This document is classified as **WHITE**.
Information is for public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

R0092 – UPDATE FOLLOWING PARTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BY ELISE HANDY

LEAD ANALYST	Elise Handy
TECHNICAL LEAD	Caroline Milner
ASSURANCE ANALYST	Vaishnavi Sharma and Anton Moden

1 CHANGE UPDATE

The R0092 work group enabled varied stakeholders to bring different perspectives on the proposals brought forward by the DCC. These formed the basis of what was to be taken forward into Impact Assessment and ensured there was the appropriate analysis and rigour on the proposed changes.

A Service Provider and Party Impact Assessment was triggered on 13 October 2023 – 10 November 2023 based on the solution at the time.

Following a review of the Party Impact Assessment responses, the Code Manager asked the DCC to review some of its proposals. These reviewed proposals are due to be provided to the Code Manager on 05 January 2024 and analysed more widely by the work group on 12 January 2024. Depending on the outcome of these proposals and the deliberations by the work group, an alternative proposal may be raised.

It is envisaged that this will be the final work group for R0092, and the next step will be for the Preliminary Change Report to be published on 20 February 2024. This will then be taken to the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) for review prior to triggering a 15 working day Consultation. The Final Change Report will published on 23 April 2024 for review by the PAB on 30 April 2024. The Code Manager will then provide the Authority with its recommendation for its final determination.

2 SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT FOLLOWING IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The following table provides an update on where discussions have been held with the DCC following Party Impact Assessment on 20 December 2023. DCC is due to give a final response in preparation for the work group on 12 January 2024.

Proposal Area	DCC Proposal	Code Manager recommendation to DCC following Impact Assessment
1. Maximum demand volumes	CSS Definition 7.3 (Switch Requests only) (a) Average daily volume = 42,300 (b) Peak daily volume = 281,600 CSS Definition x.x (total volume of messages) (a) Average daily volume = 455,000 (b) Peak daily volume = 1,088,000	Consensus that some contingency should be added to the 1,088,000 peak daily volume. The Code Manager proposes this be 5% which would take the proposed Maximum Demand Volume to 1,150,000. DCC to consider: Incorporating a Maximum Demand Volume including an optimism bias as above. As at the time of publishing this paper, the DCC agrees to the 5% contingency for the maximum demand volume.
2. Synchronous responses	CSS Definition 6.1 The CSS Provider's proposal for synchronous responses is to have no distinction between average and peak daily volumes and for this to become one performance measure of a mean time of 2 seconds or less with a 100% performance level.	General agreement with the DCC's proposal, but most respondents also agreed with the additional layer of service level to be added. DCC to consider: Incorporating a maximum response time of 10 seconds for synchronous responses. As at the time of publishing this paper, the DCC has noted that 10 seconds is not achievable and will review what is an achievable measure to be brought back to the work group.
3. Asynchronous responses	CSS Definition 6.2 The CSS Provider's proposal for asynchronous responses is to have no distinction between average and peak daily volumes and for this to become one performance measure and the target percentage would be 100%. However, it would have an SLA mean response time of 3	Strong push from respondents that this should remain as hourly. Many were concerned that if at critical times, a message is being processed and then was held and sent the next day could create rejections. This will impact the Maximum Demand Volume which

	seconds or less. It would move from an hourly to daily performance measure.	would need to be calculated based on hourly. DCC to consider: Asynchronous responses to remain at hourly with either a maximum response time of 60 seconds or the retention of the 90th percentile targets. The Maximum Demand Volume would then need to be calculated based on hourly.
4. Gate closure	CSS Definition 6.3 The CSS Provider's proposal for Gate Closure is for there to be no distinction between average and peak daily volume and for there to be a service level of a mean time of 35 minutes or less and a 90th percentile response time of 40 minutes or less. This will only be relevant to the part of the process that is within the CSS Provider's control (see green area of previous diagram).	Clear steer that DCC should be measured on the end-to-end process. Also, that there should not be any costs associated with requesting exemptions. DCC to consider: Gate closure to remain the responsibility of the DCC for the end-to-end processing with the utilisation of the exemptions process available from the PAB. This was seen as a big risk area for industry.
5. Switching incidents	5.2 Switching Operator Service Definition The Switching Operator's proposal for switching incidents is not to change any of the core service levels, however, to lower the response and resolution target percentages for Priority 3 and Priority 4 incidents.	Little to no support for changing targets for switching incidents. One respondent would like CSS to demonstrate they are reviewing their current process in order to improve performance. If there were a change, a maximum timescale would be beneficial. A suggested proposal was a maximum response times of 5 days for Priority 3 and 15 days for Priority 4. DCC to consider: Incorporating a maximum resolution time for Switching Incidents with the suggestion of 5WD for P3 and 15 WD for P4. Alternatively, no more than an additional 100% of the

		current response time 6WDs for P3 and 20WDs for P4.
6. Service requests	5.4 Switching Operator Service Definition The Switching Operator's proposal for service requests is not to change the fulfilment times of service requests however, a change in the fulfilment percentage from 100% to 98% for Priority 3 and Priority 4 requests.	Some agreement from respondents as Service Requests are seen as less important than incidents. However, other respondents don't believe there is any rationale for this change. One alternate suggestion proposed of a defined timescale of 15 days. DCC to consider: Incorporating a maximum response time for Service Requests of 15WD.