



RAASP & Unique Sites

UK Link Programme – Desktop Validation
APPENDIX DOCUMENT

Client: Xoserve
Date: 03/08/15
Version: V1_0

Reputation built on results

Copyright © Baringa Partners LLP 2015. All rights reserved. This document is subject to contract and contains confidential and proprietary information.

Approach Overview

The approach executed for the delivery of the desktop review was as follows:

Pre-requisites

- Access to all RAASP material
- Support from Wipro for analysis
- Xoserve SME support as required
- Weekly attendance at joint review meeting



PWC Review Sessions

	1	2	3	4	5
Key Activities	a) Collate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOD Definition • BRDs • Design Docs (FSs) • Plans & Assumptions b) All parties to agree the approach	a) Compare BRDs to RRC rules captured - Highlight gaps b) Qualitative req. healthcheck – Wipro and SME to confirm scope of requirements	a) Assess design traceability in place b) Review workshop on key design elements – Highlighting gaps c) Review remaining methodology to be applied	a) Validate Wipro estimates of Design plan and hence wider stage gates b) Factor in historic delivery form	a) Collation of input analysis b) Drafting of report c) Reviewed with PWC d) Communication to Industry
Actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xoserve • Baringa • PWC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xoserve • Baringa • PWC • Wipro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xoserve • Baringa • PWC • Wipro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xoserve • Baringa • PWC • Wipro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xoserve • Baringa • PWC
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collated inputs (B) • Agreed approach (All) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement gap analysis (X, W, B, P) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design traceability assessment – Highlighting the level of outstanding design • Method recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design stage duration estimate • Confirmed stage gate dates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Summary Report (X,B,P)

- ▶ A substantial level of design work had already been completed for both RAASP and Unique Sites functionality before initiating the deferral process:

RAASP

Completed to date

- ✓ 65 retro scenarios agreed with business
- ✓ All 4 of 5 Functional Specs have been signed off
- ✓ CMS consequential changes have been designed and built
- ✓ RTO and RTN file interfaces configured in AMT Marketflow catalogue

Residual Design Required

- Design documentation to be completed
- Draft of 1 T1B FS to be completed
- Design validation for identified 65 scenario's
- Four T2 FS's related to retro signed-off
- Retro BPDD to be updated for retro process (65 scenario's)

Solution Scope

- Total 12 Objects impacted
- 2 new interfaces – RTO and RTN to be built in SAP IS-U and PO
- 1 workflow development required for executing activities in sequence depending on scenario
- 1 configuration table to define the activity sequence
- 4 objects pertaining to Meter Reads to be developed
- CMS contact codes with respect to Retro to be configured
- RTO and RTN files mapping to be configured in AMT

Unique Sites

Completed to date

- ✓ Existing industry file formats have been amended to include non-shared unique sites attributes
- ✓ New templates have been designed for shared unique sites from SPA process perspective
- ✓ Registration Process example has been taken to provide a view on Unique Sites in coming slide

Residual Design Required

- Unique Sites section of the high level application design document are complete but require approval.
- Translation of business requirements (external/internal BRD, Logical Data Analysis etc) and rule mapping to be performed
- Update of sections within existing BPDDs
- Classification of SAP Standard and Bespoke Scenarios - Validation of RICEFW list
- File Formats verification
- Validation of Volumetrics, Batch Jobs, Roles/Authorizations, Exception Managements scenarios

Solution Scope

- Unique Sites have been included in the main development stream of UKLINK
- Unique sites are classified into two pots - Non-Shared Sites & Shared Sites

Requirements Analysis Performed

Criteria Assessed	RAASP		Unique Sites	
Requirement Completeness				
Functional Requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none">External BRDs mapped to Internal BRDs – No orphaned external requirements exist. Final reviews required.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">No discrete external BRD existsInternal requirements are documented and U.S. specific requirements highlighted within existing design documentation
Non Functional Requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none">No specific NFRs exist for RAASPVolumetric Data – Assumed 10% asset exchange and reads replaced. To be verified as part of design.2017 volumetrics to be reviewed as part of wider NFR analysis		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing NFRs apply – Open question on revision of volumetrics
Data Migration Requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none">High level DM requirements are captured –“All base data back to “line in the sand” will be migrated from which historic charges can be recalculated, hence rec changes can also be calculated following permitted retrospective amendment to base data.”		<ul style="list-style-type: none">At the time of de-scoping Unique Sites the data migration analysis was incomplete and was suspended. This will now need to be picked up again.Offline systems analysis requires completionIndustry agreement required on historical data migration (Treatment of allocated energy at aggregated sites)
Data model		<ul style="list-style-type: none">LDM defined – Source to target mapping to be performed as part of design		<ul style="list-style-type: none">LDM defined - Source to target mapping to be performed as part of design
Have requirements been baselined?		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Detailed requirements on the 65 scenarios need to be uploaded to RRC and built into the overall traceability models		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Unique sites requirements baselined as part of core delivery
Traceability In place		<ul style="list-style-type: none">All retro requirements are traced to either a source rule or process stepScenarios require mapping into RRC, which is a sizeable task		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Source rules require mapping to functional specifications that are yet to be written.

RAASP Findings & Recommendations

Findings	Risks	Recommendations
Several key dependencies exist before RAASP & Unique sites design are able to commence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RAASP Design commencement is subject to a resource dependency from core UAT (Currently running behind plan). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria must be defined for RAASP Stage Gate 1 to ensure the minimum position is understood that enables the start of RAASP design.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial pre-work is required to mitigate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lack of understanding of process, due to it being new functionality (Both Xoserve and Industry) A risk that the Industry and Xoserve interpretations of the BRDs are different. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements validation exercise with industry stakeholders to commence ahead of formal design window (Aug/Sep).
Design progress is well advanced but substantial activity is required to close out the phase, and the proposed design phase appears underestimated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional unplanned effort will be required to play back design workshop outputs to industry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional time should be added for process and design walkthroughs with industry participants.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65 retrospective adjustment scenarios have been identified and incorporated in early design. There is a risk that this set proves incomplete, or holds additional complexity that will be uncovered once detailed design commences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed analysis of scenarios to be performed including complexity vs frequency mapping to enable potential prioritisation Create some contingency in design plan dates, and front-load complex scenarios.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional effort not currently factored into detailed plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prep and management of workshops Mapping of Level 4 processes into the requirements traceability tool Additional associated document updates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend a proof of concept for an individual scenario to test workshop and design completion timings Factor additional effort into detailed delivery plans.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic form in design workshops suggest the following activities are underestimated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exception resolution paths definition Time required to document workshops outputs Timeline for review and sign off of deliverables Closure of parked/open items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust facilitation of workshop process is required Add an additional 50% of planned time for workshops (move 18 – 27 days).

RAASP Findings & Recommendations

Findings	Risks	Recommendations
The solution design is elegant, and appears to have minimised the level of customisation required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A key area of complexity is in managing the sequencing of multiple updates to the same MPRN in a single file Design complexity is much greater for shippers & DNS owing to the billing/rebilling processing required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front loading of complex scenarios within design activities Performance of a standalone SAP design review in parallel with Xoserve design phase.
There are limited options to reduce delivery risk through reducing requirement complexity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options discussed primarily result in reducing data volumes The underlying design remains a relatively fixed effort, regardless of the number of scenarios modelled This reduces the Programme ability to flex scope in order to control delivery risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These and wider options should be investigated as part of design validation, as scenario complexity will directly impact test effort required.
There is substantial dependency on a key group of SMEs (Xoserve & Wipro)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The same SMEs will be required to support other core delivery activities – E.g. UAT closure, Data and business Change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Careful bottom up resource planning to be performed and offset against wider Programme plans.
Future phase activities (Build and test) have been well scoped (no's scenarios are known etc) however gaps exist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regression test, performance test and Penetration test need adding to the detailed RAASP plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjustment volumes should be captured from the Industry as part of requirements validation, to help inform Performance test scope.
There is a perception of a hard dependency on Xoserve having walked through their design, before the industry can commence their own solution design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This dependency constrains development time for industry participants and puts overall delivery for the industry at risk If all Industry parties are not ready implementing retrospective adjustment logic, transitional workarounds may be required which will themselves be an impact to Xoserve in terms of requiring additional offline processing support or additional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry participants should look to reduce any dependency on Xoserve for RAASP design activities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaining a thorough understanding of the BRDs and initial process walkthroughs held in 2014 Commencing design so that this can be validated as part of the overall design window.

Unique Sites Findings & Recommendations

Findings	Risks	Recommendations
Unique sites functionality is judged to carry a lower risk profile than RAASP based on analysis performed to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional effort for a low number of sites still creates an opportunity lever. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision to be made for unique sites functionality to be removed as a scope variable.
Design appears to have been optimised to reflect the number of sites affected, with the industry preferred interfacing mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regression effort is yet to be factored into plans, and could be substantial due to the broad process coverage Whilst an increased level of manual file validation is required, it is equivalent to current as-is processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A robust regression test plan to be defined and including in low level planning.
Planning has been aligned with RAASP for ease of scheduling and code management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An independence of SMEs means that Unique sites cannot be used as a lever to de-risk retro delivery, but is still a valid tool for de-risking core delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed U.S. plan is required to understand activities and durations should decoupling be required.
Data migration complexity driven by the offline system based as-is data set	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increased number of DM test cycles may be required Timely cleanse support from industry may be required to reduce the number of translation rules. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional time to be added into plans to focus on data migration activities Early industry engagement on Data cleanse activities.



This document: (a) is proprietary and confidential to Baringa Partners LLP (“Baringa”) and should not be disclosed without our consent; (b) is subject to contract and shall not form part of any contract nor constitute an offer capable of acceptance or an acceptance; (c) excludes all conditions and warranties whether express or implied by statute, law or otherwise; (d) places no responsibility on Baringa for any inaccuracy or error herein as a result of following instructions and information provided by the requesting party; (e) places no responsibility for accuracy and completeness on Baringa for any comments on, or opinions regarding the functional and technical capabilities of any software or other products mentioned where based on information provided by the product vendors; and (f) may be withdrawn by Baringa upon written notice. Where specific Baringa clients are mentioned by name, please do not contact them without our prior written approval.