


This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

<b>Paper Reference:</b>	OPSG_33_0206_13	
<b>Action:</b>	For Information	

## OMR Project Closure: OPSG Chair's Comments

### 1. Purpose

The project to review the operational metrics for DCC Services is now about to close, following the SEC Panel's endorsement of the recommendations from the project. These recommendations will now be taken forward, principally by a SEC modification.

Following good practice, SECAS are now conducting an end of project review, in particular to identify lessons learnt. Feedback from stakeholders, including OPSG members, will be invited. The OPSG Chair's observations and views are summarised below: these have been provided to SECAS as part of this review process.

### 2. Summary Comments

These overall comments look at the project from the perspective of how well it was performed, with topics grouped loosely according to impact on "Time, Quality, and Money"

#### 2.1 Project Schedule, Planning, and Control ("Time")

1. The project achieved delivery of its final report in time for consideration by the April SEC Panel. While this was a month later than envisaged at the start of the project, it was in time to align with the Ofgem OPR workstream.
2. Project commencement and start up were slower than hoped for, due to staff availability. This in turn made it more challenging to achieve the overall schedule for the project. It also may have influenced the depth of detailed task planning and understanding achieved at the beginning of the project.
3. A number of interim milestones were not achieved according to plan, leading to, for example, the late distribution of interim products to the OPSG for review. However, in most cases the delay was relatively short.
4. SECAS had not provided the project with a ready built cost/accomplishment methodology and tool for project monitoring and control. However, with guidance, the project implemented and utilised a suitable monitoring method.

Managed by



## 2.2 “Quality”

1. The project’s final recommendations were accepted without change by the SEC Panel.
2. The project’s draft final report:
  - a. Received generally good support from SEC Parties
  - b. With a small number of changes, was supported by the OPSG
  - c. Evoked some cautious and somewhat critical comments from DCC, to which responses were provided. DCC subsequently expressed general support for the report at the Panel
3. The project addressed all of the principal topics identified in the PID.
4. In some areas, the depth of analysis and the level of detail of the recommendations was less than was hoped for at the beginning of the project.
5. DCC were not able to provide the detailed contributions to the project that had been envisaged and planned for at the beginning of the project. It is understood that this was due to other operational priorities for key DCC staff. It is likely that this will have impacted the level of detail achieved in some of the project’s work and recommendations.
6. The project’s engagement with stakeholders was good and effective. This included communications with the OPSG, SEC Parties, and Ofgem. DCC engaged strongly at the beginning of the project.
7. The project did a good job in establishing User priorities and requirements, and, as had been originally envisaged in the PID, used these to drive the identification of improvements in metrics.
8. Trialling of certain identified metrics and reporting formats worked well, and was initially supported well by DCC. Unfortunately, largely due to constraints on resource availability, trialling was truncated at 2 cycles rather than the planned 3. However, it is thought that most of the readily accessible value-added outcomes were achieved in the two cycles executed.
9. The project effectively explained the value of, and also identified, “metrics” (measuring performance for which DCC can reasonably be held accountable) and “indicators” which provide further operational insight, but which encompass factors that are not completely under DCC’s control.
10. The clarity and drafting quality of some interim deliverables and products was not initially of a suitable standard. More rework was required than would have been expected.

## 2.3 “Money”

It is understood that the final totals of resources and expenditure will be approximately 30% above the budget and estimates made at the beginning of the project. Some of the factors identified earlier in this paper will have contributed to this. Nonetheless, it is recognised that the project was demanding in both scope and schedule.

## 2.4 Input to the Modifications Process

The final report from the project now forms the starting point for the modification process. It is important that the full intent of the approved recommendations is communicated into that work. SECAS are asked to ensure that this happens.

### **3. Recommendations**

The OPSG is invited to **NOTE** the contents of this paper.

**Dave Warner**

**Chair, SEC Operations Group**

**26 May 2020**