



Preferred Hypothesis

Customer Consultation Summary Report

October 2025

Consultation start date: 30 July 2025

Response deadline: 12 September 2025

Team: Project Trident

Contact: communications@xoserve.com



Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Online survey responses	5
Lessons learned & insights survey	5
General survey	5
Customer workshop findings	8
Key themes from the discussion	8
Opportunities and risks for steps 1 and 2	10
Building confidence	10
Feedback & questions to Stakeholder Team & Customer Advisors	11
Further information requests	12
Conclusions and next steps	15

Making
energy
data
work.



Executive Summary

In July 2024, we started [Project Trident](#), a multi-year project which will modernise the UK Link platform, in response to SAP's planned discontinuation of standard support for ECC6 ISU in 2027.

Between 30 July and 12 September 2025, Project Trident held a customer consultation on its preferred hypothesis - a hybrid approach, using a two-step process:

- **Step 1** would be to migrate UK Link SAP ECC6 ISU core to S/4HANA, for a supported platform.
- **Step 2** would be to optimise and simplify the estate, to create more modular architecture.

Project Trident wants to understand its customers' views and ensure they are represented within its delivery. In line with this, a range of engagement methods were used to highlight the consultation opportunity and achieve our objective to solicit customer and industry feedback on the proposed way forward for Project Trident. A small number of responses were received, and this report is proposed to be used as a representation of customer opinion for inclusion in the decision-making process for Project Trident. Several customer comments also referred to wider Project Trident topics.

We found that customers largely expressed support or were neutral towards the preferred hypothesis based on the information shared in the consultation. This was primarily due to the minimised delivery risk assumed with the hybrid option in comparison to self-build and the further adaptability of the hybrid solution.

Customers agreed step 1 was regarded as providing the necessary foundation to ensure stability and continuity but carried delivery and duplication risks. Step 2 was seen as achieving most of the long-term benefits but is more complex and where greater risks (overheads, scope and customer impact) would surface.

Several themes emerged on what customers see as important for building confidence in the preferred hypothesis:

- **Cost and value for money:** Value for money was priority for customers within the option selection process for Project Trident. Greater clarity requested on the benefits case, cost transparency, and viability until 2040. Requests for assurances around value for money.
- **Project Management and Governance:** Robust project management and governance of Project Trident, ensuring there is a clear plan and timelines.
- **Scope:** Project Trident needs to limit scope creep, while future proofing the system to ensure flexibility to incorporate future industry changes. Scope should be clearly defined for steps 1 & 2.
- **Industry awareness and continuity:** Coordinate timelines with other industry projects to enable customers to effectively manage resources and avoid clashes. Maintaining service continuity during migration.
- **Engagement and communication:** Customers would like to be provided with updates and information sharing from Project Trident, including the provision of more information on the evidence supporting the preferred hypothesis.

In our next steps, the valuable customer input received as part of the consultation process will be considered when we bring together evidence on the preferred hypothesis and alternatives reviewed. This will all be considered alongside business needs including scalability, flexibility, speed of change and ultimately value for money of the technology option. This collective information will form our preferred option, which will be fully documented in the Outline Business Case (OBC). The creation of the OBC will also aim to provide the information requested by customers such as further clarity on the hybrid option.



Introduction

Between 30 July and 12 September 2025, Project Trident held a customer consultation on its preferred hypothesis. The information and associated reading required for customers to contribute their views was presented in a virtual customer briefing on 30 July. [View the customer briefing presentation.](#)

The preferred hypothesis is the option that is currently favoured over others based on research and evidence, indicating that this best meets the needs of Project Trident. This has been based on our research and evidence to date, including input from customer interviews and contributions within the UK Link Pain Point workshops. All options are still subject to continuing research including input from customers, our Independent Assurance Partners and our Customer Advisors so that we confidently reach the best outcome.

Our objective for the customer consultation was to solicit customer and industry feedback on the proposed way forward for Project Trident. We aimed to gather meaningful customer input into the Project Trident option selection process, based on the early sharing of the preferred hypothesis. This report is

proposed to be used as a representation of customer opinion for inclusion in the decision-making process for Project Trident.

The consultation took place during Project Trident's business case and pre-procurement phase. Customer feedback was solicited on the preferred hypothesis between these dates to ensure that opinion was captured early and could be considered swiftly within the BP26 Draft 1 and Draft 2 if required. This feedback will be summarised and included within the HMT Green Book OBC for Project Trident.

DSC customers were invited to contribute towards the consultation within three different routes: online surveys, an interactive workshop taking place on 05 September and written feedback to the Stakeholder Engagement team or Project Trident Customer Advisors.

The consultation was advertised widely to DSC customers, primarily DSC Contract Managers and previously nominated Project Trident engagement representatives. The following table captures the broad methods of communication:

Method	Date	Reach
Customer briefing: 1 hour presentation session, recorded	30 July 2025	212 invitees, 50+ attendees. The recording was shared with DSC customers on following customer awareness emails.
Project Trident homepage on xoserve.com	Launched on 30 July 2025	Publicly available.
Customer consultation awareness emails These communications were shared to the following number of stakeholders from across the industry:	31 July	178 recipients
	13 August	178 recipients
	01 September	175 recipients*
	11 September	175 recipients*
Performance Assurance Committee presentation	12 August 2025	Closed session with Performance Assurance Committee members.
The Project Trident newsletter, The Tide	21 August 2025	Directly to over 450+ newsletter subscribers and publicly available on the Trident homepage.

*The reduction in 3 recipients was in relation to customers subscription preferences.



Online survey responses

There were two surveys shared and advertised to DSC customers for completion:

1. Lessons learned & insights survey

The purpose of this survey was to gather insights and lessons learned from DSC customers whose organisations have recently changed or upgrade their core systems. The survey asked questions around recent organisational technology and transformation changes experienced by customers to ascertain insights and best practice that could be utilised by project Trident/decisions around the preferred hypothesis.

As this was a repeat of a survey shared to DSC customers between April and May 2025, it was not a surprise to receive no responses from DSC customers during the consultation.

2. General survey

The purpose of this survey was to gather customer feedback on the preferred hypothesis in comparison to the other shortlist options.

The survey was designed to be responded to by all DSC organisations.

The survey included links to suggested reading for those who responded to the questions. These were:

- Our [Strategic Outline Case \(SOC\)](#)
- Our [preferred hypothesis briefing pack available on xserve.com](#)

Each question was designed to be answered within one to three sentences, though customers could, and did, provide longer responses.

During the consultation period, we received three responses from DSC customers to this survey. While this is a lower response rate than we were expecting for the consultation, the quality of responses is reassuring.

The questions asked and the response themes were:

1. What are your thoughts on the preferred hypothesis in comparison to the other options discussed?

Responses largely expressed support for the preferred hypothesis approach based on the information available within the consultation. This was largely due to the minimised delivery risk assumed with this model in comparison to self-build and the further adaptability of the hybrid solution.

All responses consistently shared requests for further detail on the Project Trident short-list options.

Responses asked for:

- The sharing of Project Trident analysis in relation to all options within the shortlist.
- Further detail on the cost for Project Trident and assurances on how Project Trident will maintain value for money throughout the process.
- Further detail on steps 1 & 2 within the preferred hypothesis on timelines for where implementation would take place and the scope for each stage.
- Further detail on any anticipated customer impact because of the preferred hypothesis.
- Further detail on the robust governance and risk management processes that will take place throughout Project Trident.

Customers shared strategic considerations for Project Trident:

- Customers saw Project Trident as driven by SAP support date, rather than the pressing need for industry-wide process changes.
- Customers shared requests for Project Trident to coordinate timelines across the industry to avoid change fatigue and clashes.
- Customers shared resource constraints within their organisations and the industry's capacity to support large programmes without clear commercial or technological justification.
- Customers shared requests for this to be minimised through Project Trident.
- Customers wanted assurances that the solution will be adaptable to future approved changes, not just the currently projected ones.

2. Are there any substantive barriers that you foresee with Project Trident's preferred hypothesis?

The following themes were identified as potential barriers to Project Trident's preferred hypothesis:

- A. Dependency on information within Project Trident's OBC:** Customers found the information expected within the OBC as a requirement for this question and that they would require further information on costs and timelines to identify barriers.
- B. Implementation complexity and risk:** Customers identified risks largely with step 2 of the preferred hypothesis related to the risk of increased overheads, scope creep and extended timelines. Customers shared that the phased delivery could add additional complexity for their delivery teams.
- C. Technical uncertainty and migration risk:** Customers were unclear what was included as part of "modular architecture" and "SAP Core Renewal". They shared concerns about the existing pain points with the SAP solution being transferred to new infrastructure.
- D. Communication and industry engagement:** Customers shared a barrier to successful implementation could be a lack of communication with industry parties regarding required testing, changes to connectivity or services and timelines and expectations for each stage.
- E. Value for money and strategic assurance:** Customers shared their requirements for further clarity on the scope of step 2 within the preferred hypothesis. They wanted further assurances on the value for money of the preferred hypothesis, its benefits and whether it would be viable until 2040.

3. How could these barriers be removed or reduced?

Customers felt as if these barriers could be removed or reduced through:

A. Detailed Planning and Early Visibility

- Providing further information for both step 1 and step 2 of the hybrid solution, including:
 - Clear timelines and scope for step 1 & step 2.
 - Identification of impacted parties.
 - Planned work and dependencies.

B. Strong Programme Management

- The implementation of robust programme management to handle complexity.
- Establish clear approach for managing a complex arrangement of contractors and external parties, including oversight and accountability.
- Define governance for detailed design, with clarity on:
 - Decision-making processes.
 - Change control mechanisms.
 - Set early design guardrails to prevent scope creep and shifting requirements.

C. Learning from Past Programmes

- Apply lessons learned from projects such as Project Nexus, particularly around managing evolving industry needs effectively such as by avoiding premature requirement lock-in.

D. Transparent Communication and Cost Visibility

- Regular project updates, covering both technical and non-technical aspects.
- Provide visibility into costs, including:
 - Project Trident expenditure.
 - Future development costs of the selected solution.
- Ensure stakeholders understand what is required at each stage to reduce uncertainty and risk.

4. What information would increase your confidence in Project Trident's preferred hypothesis?

Customers shared that the following would increase their confidence in Project Trident's preferred hypothesis:

- Further clarity on the preferred hypothesis, in terms of costs, timeline and implementation approaches.
- The sharing of Project Trident analysis in relation to all options within the shortlist. Customers shared requests for an options comparison table.
- Anticipated customer and stakeholder impact, including how the hybrid approach addresses known UK Link Pain Points.
- Risk and impact mitigation strategies, including whether the hybrid approach allows us to change to the SAP renewal option for step 2 if required.
- Explanations of the benefits of each option for the future UK Link solution.

5. What kind of case studies would increase your confidence in Project Trident's preferred hypothesis?

Customers would value the following:

- Case studied from upgrades within the UK or EU (particularly GRDF) utilities industry with a comparable level of complexity and lessons learned from these.
- Data access case studies from other organisations.
- Garner and Forrester research to support the preferred hypothesis.

6. For step 2 within the preferred hypothesis, what best-in-class solutions would you like us to consider and why?

Customers had no specific recommendations for solutions or providers.

7. Do you have any questions on the Project Trident preferred hypothesis?

Themes for questions focused on the delivery and implementation of Project Trident.

Throughout the consultation period, the Stakeholder Engagement team received and responded to customer questions to support with their contributions. All non-commercially sensitive questions and answers are published within our [Project Trident Q&A log on xoserve.com](#).

8. Do you have any further comments?

- Customers requested impact on them be minimised, with the focus of change being on what is necessary and confirmed, while ensuring the system allows greater agility and flexibility to incorporate agreed industry changes that could occur in the future.
- Customers requested that transparent and pragmatic timelines for the project are shared, while not unnecessarily extending the ultimate timeline and increasing costs.
- Customers shared the importance of understanding and managing risk throughout the project.
- Customers asked for clear and transparent communication of information, even when that information is incomplete or still under consideration.
- Customers requested that consideration be given to how specific Supplier/Shipper processes will be incorporated into Project Trident for delivery.
- Customers shared their desire for addressing the UK Link Pain Points, within the series of workshops during June and July 2025, and clarity on the plans in place to resolve or improve them.
- Customers stated that they required further information on the preferred hypothesis as they are unsure if it will work with their business models.
- Customers shared funding Project Trident appears more expensive than other industry change projects and would appreciate Xoserve demonstrating the project's value for money.
- Customers questioned whether the aim is still to deliver a like-for-like replacement of UK Link, or if the direction now is to provide an improved UK Link service, therefore not a like-for-like replacement.
- Customers requested a review of potential changes to code(s) that may arise from the modernisation of the UK Link Platform.



Customer workshop findings

The preferred hypothesis customer workshop brought together a diverse range of 25+ customers from Shipper, Transporter and IGT constituencies. Attendees included DSC Contract Managers, Project Trident Engagement & User Representatives, and Project Trident Technical Representatives, to explore the proposed two-step approach, test assumptions, and provide feedback.

We ran the workshop with three key objectives in mind:

1. Better understand customer sentiment on the preferred hypothesis.
2. Explore barriers that customers foresee for the preferred hypothesis and how these can be overcome.
3. Understand what kind of information customers need to give them confidence in the preferred hypothesis.

Key themes from the discussion

Participants were largely supportive of the Project Trident preferred hypothesis, and the two-step approach. Five key themes emerged from conversations within the workshop:

- 1. Flexibility and future proofing:**
It was recognised that step 2 (optimise and simplify the estate) of the preferred hypothesis could provide the agility to respond to industry change, regulatory shifts, and decarbonisation requirements.
- 2. Costs and value for money:**
Participants wanted further information on the benefits case, evidence, cost transparency, and robust vendor/contract management.
- 3. Delivery approach and timelines:**
Participants requested further information on the timelines and delivery approach for Project Trident and cautioned against scope creep for the project.
- 4. Integration and continuity:**
Attendees reiterated the importance of minimising disruption to existing processes, as well as maintaining service continuity during migration. They shared their concerns about resourcing challenges from across the industry resulting in pressures on their time to dedicate to change projects, such as MHHS.
- 5. Data, governance and ownership:**
There was interest in improved data quality and standardisation across the sector.

Below is further detail on each of the key themes discussed at the workshop.

Flexibility and future proofing

Participants largely welcomed the hybrid approach as it provided greater flexibility and resilience for the future. They recognised that step 2's potential move to microservices could enable faster adoption of regulatory changes, decarbonisation measures, and industry initiatives like open data. Many highlighted that the SAP renewal option could be too rigid and costly, and that a more modular architecture could reduce technical debt and allow enhancements to be prioritised based on real customer benefit. Attendees stressed the importance of defining the scope and guardrails of microservices early, to avoid uncontrolled complexity and to control costs carefully. Overall, there was strong consensus that future proofing remains central to the design, ensuring that the system can evolve in line with industry change.

Costs and value for money

Cost transparency was a recurring priority within the workshop. Participants expressed their expectation to understand the potential long-term costs, particularly for step 2, and cautioned against scope creep or cost escalation if vendor and contract management were not tightly controlled. Case studies from other markets were seen as valuable benchmarks to be shared with customers.

Delivery approach and timelines

Participants cautioned against delivery complexity, particularly the potential overlap with other major programmes which are already consuming significant customer resources. Customers warned against setting arbitrary deadlines, noting that industry-driven dates could compromise quality if not balanced with readiness. There was also recognition that, while a phased approach reduces risk, it introduces the challenge of managing dependencies across multiple stages and duplication of effort.

Integration and continuity

Maintaining service continuity during migration was identified as a top customer priority. Many participants underlined the importance of minimising downstream impacts on market participants, particularly in terms of file formats, data flows, and testing requirements. The two-step approach to provide a supported core first and to optimise afterwards was generally welcomed to minimise disruption whilst recognising the need for system enhancements.

Data, governance and ownership

It was recognised that step 2 provides a chance to establish more standardised data models, improve data quality, and enhance reporting and analytics across the industry. Stakeholders were cautious about the potential for scope creep if the CDSP (Central Data Service Provider) were to expand into a “data controller” role rather than remaining a processor. Participants were clear that governance arrangements, roles, and responsibilities must be well defined, and that intellectual property associated with system development should remain owned by the central service provider on behalf of the industry.

Opportunities and risks for steps 1 and 2

Participants were asked to consider the opportunities and risks associated with the two steps of the preferred hypothesis.

Key opportunities identified for step 1:

- Establishing a stable, supported platform with reduced risk of obsolescence within the timeframes of SAP coming out of support.
- Minimising industry disruption during a period of high industry changes by adopting an approach that maintains existing file formats and processes.
- Laying a foundation for future innovation, enabling step 2 to be pursued more flexibly.

Key risks identified for step 1:

- Delivery risk if migration fails to replicate critical custom functionality or leads to unforeseen technical challenges due to lack of flexibility in SAP.
- Risk of underestimating impacts on participant systems, such as testing requirements, integration dependencies or over-reliance on assumptions that current file designs and integration formats will remain viable long term.
- Additional costs if work must later be repeated in step 2 or if the migration approach creates barriers to adapting or improving the system after implementation.

Key opportunities identified for step 2:

- Significant flexibility and agility through modular, microservice-based architecture with enhanced ability to support regulatory change, decarbonisation initiatives, and open data requirements.
- Reduction of technical debt and opportunity to decommission legacy code and processes.
- Ability to leverage cloud-based infrastructure for scalability, resilience, and performance.

Key risks identified for step 2:

- Scope creep due to budget or shifting regulatory or industry requirements and lack of clarity on which microservices should be prioritised.
- Risk of building an overly complex solution, introducing new dependencies rather than simplifying the system.

Building confidence

Workshop participants were asked to vote on which Green Book focus areas (Strategic Fit & Business Need including Security; Potential Value for Money; Affordability; Achievability; Capacity & Capability) would be most valuable for Project Trident. The results were:

1. Strategic Fit & Business Need including Security (15 votes)
2. Capacity & Capability (11 votes)
3. Potential Value for Money (9 votes)

For confidence in the direction of Project Trident, workshop participants wanted evidence of benefits and cost control, realistic timelines, technical robustness, and regulatory compliance.



Feedback & questions to Stakeholder Team & Customer Advisors

Within the consultation, we provided a route for customers to provide feedback to independent Project Advisors. The Project Trident Steering Committee Customer Advisors were launched in June 2025 to provide independence, challenge & advice to the Project Trident Steering Committee. During the consultation period, the Project Trident Steering Committee Customer Advisors received no written consultation responses from customers.

We additionally provided a route for customers to provide feedback outside of the survey & workshop structures. The Project Trident Stakeholder Engagement team received one written response during the consultation period. This response included:

- Requests for further information regarding differences in timelines and delivery risks for SAP renewal and hybrid options.
- Requests for further information regarding how SAP renewal, or SAP and/or alternatives differ in respect of UK Link non-core.
- Requests for the decision regarding the preferred hypothesis to be made soon, to ensure that Project Trident stays on track with indicative project timelines and avoids a compressed implementation phase of a new UK Link solution.
- Concerns about Project Trident project activity taking place in parallel. The responder shared concerns related to Project Trident Solution Definition, Business Case and Procurement activity taking place in parallel and whether this indicated constrained project timelines.



Further information requests

As of Q4 2025, Project Trident is within its solution definition, business case and pre-procurement phase where details related to implementation are being developed. Within the customer consultation, we captured requests for further information to ensure that these are fulfilled, where possible, by the project. This section sets out these requests and where & when within the project lifecycle, they will be fulfilled. For all these requests, we will endeavour to share this information as early as possible. We expect that they will largely be fulfilled within the next stages of the HMT Green Book approach; the OBC and the Full Business Case (FBC).

Request for information within consultation period	Where this will be fulfilled
Project Trident timelines for delivery and implementation, for step 1 & step 2 of the preferred hypothesis.	An indicative timeline will be given in the OBC. The final delivery plan will be subject to discussion and agreement with the selected provider.
Detailed scope for step 1 & step 2 of the preferred hypothesis.	The OBC will share further scope on the preferred option, once selected. We expect that the scope for step 2 will be dependent on decisions made against DSC Changes within BAU governance, including the UK Link Pain Points.
The changes, or customer impacts, expected for CDSP services from step 1, and detail on how the two-step approach will lead to the minimisation of customer impact, and the processes or data impacted at each stage.	The chosen option for Project Trident will be subject to detailed design and change impact assessment within the Design, Build & Test phase. A principle for Project Trident is to minimise customer impact throughout. At this stage, our indicative analysis has pointed to the hybrid approach having a lower customer impact than a bespoke approach.
Governance framework for the implementation of step 2, including how the project will identify the customisation pieces to be removed from the core estate of SAP S4/ HANA, and who will make the decision to proceed.	The Management Case within the HMT Green Book approach details the governance framework. The SOC, published in September 2024, provides an indicative structure. Design related decisions are subject to architectural governance within Xoserve's Architecture Review Board.

Request for information within consultation period	Where this will be fulfilled
Case study for GRDF, and other case studies that are applicable to the CDSPs position within the UK energy industry.	Xoserve will work with the organisations that have provided case studies for Project Trident to understand if we can share these within either the OBC or within confidential briefings.
Lessons learned from industry case studies and how these will be incorporated into Project Trident.	
Case studies that highlight how the other two shortlisted options were not favourable in comparison.	
Data-access case studies.	
Analysis against all options on the Project Trident longlist, including: • The potential end goal for each option. • Insight/evidence that has led to the preferment of the hybrid hypothesis. • Differences in timeline and delivery risks for Project Trident between the options of SAP Renewal and Hybrid. • More information on the retention of SAP (e.g. why Option D Alternative ERP Package was discounted earlier in the process).	The OBC will share analysis against all longlist options in comparison to the critical success factors for Project Trident.
Differences between SAP renewal and alternative options in respect of UK Link non-core.	The Project Trident team can provide further information on this question. We will endeavour to share this information within Q4 2025. Project Trident intends to minimise customer impact, reducing impacts to the UK Link non-core. Some of the UK Link non-core is already non-SAP products.
Greater detail on what type of architecture (could be relevant tables etc.) that form part of the core SAP renewal, and what architecture and information would form part of the modular architecture.	The Project Trident team can provide further information on this question. We will endeavour to share this information within Q4 2025.
Industry testing approach and requirements for customers.	The testing approach for Project Trident will be subject to detailed review with the chosen supplier/s within the Design, Build & Test phase.
The vision for data access/reporting/visualisation and how will customers be engaged to develop that vision into a strategy that meets different customer needs and expectations.	The vision for data access, reporting and visualisation will be incorporated into an Xoserve-wide data strategy. This strategy will highlight where Xoserve wish to drive new capabilities and offering for our customers, including within Project Trident. Xoserve intends to publish this to customers within 2026, subject to review and approval.
A clear summary of costs, including relevant context and justification.	BP26 sets out the indicative and public costs for Project Trident's business case and procurement phase. Further commercially sensitive breakdowns will be provided for Contract Managers within this business planning cycle.

Request for information within consultation period	Where this will be fulfilled
More information on what inherent weaknesses SAP itself presents to an organisation such as Xoserve, and how those weaknesses will be potentially mitigated (for example alternatives to SAP data warehouse functionality).	The Economic Case will present an indicative risk assessment of each option within the constraints of the decision-making criteria in the OBC. This will be further developed within the FBC.
Risk assessment done by constituency i.e. what risks to IGTs are there.	The Economic Case will present an indicative risk assessment of each option within the constraints of the decision-making criteria in the OBC. This will be further developed within the FBC. There will be further risk assessments by user groups within the Design, Build and Test phase.
The benefits of the preferred hypothesis to UK Link, with practical examples.	The Economic Case will present an indicative benefits case of each option within the constraints of the decision-making criteria in the OBC.
Summary for the next steps for the UK Link Pain Points gathered.	The outcomes of the feasibility assessments on the UK Link Pain Points will be presented within Q4 2025.



Conclusions and next steps

Throughout the duration of the consultation, we found that customers largely expressed support or were neutral towards the preferred hypothesis based on the information shared in the consultation. We found customers requested further information on Project Trident in order to be confident in Project Trident's preferred option, whether this be the preferred hypothesis (Hybrid option) or another choice.

On Project Trident's preferred hypothesis, customers agreed step 1 was regarded as providing the necessary foundation to ensure stability and continuity but carried delivery and duplication risks. Step 2 was seen as achieving most of the long-term benefits but is more complex and where greater risks (overheads, scope and customer impact) would surface.

Several themes emerged on what customers would want see further information on to build confidence in both the preferred hypothesis and Project Trident:

- **Cost and value for money:** Value for money was priority for customers within the option selection process for Project Trident. Greater clarity requested on the benefits case, cost transparency, and viability until 2040. Requests for assurances around value for money.
- **Project Management and Governance:** Robust project management and governance of Project Trident, ensuring there is a clear plan and timelines.
- **Scope:** Project Trident needs to limit scope creep, while future proofing the system to ensure flexibility to incorporate future industry changes. Scope should be clearly defined for steps 1 & 2.

- **Industry awareness and continuity:** Coordinate timelines with other industry projects to enable customers to effectively manage resources and avoid clashes. Maintaining service continuity during migration.
- **Engagement and communication:** Customers would like to be provided with updates and information sharing from Project Trident, including the provision of more information on the evidence supporting the preferred hypothesis.

As our next steps, the valuable customer input received as part of the consultation process will be considered when we bring together evidence on the preferred hypothesis and alternatives reviewed. This will all be considered alongside business needs including scalability, flexibility, speed of change and ultimately value for money of the technology option. This collective information will form our preferred option, which will be fully documented in the Outline Business Case (OBC). The creation of the OBC will also aim to provide the information requested by customers such as further clarity on the hybrid option.

This report will be published externally, and there will be a briefing held for customers on the findings from this piece of work. The Request for Information list will form part of our next stage of work. The creation of the OBC will also aim to provide the bulk of the information requested by customers.

