

XRN5365 - Request impact assessment on aligning Major Releases to the REC Release Schedule

ChMC Initial Industry Consultation

Background

The Retail Energy Code Manager have provided a view they are proposing to align delivery of Retail Energy Code to other market sector delivery implementation day to fall on a weekday. At present all CDSP change delivery is implemented over a weekend due to the impacts of making changes during peak system activity and processing days. These impacts were informed to DSC Change Management Committee when this was assessed previously, with the main impacts being file processing with little system downtime, and the risk associated with having to roll back the system and its related functional code, if implementation were not successful. At the time DSC customers approved to continue with a weekend implementation.

The Retail Energy Code Manager have provided a view they are proposing to utilise all 3 Major Releases in a year (Feb, June, Nov) for delivery of REC change. Under current DSC funding arrangements customers fund 2 Functional Major Releases per year (with Feb being Documentation Only if needed), therefore need to understand impacts of increasing to 3 including costs to inform the investments made by our customers in each Business Planning exercise.

The purpose of XRN5365 is to carry out a deep dive assessment to identify the impacts of moving to a weekday implementation and an additional Functional Major Release in Feb. It is however, the intention of the REC to make a decision on the points above in the coming months, so the CDSP have carried out an initial high-level assessment, to feed into this consultation with a detailed assessment to follow (to aid in Business Planning).

Overview

Over the last few months the CDSP have been working with our service providers to carry out an assessment on the proposals being made by the REC. Initial high-level assessment has been communicated to the REC from a functional/delivery perspective (details below), but it is the expectation of the CDSP that DSC customers provide input and clarification on a number of key areas to raise to the REC so they have a consistent viewpoint from a DSC perspective.

Problem Statement:

REC have requested details on the potential scale of impact to the CDSP for...

- Proposed alignment of Energy Code implementation dates, which is anticipated to fall outside of current weekend deployment activities.

- Proposal for REC to utilise three functional Major Releases per year (Feb, Jun & Nov), where the CDSP currently utilises two (Jun & Nov) with Feb being documentation only change.

High-Level Impacts Identified:

1. Increase in expected DSC Change Proposals (following introduction of REC)
2. Increase in DSC budget required to stand up a Functional Major Release in Feb
3. Reduction of usable space for non-REC related change within all Functional Major Releases
4. Overlap of Functional Major Releases to lead to an increased demand on governance timelines, resources and environments
5. Move to a weekday implementation is not seen to increase direct effort, however, elements of implementation may not be achievable on weekdays (some scenarios may still require 'downtime' to complete) which may increase costs

Additional Information:

1. Future demand for change (UNC/DSC/REC) is currently unknown, increased demand for change introduces additional risk and costs to that described
2. Certain system changes may require 'downtime' to systems and could require weekend / additional non-business days implementation (UNC Modification required)
3. Impacts are based on the 'as-is' release capacity, future increase in delivery are not accounted for
4. Assumed that REC related change can only be implemented within a Functional Major Release
5. This assumes that Gemini change/release cycles are out of scope
6. Assessment is high-level and subject to change following detailed assessment to be carried out

ChMC Action

The initial findings have been presented to the REC and we have outlined the following key messaging:

1. Moving to a weekday implementation, although achievable from a technical perspective and thought not to increase effort, could pose risk and increase cost to several DSC customers
2. Introduction of a Functional Major Release in Feb would increase significant costs to the DSC, not just for the release itself, but the governance and Release Cycle overlaps that it would introduce
3. Increase in REC Change Proposals, which have a consequential impact to DSC systems/services would increase costs to the DSC which would need to be accounted for in the BP investment lines moving forward
4. Introduction to REC related consequential changes would reduce the capacity for DSC/UNC only change to be delivered

It is requested that ChMC & DSC industry representatives provide feedback and additional details about the impacts that the proposed changes could mean to them. It is the CDSP's intention to relay this back to the REC so they have a DSC viewpoint (some are non-signatories to the REC) to feed into any discussions surrounding the approval cycle of the changes.

Please provide a representation response for the following questions and also feed in as much information as possible.

Do DSC Customers envisage that the CDSP will coordinate and facilitate REC related changes to DSC Services?

Do DSC Customers intend to retain control over the implementation dates of REC related changes that impact CDSP systems and processes?

Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC present any risks, issues or associated costs to your organisation and / or the market?

Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC may benefit your organisation and / or the market?

Are you in favour of introducing an additional functional Major or Minor Release into the DSC Release Calendar?

Do you support moving Major Release implementation dates to a weekday to align with the REC proposals?

Would you have similar support or concern if the same approach is adopted for Minor Release implementations?

If the proposals set out by the REC are opposed to, would it be accurate to assume that similar concerns would exist for those customers who operate gas and electricity system changes?

Please feed in any other comments and considerations that you feel will aid our assessment

Representation Response

Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE Energy Supply Ltd
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	Megan.Coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	01738340451
Representation Status:	Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	<p>1. Do DSC Customers envisage that the CDSP will coordinate and facilitate REC related changes to DSC Services? Yes.</p> <p>2. Do DSC Customers intend to retain control over the implementation dates of REC related changes that impact CDSP systems and processes? Yes, insofar as DSC Customers already do this for other Code related changes (i.e. UNC etc).</p> <p>3. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC present any risks, issues or associated costs to your organisation and / or the market? No. As we are already implementing releases for other Codes according to these release schedule timetables, we do not see that the REC proposals would have significant additional impacts.</p> <p>4. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC may benefit your organisation and / or the market? No, we anticipate the impact will be immaterial.</p> <p>5. Are you in favour of introducing an additional functional Major or Minor Release into the DSC Release Calendar? Yes.</p> <p>6. Do you support moving Major Release implementation dates to a weekday to align with the REC proposals? Yes.</p> <p>7. Would you have similar support or concern if the same approach is adopted for Minor Release implementations? Yes (support).</p> <p>8. If the proposals set out by the REC are opposed to, would it</p>	

	<p>be accurate to assume that similar concerns would exist for those customers who operate gas and electricity system changes? The meaning and intent of this question is unclear – we assume you are asking whether there would be concerns about gas and electricity releases being on different days if the REC proposal (i.e. alignment of release schedules) is rejected? We do not oppose the REC proposals however our assumptions would be that parties could have similar concerns with regards the impact of REC changes across both fuels if not aligned, however there is also potential for different impacts and requirements unique to the individual fuels dependent on the context of a particular REC change.</p> <p>9. Please feed in any other comments and considerations that you feel will aid our assessment There is a risk that minor change in the REC could result in significant change in UK Link. This is however a current risk with other 'parent' Code changes that is managed as part of the normal change process. Regardless, it should not be assumed that a 'minor' change in the REC necessarily equates to a minor change in UK Link. It is our understanding that RECCO is setting up a Cross-Code Steering Group to review change and identify where instances of this may occur, and as such Xoserve should ensure they are engaged with this steering group.</p> <p>We note that some of the concerns raised by Xoserve in this change pack (e.g. increased demand on governance timelines, resources and environments) are somewhat expected internal impacts to Xoserve, as they are to most industry parties, in the wider context of Government and Ofgem programmes to streamline and improve the energy market. The intention of Retail Code Consolidation has always been to better align the gas and electricity industry processes, and Ofgem/BEIS's Energy Code Reform (and recently announced design and delivery consultation on this) will likely add further momentum to realise this intent.</p> <p>Although we do not oppose the REC proposals in principle, we also note with some concern that REC does not appear to have communicated these proposals more widely with industry ahead of delivering them to Xoserve for change pack assessment. We cannot find documentation or consultation evidence from REC to evidence what stakeholder engagement has fed into the proposals to decide that moving the gas implementation schedule from weekend to weekday to align with electricity implementation schedule is the best option. We'd suggest REC should be transparent in evidencing this and engaging with industry and Xoserve ahead of any further impact assessment activity.</p>
<p>Confirm Target Release Date?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>«h1_userDataAlternative»</p>

Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we have forward these onto the REC Code Manager.
---	---

Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Representation Status:	See comments	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	<p>1. Do DSC Customers envisage that the CDSP will coordinate and facilitate REC related changes to DSC Services? Yes. We would assume that CDSP continue to coordinate and facilitate change related to DSC services that happens under REC</p> <p>2. Do DSC Customers intend to retain control over the implementation dates of REC related changes that impact CDSP systems and processes? We believe that aligning CSS, CDSP & MPAS changes is the way forward. As CSS is a dual fuel system - we need to align any changes that also impact both CDSP and MPAS to same time lines.</p> <p>3. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC present any risks, issues or associated costs to your organisation and / or the market? It is unclear what CDSP believes the cost impact would be of moving to 3 major releases aligned across energy industry. This needs clarifying.</p> <p>4. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC may benefit your organisation and / or the market? More releases can only be good for speeding up delivery. In addition, a single release day will benefit us in not having to have release teams mobilised on 2 separate days at each release as is the case today</p> <p>5. Are you in favour of introducing an additional functional Major or Minor Release into the DSC Release Calendar? See answers to Qs 2 & 4</p> <p>6. Do you support moving Major Release implementation dates to a weekday to align with the REC proposals? See answers to Qs 2 & 4</p> <p>7. Would you have similar support or concern if the same approach is adopted for Minor Release implementations? Minor releases don't tend to require us to mobilise implementation support</p>	

	<p>teams, however in case they do, Minor release timelines should be the same as major releases – so if major releases are implemented between Friday 00:00 to Sat 04:00 then minor releases (albeit different dates) should follow same timings</p> <p>8. If the proposals set out by the REC are opposed to, would it be accurate to assume that similar concerns would exist for those customers who operate gas and electricity system changes? Not sure I understand this question</p> <p>9. Please feed in any other comments and considerations that you feel will aid our assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REC might give rise to more minor releases but difficult to quantify that will occur until we see it in operation - It's unclear where the expectation comes from that there would be an increase in changes originating from the REC – that impact DSC at least - It is also unclear why CDSP believe that these proposals would take away from the ability to implement BAU change - Any CDSP only changes should have same timings as for major cross system release as we do not really want changes that say impact CSS and CDSP being delivered on one day and changes impacting CDSP only on next day as it is inefficient in terms of release management. 	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we have forward these onto the REC Code Manager.
---	---

Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power
	Name:	Helen Bevan
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	01416145517
Representation Status:	Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do DSC Customers envisage that the CDSP will coordinate and facilitate REC related changes to DSC Services? Yes 2. Do DSC Customers intend to retain control over the 	

	<p>implementation dates of REC related changes that impact CDSP systems and processes? Yes.</p> <p>3. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC present any risks, issues or associated costs to your organisation and / or the market? No, however, still unsure on the actual cost impact.</p> <p>4. Do you feel that the proposals set out by the REC may benefit your organisation and / or the market? Yes we can't see how it wouldn't benefit, however, will need to see as still some uncertainty.</p> <p>5. Are you in favour of introducing an additional functional Major or Minor Release into the DSC Release Calendar? Yes as need to align any changes.</p> <p>6. Do you support moving Major Release implementation dates to a weekday to align with the REC proposals? Yes, Thursday or Friday would be preferable, however, as long as aligned to REC.</p> <p>7. Would you have similar support or concern if the same approach is adopted for Minor Release implementations? Yes - support.</p> <p>8. If the proposals set out by the REC are opposed to, would it be accurate to assume that similar concerns would exist for those customers who operate gas and electricity system changes? Yes.</p> <p>9. Please feed in any other comments and considerations that you feel will aid our assessment - N/A.</p>	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we have forward these onto the REC Code Manager.
---	---