier assurance, manufacturing expediting, logistics and material readiness, and performance governance. The review compares conventional activity-based management with integrated readiness-based control. Its limitations include heterogeneous project environments, limited public disclosure of commercially sensitive supplier performance, and uncertain transferability of findings between subsea developments, processing plants and pipelines. These limitations motivate future project-level validation rather than sweeping claims about guaranteed cost reductions.

Results and Discussion:-

Bottlenecks Occur at Interfaces, Not Only Suppliers:-

The principal synthesis finding is that procurement delay frequently arises from mismatched assumptions across organizational boundaries. Engineering may define an item as ready for inquiry while critical technical information is missing; procurement may define it as ordered while manufacturing release is withheld; and the site may define it as received while inspection acceptance remains incomplete. These states are individually understandable but collectively misleading. A stronger performance model requires agreement on milestone definitions and explicit escalation when a downstream requirement cannot be met.

This interpretation is consistent with network-based megaproject research, which emphasizes coordination among interdependent actors (Stefano et al., 2023). For Saudi oil and gas developments, an integrated control room need not be a new physical facility; it can be a recurring cross-functional review that brings together procurement, engineering, project controls, quality, logistics and construction. The review should prioritize exceptions with credible schedule or safety consequences, allocate a named owner and document how resolution affects forecast dates and costs.

Table 1. Conventional Procurement Versus Integrated Supply Chain Optimization

Decision element	Conventional approach	Integrated optimization approach
Planning	Purchase orders follow individual requests	Sourcing sequence linked to work packages and critical path
Supplier evaluation	Emphasis on bid price	Technical fit, capacity, lifecycle value and delivery credibility
Expediting	Follow-up on promised shipment	Critical milestone tracking with early escalation
Logistics	Delivery to destination	Acceptance and readiness at the workface
Inventory	Buffer stocks applied broadly	Criticality- and lead-time-based segmentation
Reporting	Transaction and spend dashboards	Readiness, risk exposure, cost and schedule indicators

Cost Optimization Requires Lifecycle Reasoning:-

The phrase “cost savings” requires careful definition. A lower tender price is not necessarily a saving if it increases installation rework, operational downtime or the likelihood of replacement. Conversely, a premium for earlier delivery is not automatically wasteful if it protects a genuinely critical path. Procurement decisions should document the baseline, excluded items and assumptions used in comparing offers. The economic comparison may include purchase price, inspection and transport cost, expected delay exposure, operating support, energy efficiency, spares and eventual disposal.

Portfolio analytics can identify categories where standardization yields value, but project teams should resist excessive standardization when engineering conditions differ. Decisions may instead be organized by the cost of variation: common specification elements can be aggregated while safety-critical design differences remain controlled. A joint engineering-commercial review of supplier alternatives is therefore more defensible than commercial approval followed by technical negotiation. Transparent value assessments protect both procurement integrity and project execution.

Schedule Reliability Is a Material Availability Problem:-

Supply chain schedules should be connected directly to construction sequences rather than treated as an independent reporting stream. A critical equipment package requires backward scheduling from the latest safe installation date through transport, customs clearance, factory release, inspection, manufacturing and vendor-document approvals. Every step contains variability. A schedule should therefore expose uncertainty and recovery options rather than rely on a single deterministic promised date. Scenario analysis can distinguish the effect of expediting, alternative suppliers, partial shipments and revised construction sequencing.

The project team should not expedite every purchase order equally. Scarce expediting capacity is better directed toward packages with high schedule sensitivity, limited substitutes, uncertain lower-tier supply or long recovery time. A weekly exception review can identify where action is required, but escalation should be proportionate: routine documentation delay may call for a coordinator, while a threatened manufacturing slot for a critical pump could need senior commercial intervention. The objective is an accountable flow of information and decisions, not maximum frequency of supplier reminders.

Localization and Resilience Must Be Pursued Together:-

Saudi industrial-development policy provides opportunities to strengthen local manufacturing, maintenance and logistics capabilities. The NIDLP 2024 Annual Report describes continued investment in industrial and logistics integration, while Aramco’s iktva framework emphasizes domestic value creation, jobs and supplier development.

For megaproject procurement, these objectives can complement delivery resilience when domestic suppliers offer responsive technical support, shorter transportation distances and more accessible after-sales services. They may also generate new training and investment requirements during early capability-building periods.Localization strategies should distinguish genuine capability development from simple changes in intermediary ownership. Qualification criteria must still address technical compliance, financial strength, safety, quality and production capacity. A staged approach can combine multinational technology transfer, joint quality audits, workforce training and progressive allocation of technically appropriate packages to qualified local manufacturers. Performance should be evaluated using measured domestic value creation and reliable service outcomes, not solely the nominal address of a contracting party.

Governance Makes Optimization Repeatable:-

Optimization programs often fail to sustain results because procurement savings, schedule commitments and supplier risk are managed in separate forums. A common governance structure should assign responsibility across the full cycle, define escalation thresholds and preserve decision records. At a minimum, the team needs a procurement execution plan, interface matrix, material criticality register, supplier risk register, integrated milestone schedule and consistent source of status data. Commercial change management must remain connected to the consequences for engineering and construction.

Governance also requires balanced metrics. Aggressively rewarding purchase-order issuance can encourage incomplete requisitions; rewarding unit-price reductions can undermine technical quality; and rewarding shipment without acceptance can conceal delayed readiness. A portfolio scorecard should combine timeliness, specification adherence, supplier responsiveness, material availability, rework and cost variance. Measures should be reviewed together because improving one indicator at the expense of another may reduce overall project value.

Table 2. Proposed Procurement Optimization Scorecard

Indicator	Operational meaning	Suggested review use
Critical-item readiness	Accepted material available by required workface date	Identify threatened construction activities
Vendor data timeliness	Approved drawings and documents versus agreed dates	Prevent engineering/manufacturing rework
Milestone schedule variance	Actual or forecast dates versus integrated baseline	Trigger focused expediting
Supplier quality closure	Age and severity of unresolved nonconformities	Prioritize quality intervention
Supply concentration	Dependence on single suppliers or regions	Assess resilience and contingency needs
Local capability progress	Verified supplier training and domestic value contribution	Track localization without relaxing qualification

Proposed Integrated Optimization Framework:-

The proposed framework, termed the Procurement-to-Workface Readiness Framework, links strategic sourcing with real physical availability for construction. It begins by classifying project scope and critical path exposure; proceeds through market intelligence, packaging and qualification; integrates supplier manufacturing and logistics milestones; and ends with installation readiness and lessons learned. Its distinguishing feature is explicit feedback: unexpected supplier constraints are used to revise engineering sequences, contingency plans and future category strategies rather than merely reported as late orders. The framework is a conceptual proposal requiring empirical testing in a Saudi energy project setting

Figure 1. Procurement-to-Workface Readiness Framework:-

Scope, engineering maturity and construction sequence
↓
Market capacity, supplier qualification and package design
↓
Tender evaluation, contracting and baseline milestones
↓
Vendor data, manufacturing, inspection and expediting
↓
Transport, customs, receipt, preservation and allocation
↓
Workface material readiness, installation and feedback

Implementation can be phased. During the first stage, a project standardizes package IDs, required-on-site dates and criticality ratings. Next, the procurement and project-controls teams reconcile vendor milestones with the integrated schedule. The third stage adds consistent shipment and warehouse status and establishes exception escalation. Finally, lessons learned and supplier capability assessments inform later packages. Such sequencing may be more effective than purchasing a complex enterprise platform before responsibilities and data meanings are agreed.

Figure 2. Risk-Informed Procurement Decision Loop:-

Identify schedule-critical packages and supply exposures
↓
Assess impact, probability, alternatives and owner
↓
Select sourcing, buffering, logistics or schedule response
↓
Monitor agreed milestones and evidence of completion
↓
Escalate deviations and document commercial decisions
↓
Update risk register, forecasts and supplier learning

Recommendations:-

Integrate Procurement with Project Controls:-

Every significant procurement package should have a documented relationship to construction milestones. Engineering release, award, vendor drawing approval, factory test, shipping and required-on-site dates should be part of a single controlled schedule. Project controls should calculate the consequence of supplier delay, while procurement validates the practical recovery options. This arrangement changes reporting from backward-looking transaction totals toward forward-looking schedule protection.

Introduce Criticality-Based Supplier Surveillance:-

Supplier surveillance should vary by package consequence and uncertainty. A bespoke compression train may require frequent engineering and manufacturing reviews, whereas established low-risk commodities can be managed through periodic exception reporting. Supplier visits and document checks should follow objective risk triggers and approved quality plans. Surveillance should support timely resolution, not create duplicate administrative work that diverts supplier resources from fabrication.

Strengthen Materials and Logistics Transparency:-

The project should reconcile physical status with financial records and procurement forecasts. A consistent material hierarchy from package to tag and serial number can improve traceability. For items subject to environmental damage or specialized preservation, quality teams should verify storage conditions and expiry-sensitive controls. Site teams should confirm that delivered material is genuinely ready for its intended installation sequence rather than counted solely at the warehouse gate.

Build Qualified Local Supplier Capacity:-

Domestic supplier development should be prioritized in categories with credible demand, accessible technical standards and an achievable path to quality approval. Long-term framework agreements, supplier-development workshops and engineering collaboration may help manufacturers invest in skills and production readiness. Each

initiative should have measurable milestones for product qualification, delivery reliability and local capability contribution. Procurement teams should maintain fair competition and avoid unsupported assumptions that geographic proximity guarantees resilience.

Adopt Transparent Data and Decision Rules:-
Digital dashboards should define source records, update frequency, exception ownership and decision rights. Automated alerts may highlight discrepancies, but accountable staff must validate circumstances before acting. Project governance should protect commercial confidentiality, maintain audit trails and specify how suppliers can correct inaccurate status information. Leaders should prefer a small group of trusted indicators to an impressive but unreliable volume of data.

Future Research Directions:-
Future studies should examine anonymized procurement data from Saudi energy projects to test whether integrated readiness indicators improve predictability relative to standard purchase-order metrics. A longitudinal design could compare forecast accuracy before and after adoption of milestone integration while controlling for project scope, design maturity and supplier concentration. Researchers should avoid treating correlation between dashboard adoption and performance as automatic proof of causality; simultaneous managerial changes and portfolio conditions could explain part of any improvement.

A second research opportunity involves supplier localization and resilience. Comparative case studies could examine manufacturing capability, disruption recovery time, lifecycle quality and technical service responsiveness across local and international supply arrangements. Such work must account for equipment complexity and qualification status. A third avenue is project inventory: models could quantify the trade-off between storage cost and critical-path protection under uncertain delivery times. Real-time site readiness data may enable more accurate decisions than broad inventories of undifferentiated material.

Researchers could also test transparent risk models using supplier milestone histories, quality records and transport uncertainty. The design should incorporate explainability, human review and rigorous holdout validation rather than presenting unverified predictive accuracy. Finally, mixed-method studies involving owners, EPC contractors and lower-tier manufacturers could illuminate why apparently well-designed procurement rules fail at organizational boundaries. The greatest contribution would be evidence that connects procurement interventions to measurable workface readiness and sustainable operating value.

Interface mapping can be formalized through an equipment-and-service dependency register. For each critical tag, the register links the engineering basis, vendor document approvals, utility connections, lifting arrangements, preservation measures, construction workfront and commissioning prerequisites. The resulting map identifies where a relatively low-cost component can become the controlling constraint. It also improves ownership because a missed milestone is discussed in terms of affected work rather than a generic late line item. Across multi-contractor projects, such mapping can reduce gaps between contractual scope boundaries and physical system completion.
Supplier recovery planning should be prepared before a package becomes irrecoverably late. Recovery options include alternative production slots, qualified parallel sourcing, resequencing of engineering inspections, partial deliveries, temporary equipment or revised installation work packages. Each option carries trade-offs in engineering approval, cost, quality and claim exposure. Decisions should be captured through normal contractual authority and reviewed against safety requirements. The recommended approach is not constant acceleration but a disciplined comparison of options while meaningful choices are still available.

Assurance evidence must remain proportionate. Excessive report production can give the appearance of control while obscuring unresolved manufacturing problems. A useful procurement review identifies what has changed since the previous period, the underlying cause, the owner of the required action and the forecast impact. Narrative explanations should be supported by measurable vendor progress and document status. When project teams share a consistent understanding of these terms, senior leaders can focus attention on decisions that suppliers and package managers cannot resolve independently.

A phased pilot should be selected from several packages that differ in lead time, supplier maturity and workface importance. Before deployment, the project should capture baseline data quality and existing forecast error. During the pilot, teams would monitor whether milestone exceptions are identified sooner, whether escalations result in action and whether materials reach the site in usable condition. Lessons should be documented without claiming

statistically significant improvement from small samples. This allows a project to refine definitions and routines before organization-wide scaling.

Procurement capability development is another requirement. Commercial personnel need sufficient understanding of engineering documentation, manufacturing lead times and construction constraints to question infeasible delivery promises. Equally, engineering and construction staff should understand tender governance, supplier qualification and approval authority. Joint training and cross-functional reviews can improve the quality of requisitions and change decisions. Senior management should define escalation routes that support rapid resolution without bypassing compliance and accountability controls.

Future evidence would be stronger if project researchers distinguish planned savings, committed reductions and realized economic outcomes. Procurement analysts often report an award below a benchmark as savings, even though the reference specification or scope may have changed. Auditable evaluation should reconcile baseline assumptions, change orders, final payments and downstream project consequences. A similar distinction applies to schedule: earlier shipment is not necessarily earlier readiness if acceptance or construction access is outstanding. Transparent definitions are therefore essential to reliable comparative research.

An implementation scorecard should be reviewed for evidence of genuine action rather than compliance with presentation routines. Regular reconciliation between supplier reports, third-party inspection notes, transportation evidence and site receipts helps detect optimistic forecasts. Independent review of unusual cost or schedule outcomes can distinguish process failure from unavoidable external disruption. Such learning improves the design of future tenders and reinforces trust in project-level risk reporting.

An implementation scorecard should be reviewed for evidence of genuine action rather than compliance with presentation routines. Regular reconciliation between supplier reports, third-party inspection notes, transportation evidence and site receipts helps detect optimistic forecasts. Independent review of unusual cost or schedule outcomes can distinguish process failure from unavoidable external disruption. Such learning improves the design of future tenders and reinforces trust in project-level risk reporting.

An implementation scorecard should be reviewed for evidence of genuine action rather than compliance with presentation routines. Regular reconciliation between supplier reports, third-party inspection notes, transportation evidence and site receipts helps detect optimistic forecasts. Independent review of unusual cost or schedule outcomes can distinguish process failure from unavoidable external disruption. Such learning improves the design of future tenders and reinforces trust in project-level risk reporting.

An implementation scorecard should be reviewed for evidence of genuine action rather than compliance with presentation routines. Regular reconciliation between supplier reports, third-party inspection notes, transportation evidence and site receipts helps detect optimistic forecasts. Independent review of unusual cost or schedule outcomes can distinguish process failure from unavoidable external disruption. Such learning improves the design of future tenders and reinforces trust in project-level risk reporting.

Conclusion:-

Procurement and supply chain optimization in Saudi oil and gas megaprojects requires a change in the unit of management. Individual tenders and purchase orders remain necessary, but they do not capture how engineering, supplier capacity, quality assurance, logistics and construction readiness interact. The review indicates that effective performance depends on early market intelligence, defensible package strategy, risk-informed supplier qualification, integrated milestone control and transparent material availability. These practices should be evaluated using their effect on installation readiness, lifecycle cost, schedule exposure and quality, rather than isolated procurement activity metrics.

Saudi Vision 2030 creates an additional opportunity to combine resilient project delivery with genuine supplier development and industrial localization. Achieving that combination requires staged capability-building, technical rigor and measurable domestic value. The proposed Procurement-to-Workface Readiness Framework provides a structured basis for operational improvement and future empirical evaluation. Its central principle is straightforward: procurement succeeds when technically accepted material and services are available for the right work at the right time, with documented value, manageable risk and sustainable capacity for the projects that follow.

References:-

1. Stefano, G., Denicol, J., Broyd, T., & Davies, A. (2023). What are the strategies to manage megaproject supply chains? A systematic literature review and research agenda. International Journal of Project Management, 41(3), 102457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.102457
2. Cottafava, D., et al. (2024). Megaprojects from the lens of business and management studies: A systematic literature review. Journal of Public Affairs, 24(3), e2937. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2937
3. National Industrial Development and Logistics Program (NIDLP). (2024). Annual Report 2024. https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/media/uvknp4di/nidlp_annual_report-2024_-en.pdf
4. Saudi Aramco. (n.d.). In-Kingdom Total Value Add (iktva): Frequently asked questions. https://www.iktva.sa/english/faq
5. International Trade Administration. (2026). Saudi Arabia—Oil, gas and petrochemicals. https://www.trade.gov/knowledge-product/saudi-arabia-oil-and-gas
6. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2024). Review of Maritime Transport 2024. https://unctad.org/publication/review-maritime-transport-2024
7. World Bank. (2023). Connecting to Compete 2023: Trade Logistics in an Uncertain Global Economy. https://lpi.worldbank.org/
8. International Energy Agency (IEA). (2024). World Energy Outlook 2024. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2024
9. International Energy Agency (IEA). (2023). Oil 2023: Analysis and Forecast to 2028. https://www.iea.org/reports/oil-2023
10. International Energy Agency (IEA). (2024). Oil 2024: Analysis and Forecast to 2030. https://www.iea.org/reports/oil-2024
11. International Energy Agency (IEA). (2025). Oil 2025: Analysis and Forecast to 2030. https://www.iea.org/reports/oil-2025
12. International Monetary Fund. (2024). Saudi Arabia: 2024 Article IV Consultation. https://www.imf.org/en/Countries/SAU
13. World Economic Forum. (2023). Global Risks Report 2023. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2023/
14. World Economic Forum. (2024). Global Risks Report 2024. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2024/
15. World Economic Forum. (2025). Global Risks Report 2025. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-risks-report-2025/
16. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2018). ISO 31000:2018 Risk management—Guidelines. https://www.iso.org/standard/65694.html
17. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2015). ISO 9001:2015 Quality management systems—Requirements. https://www.iso.org/standard/62085.html
18. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2017). ISO 20400:2017 Sustainable procurement—Guidance. https://www.iso.org/standard/63026.html
19. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2018). ISO 45001:2018 Occupational health and safety management systems—Requirements with guidance for use. https://www.iso.org/standard/63787.html
20. Project Management Institute. (2021). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide), 7th ed. https://www.pmi.org/pmbok-guide-standards/foundational/pmbok
21. Project Management Institute. (2024). Pulse of the Profession 2024. https://www.pmi.org/learning/thought-leadership/pulse
22. United Nations Global Compact. (2023). Supply Chain Sustainability: A Practical Guide for Continuous Improvement. https://unglobalcompact.org/library
23. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). (2024). Industrial Development Report 2024. https://www.unido.org/idr2024
24. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2023). OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct. https://mneguidelines.oecd.org/
25. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. (2024). Saudi Vision 2030 Annual Report 2024. https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/