

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Switching Programme Change Request Form | | |

**Part A – For the requestor to fill in**

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Requestor’s Details** |
| Name: Elisabeth Rekker on behalf of MRA Faster Switching Expert Group (FSEG)  Organisation: Gemserv  Email address: [FSEG@gemserv.com](mailto:FSEG@gemserv.com) / [elisabeth.rekker@gemserv.com](mailto:elisabeth.rekker@gemserv.com)  Telephone number: 020 7090 1029  Please note that by default we will include the name and organisation of the Change Requestor in Switching Programme’s published Change Log. If you do not wish to be identified please tick this box |

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Title** |
| Retrospectively updating MPAN’s Import/Export Code (Metering Point Energy Flow) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Summary** |
| Note: The Metering Point Energy Flow (Import/Export Code) was previously referred to as an indicator in this CR and DCC documentation. The Meter Point Energy Flow is a Boolean field and therefore can only be ‘true’ or ‘false’. This has been updated to a code to allow for text values such as ‘I’ and ‘E’ in the Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC).  It has been identified that the Central Switching Service (CSS) design assumes that the electricity supply (either import or export) to a premises will not change in the lifetime of the Meter Point Administration Number (MPAN). This is not reflective of the functionality currently in operation.  There may be instances where it provides benefit to the customer, as well as to the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) to allow DNOs to correct and rectify errors once in the lifetime of a Registered Meter Point (RMP), back to the creation of the RMP.  The change requested is to allow the DNOs to rectify errors and update CSS with the import and export status of a supply via the Meter Point Administration Service (MPAS), similarly to what is in place in current governance. This will ensure that the enduring processes can continue outside of the CSS and ensure that the CSS continues to remain synchronised with MPAS.  The CSS will send the export/import code to the Data Service Provider (DSP). The DSP primarily requires the code for access control purposes as the import and export suppliers are different user types. The import/export code will be passed to the DSP as either the value ‘I’ (Import) or ‘E’ (Export).  Following this change it should be considered where the regulatory framework on this should sit. Until it is superseded by the Retail Energy Code (REC), this is governed in the MRA under MRA Agreed Procedure (MAP) 04 – Procedure for Error Resolution and Retrospective Manual Amendments.  Additionally, as the import / export status will be derived by an enduring DNO attribute, the Line Loss Factor Class (LLFC) ID for pricing, billing and settlement and not related to switching.  ECOES users will still be able to view the import/export status as they do today. This will still come from MPAS’s to ECOES. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change considerations & viewpoint** | |
| *Please provide your considerations and views on change using information available to you and stakeholders you have engaged.* | |
| **Priority assessment for Change Request**  **An important change; its absence would be very inconvenient, although a 'work-around' is possibleAn important change; its absence would be very inconvenient, although a 'work-around' is possible** | If Suppliers cannot change the import/export status of a supply once it is set, this would require the Supplier to terminate an MPAN and create a new MPAN whenever they would need to rectify an error. The termination and creation of MPANs could cause additional cost, and confusion and negative impacts for customers. |
| **Base reason for Change**  **Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope** | The change requests for a functionality to be added to the baseline design: i.e. the functionality to update the import/export status of an MPAN retrospectively. |
| **Rating of Change implementation**  LOW - Minor consequence requiring some minor redesign or rework; Minor cost impact; Minor impact to schedule | This change can be taken as part of the further development that is undertaken by parties and this should limit the impact of the change.  It is unlikely the change will cause significant additional costs and/or any delays and impact to the schedule. |
| **“Do nothing” implications** | If this CR does not go ahead, customers could be impacted if errors in the status of their Supply cannot be rectified.  It is expected the need to update of this status will increase going forward, with an increase of renewable energy solutions and innovation. |
| **Potential stakeholders affected by the Change** | * Customers * Suppliers * System Providers * DNOs |
| **Alternative sought to reduce negative impact** | No alternatives aside from a workaround method have been identified at this point. |
| **Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change** | Delaying decision may be a risk to the implementation of the Change. |
| **Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted** | The Change was discussed at FSEG, which members include DNOs, system providers and Suppliers. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Justification for Change** |
| The change requested is to allow the DNOs to rectify errors and update CSS with the import and export status of a supply via the Meter Point Administration Service (MPAS), similarly to what is in place in current governance. This will ensure that the enduring processes can continue outside of the CSS and ensure that the CSS continues to remain synchronised with MPAS.  If DNOs are able to rectify errors, the impact on customers can be reduced, as workaround processes could cause considerable confusion. Additionally, the industry would have to work together to agree the design and the additional consequential changes for existing central, DNO and supplier systems.  Any change in RMP would also have to be highlighted to the customer to ensure there would be no consequential effect on their switching experience. If DNOs can rectify errors retrospectively the possibility of this risk can be mitigated by implementing this change. Any errors can be rectified once in the lifetime of an RMP, back to the creation of the RMP. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Programme Products affected by proposed change** |
| ABACUS Data Model  ABACUS Design Depositary |

Please submit this completed form to the Ofgem Switching Programme PMO Team ([SwitchingPMO@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:SwitchingPMO@ofgem.gov.uk)) with the subject as the Change Request number and title.

**Part B – For Ofgem Use Only**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Change request No.** | CR-E37 | **Date CR submitted** | 15/03/2019 |
| **Change request status:** | Approved | **Current CR version:** | v1.0 |
| **Change Window:** | 19 | **Version date:** | 10/05/2019 |
|  | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:** | Name and organisation: Jenny Boothe |
| **Contact details:** | Email address: [jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk) |
| **PMO Lead:** | Name: Matthew Finlay |
| **Contact details:** | Email address: [matthew.finlay@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.finlay@ofgem.gov.uk) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial assessment/Triage** | |
| *Please provide a summary of the initial assessment, detailing any changes made by the Change Advisory Team (CAT) which includes Ofgem PMO, Design, Implementation, Alignment, Commercial, Regulatory and Security Workstream Leads and DCC.* | |
| **Design & Data Impact and resource input required for IA?**  Yes – as set out below | |
| **Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?**  No | |
| **Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?**  No | |
| **Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?**  No | |
| **Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?**  No | |
| **Security Impact and resource input required for IA?**  No | |
| Detailed Switching Repository - Data and Messaging:   * Message CSS\_00400 (Metering Point RMP Event) modified to include new event type and related data elements * Add a new RMP Event subtype to the data model * Remove the attribute ‘Metering Point Energy Flow’ from the ‘Registrable Measurement Point’ entity * Ensuring 2 above changes are reflected in both the E2E and CSS diagrams * Replacing ‘Metering Point Energy Flow’ from the message RECM\_SN\_CSS00300 (Metering Point Synchronisation) with attributes from the new subtype * Replacing ‘Metering Point Energy Flow’ from the message RECM\_SN\_CSS02900 (Smart Metering RMP Synchronisation) with attributes from the new subtype * Ensuring ABACUS message catalogue and is updated with afore-mentioned message changes   D4.2.1 User Requirements Specification:   * Update references in URS to new RMP Event   D-4.1.5 E2E Solution Architecture:   * Central Data Services section contains following text:   “The Retail Offering (Import or Export) will be identified for each RMP –once set this indicator cannot be changed. | |
| **Major or Minor Change?** | Minor |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change Process Route** | Standard |
| **Change Window** | 19 |
| **To be submitted to the Design Forum on:** | 18/03/2019  25/03/2019 |
| **Approval Authority:** | Design Authority |
| **Target Change Decision Date:** | 05/04/2019 |
|  | |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matt Finlay 01/04/2019 | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment** |
| The change has a positive impact for customers, as it prevents unnecessary administration and confusion when the import / export status of an MPAN is adjusted. |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matt Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Industry cost** |
| The change is part of the existing changes that industry are processing and the additional cost for industry is limited. |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matt Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Resource Effort** |
| *1 wd DCC Business Analyst to update design products*  *1 wd DCC Data Architect to update Detailed Switching Repository*  *1 wd Quality Assurance analyst to validate changes*  *1 wd DCC project Manager to co-ordinate approvals and release of updated documents* |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 18/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Programme** |
| *The main benefit of the change is the decreased impact on customers, as it prevents any confusion when the import/export code needs to be corrected and thus improving the customer experience, similarly to the current governance under the MRA.* |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment –Programme Design & Architectural Principles** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Design Principle** | **Description** | **RAG Status & Summary** | | **Impact on Consumers** | | | | 1 Reliability for customers | All switches should occur at the time agreed between the customer and their new supplier. The new arrangements should facilitate complete and accurate communication and billing with customers. Any errors in the switching process should be minimised and where they do occur, the issue should be resolved quickly and with the minimum of effort from the customer. The customer should be alerted in a timely manner if any issues arise that will impact on their switching experience. | Green – In the current arrangements there is a risk that a customer may attempt to switch with the old MPAN if the MPAN has recently been rectified. This change will remove this risk as it will not require a new MPAN. | | 2 Speed for customers | Customers should be able to choose when they switch. The arrangements should enable fast switching, consistent with protecting and empowering customers currently and as their expectations evolve. | Green – No Impact | | 3 Customer Coverage | Any differences in customer access to a quick, easy and reliable switching process should be minimised and justified against the other Design Principles. | Green – No Impact | | 4 Switching Experience | Customers should be able to have confidence in the switching process. The process should meet or exceed expectations, be simple and intuitive for customers and encourage engagement in the market. Once a customer has chosen a new supplier, the switching process should require the minimum of effort from the customer. The customer should be informed of the progress of the switch in a timely manner. | Green – The change would benefit the customer experience positively. | | **Impact on Market Participants** | | | | 5 Competition | The new supply point register and switching arrangements should support and promote effective competition between market participants. Where possible, processes should be harmonised between the gas and electricity markets and the success of the switching process should not be dependent on the incumbent supplier or its agents. | Green – No impact. | | 6 Design – simplicity | The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible. | Green – No impact. | | 7 Design – robustness | The end-to-end solution should be technically robust and integrate efficiently with other related systems. It should be clearly documented, with effective governance. The new arrangements should proactively identify and resolve impediments to meeting consumers’ and industry requirements. These arrangements should be secure and protect the privacy of personal data. | Green – The proposed arrangements in this change simplify the process and should prevent issues when a MPAN status are corrected from export to import and vice versa. | | 8 Design – flexibility | The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models. | Green – The change enables the system to be better equipped to mitigate errors, as it will be possible to rectify the code. | | **Impact on Delivery, Costs and Risks** | | | | 9 Solution cost/benefit | The new arrangements should be designed and implemented so as to maximise the net benefits for customers. | Green – This change will increase the benefits for customers. | | 10 Implementation | The plan for delivery should be robust, and provide a high degree of confidence, taking into account risks and issues. It should have clear and appropriate allocation of roles and responsibilities and effective governance. | Green – It does not alter the delivery plan. |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Architectural Principle** | **Description** | **RAG Status & Summary** | | 1 Secure by default & design | All risks documented & managed to within the tolerance defined by the organisation or accepted by the Senior Risk Owner | Green - No impact | | 2 Future Proof Design | Common design approaches will better enable designs to support future developments  e.g. A mechanism for achieving non-repudiation | Green - No impact.  The change is ensuring existing industry scenarios can be supported | | 3 Standards Adoption | Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes.  e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition | Green - No impact | | 4 One Architecture | One single definitive architecture prevails | Green – No impact | | 5 Data is an asset | Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly | Green – No impact | | 6 Data is shared & accessible | Users have access to the data necessary to perform their duties; therefore, data is shared across enterprise functions and departments. | Green – No impact | | 7 Common vocabulary & data definitions | Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users. | Green – the proposed design change implements the setting or updating of the energy flow through an RMP event, in line with existing data modelling approach | | 8 Requirements-based change | Only in response to business needs are changes to applications and technology made.  E.g. only industry arrangements affecting switching will be impacted. | Green – existing business scenario has been the driver for this change | | 9 Quality Characteristics | Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services. | Green – No impact |   **Summary: -** |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 09/05/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration** |
| *There are no impacts on the planned data migration and data cleansing activities, as there is no requirement for industry to cleanse their data. The code will be derived at the point of migration to the CSS.* |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Programme Plan** |
| The change is not necessary for CSS go-live and will not impact the procurement process or parties’ implementation activities, as the change only allows for errors in the import/export code to be adjusted. |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Assessment – Security** |
| There is no impact on the Programme’s Security Strategy. The change only allows for parties to retrospectively correct errors in assigning the import/export code. |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 01/04/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Programme Recommendation** |
| Recommendation for Approval |
| **Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Date:**  Matthew Finlay 10/05/2019 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Request Decision** |
| Approved |
| **Changed Approved: Yes**  **Decision Maker (Name & Role):** **Date:**  Arik Dondi 10/05/2019 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Next Steps** | | |
| Next steps include updating the impacted Programme Products (ABACUS Data Model and ABACUS Design Depositary). | | |
| ***If Change Request is approved:-*** | **Role** | **Date** |
| **Product updates to be completed by:** | DCC |  |
| **Ofgem review dates:** |  |  |
| **Product approval to be completed by:** | Arik Dondi |  |