



respect > commitment > teamwork

# UKL Future Release Prioritisation & Scoping Approach

*Final Draft  
(Version 0.4)*

---

## Document Purpose

The purpose of this document is to describe the Xoserve proposed New UK Link Change Prioritisation and Release Scoping Approach. The document is focused on specifying the prioritisation process through which all Change Proposals and backlog items will be taken through to determine their relative priority of implementation. This priority will be considered in conjunction with the impact of the change (classified via an Impact Assessment carried out by Xoserve and relevant 3<sup>rd</sup> parties) to determine the proposed scope of future releases.

The proposed approach and processes are subject to review and ratification by the DSC Change Committee. It is expected that the principles and processes articulated in the document will be refined (and, where required, further detailed) with the Committee.

This document will outline, at a high level, the internal Impact Assessment (IA) process referenced above, however, the details of the IA process are described in the Future Release Impact Assessment document. This document also won't prescribe in detail the specific changes that form the current change backlog, nor will it elaborate on the delivery approach or any other approaches to be utilised in implementing the proposed changes.

While the focus of the document will be on the scope of the first two major release post-UKL Go-live, the approach is intended to be re-usable in assessing changes on an enduring basis. As such, the approach will endeavour to adopt enduring principles throughout.

The Prioritisation and Scoping approach is intended to align with the DSC Change Committee's Change Management Procedures, which have been utilised in drafting the proposed processes contained in the document.

---

## Table of Contents

Document Purpose .....	2
1. Introduction and Context .....	4
2. Channelling Changes .....	6
3. Scoping Process .....	8
4. Impact Assessment Approach – Tiers 1 & 2.....	12
5. Prioritisation Framework .....	13
6. Proposed Scope Selection & Industry Review.....	18
7. Document Control .....	19
Appendix .....	20
Appendix A – CDSP Service Document: DSC Change Management Procedures (v1.0) .....	20
Appendix B – Proposed DSC Change Committee Timeline for Scoping of Release 2 .....	21

# 1. Introduction and Context

Xoserve has a long and successful track record of delivering managed change to its existing systems in response to industry requirements and to maintain the integrity and stability of the infrastructure. June 2017 will mark the delivery of one of the largest such changes, in the shape of the UK Link Programme. This programme has represented a significant step change in scale, complexity and risk for the delivery portfolio and will require a robust, well planned strategy to enable delivery of subsequent changes.

As the UK Link Programme nears its Go Live, increased scrutiny is expected from external stakeholders on Xoserve’s readiness to operate under BAU conditions and plans for how future change will be delivered by the organisation. Such plans must align to a changing industry governance landscape and new funding arrangements being introduced under the DSC.

At a high level, Xoserve’s intended approach is to deliver multiple major releases of functionality a year, alongside a stream of minor enhancement work. The first major releases are anticipated to be ‘Release 2’ and ‘Release 3’, with estimated delivery dates in (calendar) Q2 and Q4 2018 respectively.

The high level plan for the lead up to and delivery of major Release 2 and then 3 is outlined below:




Figure 1: HL Release 2 & 3 Plans

There are a number of external (to Xoserve) and internal factors that will influence the approach adopted to determining the scope of these releases. The key factors relevant for Releases 2 & 3 are summarised below:





Figure 2: External and Internal Factors Impacting Release Scoping

## Approach Objectives

This document is focused on determining the approach to identify the change items to form the scope of each UK Link major release. Gemini specific changes are expected to be catered for via the as-is assessment, prioritisation and Gemini release route. In the context of Xoserve's Change Management Framework (CMF), the prioritisation and scoping approach sits as part of the 'Early Engagement' and 'Release Scope' lifecycle steps.



*Figure 3: Change Management Framework - Scoping Approach Relevant Steps*

At a high level, the approach will provide:

- **An overall process for assessing items in the UK Link Change Backlog**
- **A method by which to prioritise changes internally**, before being taken to the DSC (Data Services Contract) Change Committee
- **A framework for identifying the scope of UK Link future major releases**
- **The document does not cover Gemini specific changes and releases.** These will continue to be orchestrated via Gemini specific releases (and related scoping of these). The only exception that may need to be considered is where a UK Link change has Gemini consequential change impacts – these will be assessed on a case-by-case basis

## 2. Channelling Changes

The scope of future releases will be comprised of various bundled changes (internal/externally driven change requests, business process and excellence linked changes, deferred defect fixes, technology roadmap driven changes, system sustaining changes etc). **The scope of a release will be delivery capacity and timeline constrained, not purely demand led.**

To ensure that the pre-defined release schedule is met without fluctuating delivery capacity, this will require a robust change prioritisation and selection process. The process should also be able to factor in that some changes will be better suited for delivery as part of a Minor Enhancement or Emergency/Extraordinary Fix rather than a major release.

The following diagram illustrates the various factors that will funnel changes down one delivery path or another.




Figure 4: Change Selection and Release Scoping Factors

### Sources of Change

Change Proposals to be assessed, prioritised and selected for delivery as part of a major release may take several forms, including:

- Change requests deferred from previous programmes (for example, UK Link Release 1)
- Xoserve Business Plan and Business Excellence (service improvement) type Change Proposals
- Defects deferred from other programmes, or not considered urgent enough to be fixed via a BAU issue resolution track
- New industry Change Proposals
- Technology roadmap related changes (e.g. SAP platform related changes)
- Regulatory or mandated changes
- Other changes raised for assessment at/by the DSC Change Committee

---

Changes in this context are changes to CDSP services or central systems.

**Impacting Factors:**

1. **Magnitude and Criticality of Change** – high priority/criticality changes (such as emergency defect fixes) will be pushed down the Minor Enhancements / Extraordinary Changes path. For other changes, priority will influence which release it is selected for
2. **Existing Delivery Commitments** – changes will naturally be assessed relative to other changes already within a release's scope and against other changes in the 'change pot'
3. **Benefit / Cost Reduction** – a key facet of change selection will be the benefits case and priority attributed to it by the industry collectively. This input will be driven primarily by the Change Committee (see section 7)
4. **Technology Roadmap Drivers** – Central Systems and wider industry technology roadmaps will influence what changes are selected for delivery and in what order
5. **Delivery Capacity** – one of the key approach principles (see section 2) is for delivery capacity (rather than purely demand) to drive release scope. Capacity to deliver in this instance should be viewed both from a CDSP (Xoserve) as well as industry perspective. This, along with the average delivery lifecycle of c8months per release will be a major factor in defining how much change can be grouped into each major release



### 3. Scoping Process

For the existing change backlog, the approach to allocate a change into one of the planned future releases will be driven by the **effort/complexity of delivery** weighted against its **criticality/industry priority**. Furthermore, the changes will be selected, as much as possible, according to which areas of the solution they impact (to help achieve delivery synergies).

Selection into one of the scheduled future releases (Releases 2 and 3 are the first two major releases targeted post UK Link go-live) is also dependant on delivery capacity. Capacity is a factor of end-to-end delivery timelines, change resourcing and the selected delivery methodology.




Figure 5: HL Approach to Selecting Changes for Release Scope



### Effort and Complexity

- Aggregation of all known changes into a change backlog
- Quantifying the complexity of each item of change based on a number of criteria (incl impacted processes & systems, estimated man-hours)
- Assessment utilising existing materials and analysis (e.g. CR documentation)

### Benefit and Criticality

- Industry benefits and priorities to be received through the DSC Change Committee
- Alongside Change Committee principles, the prioritisation should also take into account benefits and cost reductions enabled by the specific change as well as business process impacts of not implementing it
- It is not expected that CDSP Service Sustaining changes will have to proceed through the exact same prioritisation process. Such changes are to be allocated to a future release based on urgency and capacity considerations (each release is to have some capacity to cater for such changes as required)

The prioritisation, associated delivery effort and complexity and capacity availability will drive what is selected for delivery in Release 2 and 3. Therefore, relative priorities of changes in the backlog won't be the only factor determining if a change is included in scope, meaning the highest priority changes won't always end up being selected for delivery in the next release.

The scoping of releases will follow the high level process below. It is important to note that **the full scope of a release is not expected to be finalised until after a sufficient level of High Level Design (HLD) has been completed**. This is to cater for any previously unforeseen delivery complications that may only have become apparent through design, and to provide some flexibility to ensure that the set implementation date is realistic.




Figure 6: Release Scoping Process

## Minor Enhancements & Extraordinary Changes

As part of Tier 1 Impact Assessment, the criticality and / or magnitude of a change may mean that the change is proposed for delivery as part of a Minor Enhancement / Extraordinary change track. This stream will cater for some immediate changes as well as minor changes (such as the creation of a new report). However, it is intended for most changes to progress via the major release route and progress through the remainder of the process above (to be proposed for inclusion in a future release's scope).

The DSC Change Committee will be presented changes proposed to be progressed via the Minor Enhancements / Extraordinary change route. The Committee will also have the opportunity to nominate further changes for this method of delivery as part of release scope reviews (penultimate step above).

## Initial vs Enduring Process

Given the urgency and timeline set for assessing the current change backlog and agreeing a Release 2 scope, the process is proposed to follow the lifecycle above. The enduring process flow may benefit from some amendments, however. For example, it should be possible to complete both Tier 1 and 2 IAs for new changes as they are raised, aiding the prioritisation and scoping steps to follow and speeding up the end-to-end process. These changes are anticipated to evolve through initial trialling of the proposed process with the DSC Change Committee.

## Other Scoping Considerations

- **Contingency** – following HL sizing, the proposed scope of releases should contain an element of unutilised “delivery space” to cater for new, more urgent changes down the line and to provide contingency for potential delivery issues
- **Delivery Capacity** – as reflected in section 2, the selection of a release scope will be delivery capacity constrained
- **Service Sustaining Changes** – will be proposed for inclusion in a release's scope based on the CDSP's assessment of urgency/need date
- **Increasing Scope Confidence** – throughout the process steps, the scope of a Release are intended to become clearer, however, full confirmation of scope will only be possible once an element of high level design (HLD) has been carried out. This is to ensure any complexities uncovered in design can be factored in to delivery timelines/scope
- **Enduring Process** – elements of the process may be re-used to provide an enduring scoping approach, however, as-is the process is primarily intended to tackle the stable existing demand pot to be assessed for R2 & R3
- **Assessing New Changes** – changes not part of the current (original) Change Register are expected to flow into the same process. It is expected that once assessed, there will be an internal allocation (to either R2, R3, a further release or the ME scope) suggestion, to be ratified in the final industry review step

#### 4. Impact Assessment Approach – Tiers 1 & 2

A two tiered approach has been proposed to: ensure clarity of change requirements and subsequent assessment of the complexity and delivery effort associated with implementing changes from the change backlog.

The first tier of the assessment is intended to be done primarily utilising Business Analyst inputs and existing process and data models held by Xoserve. This assessment is intended to determine general impact areas (process and data model focused) and provide a rough assessment as to the likely magnitude of the change. The second tier is to be completed with functional and delivery inputs (including the selected SI's assessment) and is focused on determining a more detailed assessment of the complexity and effort required to deliver the specific change.

IA Tier	Overview and Objectives	Key Assessment Criteria
<p><b>Tier 1</b></p>	<p>Tier 1 will provide a high level assessment of the magnitude of a change. The focus in this phase will be on identifying the systems, processes and data objects which may be impacted to provide an indication of how widespread the change is.</p> <p>What is documented here will be used to identify what general areas the changes are clustered in. The updated change backlog will also enable a more efficient assessment process in Tier 2 (which will predominantly be carried out by functional consultants and technical teams). The magnitude of the changes assessed in Tier 1 will only be used as a rough guide for selecting changes for a release scope, as the lower level assessment has not yet been completed at this stage.</p> <p>The requirements within a change will also be validated and detailed into business requirements understandable by the SI.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems likely to be touched</li> <li>• Business Processes that may be impacted (L4)</li> <li>• Related data objects</li> <li>• Source Rules impacted</li> <li>• Interfaces / file formats that may be changed</li> </ul>
<p><b>Tier 2</b></p>	<p>Tier 2 will provide a more detailed assessment of the effort and complexity required to deliver a change. To do this, the business requirements clarified in Tier 1 will be used to create a high level conceptual design identifying the general solution options. While still focusing on individual changes, this phase should also identify delivery efficiencies that may be possible through grouping changes.</p> <p>The assessment at this phase is to be carried out by subject matter experts with an understanding of the current solution and the delivery methodology to be employed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design complexity</li> <li>• Build effort</li> <li>• Test effort</li> <li>• Business Change and Readiness impacts</li> <li>• Implementation and Operate effort/implications</li> <li>• Non-Functional (performance, security, etc) implications and test effort</li> </ul>

*The detailed approach for each Tier of the Impact Assessment above is contained within the **Future Release Impact Assessment Approach** document.*

## 5. Prioritisation Framework

The primary aim of the proposed framework below is to satisfy the DSC Change Committee's 'Priority Principles' while also offering a pragmatic way to rank the relatively large current change backlog that needs to be prioritised. To be able to more effectively draw distinctions between similar changes, benefits/cost reduction and business/industry process impacts are also to be taken into account. The framework is expected to form the basis of an enduring approach to prioritise changes on an on-going basis (with modifications where required).

### Objectives

Considering the existing backlog of changes, the objective of the prioritisation framework is to order all the changes into a ranking of relative priority. The scoping process outlined in section 3 will utilise the priority ranking, alongside delivery effort and capacity considerations, to select a proposed scope for future releases. Although the approach is focused on ordering the current backlog, it is anticipated that the framework (with modifications where required) can be re-used to prioritise new changes on an enduring basis.

### DSC Change Committee Priority Principles

The following principles are stipulated in the CDSP Service Document to assess the relative priority of Change Proposals (the full chapter 4.5 of the Service document is included in Appendix A):

*The following principles (Priority Principles) shall apply, and shall bind the CDSP and the Committee, in determining any Priority Question:*


- (a) a Priority Service Change shall take priority over a Non-Priority Service Change;*
  - (b) as between Non-Priority Service Changes, a Change Proposal with an earlier Proposal Date shall take priority over a Change Proposal with a later Proposal Date;*
  - (c) in deciding the priority between Modification Service Changes:
    - (i) any views expressed by the Authority shall be taken into account;*
    - (ii) an Urgent Modification shall take priority over a Modification which is not an Urgent Modification;*
    - (iii) a Modification for which (at the relevant time) an Implementation Date has been set shall take priority over a Modification for which an Implementation Date has not been set; and*
    - (iv) a Modification for the purposes of ensuring compliance with Law shall take priority over a Modification which is not for such purposes**
- (without any prescribed priority between the principles in paragraphs (i) to (iv));*
- (d) as between Priority Service Change, subject to paragraph (c), a Change Proposal with an earlier Proposal Date shall take priority over a Change Proposal with a later Proposal Date; and*
  - (e) subject to paragraph (c), the Committee may by Unanimous Vote decide a different priority than the above as between any Proposed Service Changes for which the Relevant Customer Class(es) are the same.*

## Proposed Framework

Taking into account the Change Committee principles and overall objective, the following diagram sets out the proposed 4 step process for the practical ordering of the change backlog into a relative priority ranking.

All Change Proposals in the Change Backlog may be progressed through the framework, however:

- i) The DSC Change Committee have expressed a preference to prioritise changes that have owners/sponsors and an associated Change Proposal
- ii) CDSP service sustaining changes are expected to be presented by Xoserve and allocated to a release based on urgency of delivery, need date and release capacity considerations, but do not need to be progressed through the same prioritisation process





## Process Step Details

Step	Overview	Input(s)
1	<p><b>Priority Change Proposal Status</b></p> <p>To determine if a Change Proposal is a priority Service Change or a non-priority, the DSC Change Committee Priority Principle will be utilised. Namely, a priority service change is one that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) a Modification Service Change; or</li> <li>(ii) a Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made)</li> </ul> <p>Changes to other industry code (such as SPAA or SEC) may also be considered by the DSC Change Committee to constitute a priority.</p> <p>Priority vs non-priority status will be assessed based on the Change Proposal and information contained within it.</p> <p>Change proposals that fall into the priority service change category are allocated to a higher ranking group than those that do not. This high level ranking may then be further modified, refined in each of the subsequent steps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change Backlog – put through Xoserve Tier 1 IA</li> <li>• Modifications associated with the Change Proposals</li> <li>• Change Proposal details (as logged in the proposal document)</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Change Proposal Urgency</b></p> <p>Urgency is to be assessed using the principles set out in the UNC Modification Rules (and specifically Standard Special Condition A11). For non-modification changes (or those related to other industry code, SPAA, SEC), it is proposed that relative urgency be assessed/determined by the Change Committee based on information contained within the Change Proposal.</p> <p>The urgency associated with a Change Proposal is then utilised (along with step 1) to determine if a change should fall into the 'High', 'Medium' or 'Low' general prioritisation grouping.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change Proposal details</li> <li>• UNC Modification Rules</li> <li>• CDSP internal view on change urgency (where applicable/available)</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Benefits &amp; Business Process Criticality Assessment</b></p> <p>At this stage, the assessment should determine (assessment details provided in the next sub-section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefit to CDSP service provision (e.g. cost savings)</li> <li>• Benefits the change will provide to Industry Participants / restrictive classes</li> <li>• Industry processes impacted (and magnitude of impact) if the change is not implemented</li> </ul> <p>Where the benefit / industry process impacts are specific to certain industry participants or restrictive classes, the responsibility will be on said parties to set out these benefits and process impacts related to the change.</p> <p>This assessment will be used to further refine the prioritisation ranking, allowing movement between the general groupings set in the previous two steps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change Proposal details</li> <li>• Participant benefit calculations</li> <li>• CDSP internal benefit and process assessment (where applicable/available)</li> </ul>



Step	Overview	Input(s)
4	<p><b>Other Ranking Considerations</b></p> <p>Finally, the following considerations may also be used to modify relative priority between certain changes in the ranking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If related to a Modification (or other industry code change), the implementation date of the change</li> <li>• Proposal date of the service change – earlier proposal dates take priority</li> <li>• Change Committee vote on modifying relative priority (between service changes for which the Relevant Customer class(es) are the same)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change Proposal details</li> </ul>

### Benefits and Business Process Criticality

Step 3 in the above process will require an assessment of the relative benefit (for example cost reduction) and business process impact of each change. This is to ensure that changes offering a relatively high return either on benefit to industry parties or in ensuring that central industry processes can be sustained may be suitably moved up the ranking order.

**Benefit** should be measured either to CDSP service offerings, benefit to impacted market participants or both. For comparability, the measure should be clearly set out in terms of a monetary value where possible. For benefits to be accumulated by the CDSP, the relevant assessment is to be made by Xoserve. For participant benefits, the benefit assessment should be carried out by impacted parties and a corresponding benefit case / justifications made available. Benefit will be completed by ordering changes into a relative order of benefit size (tolerances for what constitutes a high, medium or low category are to be agreed with the DSC Change Committee and these tolerance may be revisited).

**Industry Process Impact** of not implementing the change may be proposed by either the CDSP or impacted participants. The process impacts should be clearly set out and impact magnitude agreed by the Change Committee (or relevant customer classes within the Committee). Key considerations for process impact should include:

- i) The volume of transactions/meter points impacted by the process and
- ii) Availability of a feasible and supportable workaround

The following guiding principles should be used to determine process impact:

**High** – one or more high volume central industry process(es) are not expected to be able to function without the change being implemented with no workaround possible (or feasible)

**Medium** – service degradation is expected to occur in one or more high/medium volume process areas as a result of not implementing the proposed change. Workaround not desirable, although available if required

**Low** – minimal or no process/service impact is expected as a result of not implementing the change and/or a feasible and supportable workaround is available

To arrive at a joint Benefit and Business Process categorisation changes will be plotted on the following axes:




Figure 7: Benefit and Business Process Axes

## 6. Proposed Scope Selection & Industry Review

The proposed forum for reviewing and agreeing Change Proposal priorities (as described in *section 5*) and the final scope of future releases (*section 3*) will be the DSC Change Committee. The Committee sits monthly, and while this format is expected to work well in a BAU environment, it is anticipated that a more structured approach will need to be set out for the initial review of the existing change backlog. The process should ensure that a thorough review of the backlog is completed, but also factor in the demanding timeline in agreeing the scope of Release 2 in order to be able to meet the proposed implementation dates specified in *section 1*.

### Initial Backlog assessment process

To ensure that the existing backlog can be successfully reviewed, the following is proposed (a timeline representation of the proposed steps is provided in *Appendix B*).

- (i) Dedicated Change Committee session for:
  - a. Review and agreement of the proposed prioritisation and scoping process
  - b. Review of Change Proposals within the current change backlog
- (ii) A follow-on session dedicated to prioritising the Change Proposals in line with agreed prioritisation principles (proposed process set out in *section 5*)
- (iii) Following the prioritisation of the backlog and Xoserve's Tier 2 Impact Assessment, a proposed scope of Release 2 will be presented by the CDSP in line with all scoping considerations (articulated in *section 3*). This scope is to be reviewed and amended / accepted through a review cycle by the Change Committee

While the timeline is still expected to be ratified by the Change Committee, deviations in the timeframe for agreeing Release 2 scope could impact the proposed delivery timescale (or alternatively the amount of change that can be delivered).

### Enduring process

Although the processes described in this document have primarily focused on the initial assessment of the current backlog, it is expected that they will be re-used for the scoping of subsequent future releases and for the prioritisation of new Change Proposals as they are raised. Once the initial ranking exercise has been completed, it is expected that the priority order is reviewed on a regular basis by the Change Committee.

The key triggers for priority review being:

- The identification of a **new Change Proposal** to be prioritised – each new Change Proposal should be assessed using the process above and slotted into the existing rankings
- Start of the **scoping cycle of a new future release**
- **Changing circumstances of a change already prioritised** (such as required implementation date)

Scoping cycles will align to the agreed UK Link release schedule (and where possible take into account electricity market release cycles).

## 7. Document Control

Version	Date	Status	Author(s)	Notes
V0.1	29/03	First Draft	Balint Vizi	First draft for review
V0.2	13/04	First Draft	Balint Vizi	Inputs from April DSC Change Committee meeting and Change Mgt Procedures
V0.3	27/04	Second Draft	Balint Vizi	Review comments from Future Release team
V0.4	11/05	Final Draft	Balint Vizi	Updates following the May DSC Change Committee (10/05).

## Appendix

### Appendix A – CDSP Service Document: DSC Change Management Procedures (v1.0)

#### Section 4.5 – Priority Principles

4.5.1 For the purposes of this paragraph 4:

- (a) a Priority Service Change is: (i) a Modification Service Change; or (ii) a Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made); and
- (b) a Service Change which is not a Priority Service Change is a Non-Priority Service Change.

4.5.2 A Priority Question is any question as to sequencing and resolving conflicts in the operation of the Service Change Procedures in relation to different Proposed Service Changes, AXM/DBT/036091.00001/46768906.01 Page 9 including conflicts between plans and programmes for Business Evaluation and Implementation of different Proposed Service Changes, and including setting Target Commencement Dates.

4.5.3 The following principles (Priority Principles) shall apply, and shall bind the CDSP and the Committee, in determining any Priority Question: (a) a Priority Service Change shall take priority over a Non-Priority Service Change; (b) as between Non-Priority Service Changes, a Change Proposal with an earlier Proposal Date shall take priority over a Change Proposal with a later Proposal Date; (c) in deciding the priority between Modification Service Changes: (i) any views expressed by the Authority shall be taken into account; (ii) an Urgent Modification shall take priority over a Modification which is not an Urgent Modification; (iii) a Modification for which (at the relevant time) an Implementation Date has been set shall take priority over a Modification for which an Implementation Date has not been set; and (iv) a Modification for the purposes of ensuring compliance with Law shall take priority over a Modification which is not for such purposes (without any prescribed priority between the principles in paragraphs (i) to (iv)); (d) as between Priority Service Change, subject to paragraph (c), a Change Proposal with an earlier Proposal Date shall take priority over a Change Proposal with a later Proposal Date; and (e) subject to paragraph (c), the Committee may by Unanimous Vote decide a different priority than the above as between any Proposed Service Changes for which the Relevant Customer Class(es) are the same.

4.5.4 The CDSP shall inform the Committee where a Priority Question arises in relation to any Proposed Service Change(s).

4.5.5 Where application of the Priority Principles does not resolve a Priority Question, the Committee shall decide the Priority Question having regard to the DSC Objectives.

4.5.6 Where a Priority Question arises in relation to any Proposed Service Change(s), the CDSP shall at the request of the Committee propose any resequencing or rescheduling of the operation (in relation to such Proposed Service Change(s)) of the Service Change Procedures which will resolve such Priority Question.

4.5.7 Decisions on Priority Questions shall be made by the Full Vote of the Committee, except for a decision as to priority between two or more Restricted Class Changes for which the Relevant Customer Class(es) are the same.

## Appendix B – Proposed DSC Change Committee Timeline for Scoping of Release 2

The following change backlog review, prioritisation and Release 2 scoping timeline has been shared with the DSC Change Committee at the April 2017 session and is awaiting confirmation.

