ofgem
Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Andy Boojers

Organisation: Smart DCC

Email address: andy.boojers@smartdcc.co.uk

Telephone number: 07855 277 841

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

Rejection of cosmetic change proposed under CR E-36 to include unique identifiers for data elements included in messages.

Change Summary

RegNotification Interface

CR-E36 described 26 changes for the Detailed Switching Repository (ABACUS) for artefacts other than those related to data and messages. 4 of these proposed changes related to updating elements of the model with the notion of a RegNotification interface. This notion was originally proposed as a design option for CR-E08/09 but discounted. Therefore these changes are obsolete. This CR will ensure that all obsolete changes are backed out in a consistent manner.

Interaction Sequence Diagram Changes

Also included within CR was a proposed change to update the description of interactions contained in several sequence diagrams. It is proposed to reject this change. on the basis that these sequence diagrams are likely to be impacted by CR-E41 'Update to Registration Request Status, Registration Status and supporting business rules'.

Change C315 proposed to introduce a new business rule to the Registration Event Validation Decision Service – this change is proposed to be rejected.

Change C320 proposed to introduce a new decision service that has been identified as unnecessary and is proposed to be rejected.

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 **A Nice-to Have but not vital, cosmetic change; of no importance**	This request reverses changes set out in CR-E36.
Base reason for Change **Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope**	Prevent pollution of design products with obsolete information.

Rating of Change implementation Rating **Very Low**	Very Low
"Do nothing" implications	Design Products will be updated in line with ALL changes set out in CR E-36, including those that would introduce obsolete, and incorrect information into the design products.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	N/a – minor cosmetic change only
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	N/a
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	N/a
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	DCC Design Lead, DCC Data Architect and DCC Lead Business Analyst

Justification for Change
Maintain the accuracy and integrity of the design products. RegNotification Interface This notion was originally proposed as a design option for CR-E08/09 but discounted. Therefore these changes are obsolete. In conjunction with CRs E-33 & E-35, E-x this CR will ensure that all obsolete changes are backed out in a consistent manner. C366 proposed to introduce the RegNotification interface to the interface catalogue, and as such, is also proposed to be withdrawn. Interaction Sequence Diagram (ISD) Changes C194, C322 & C323 proposed the introduction of, or amendments to, sequence diagrams to accommodate changes to forced registration scenario. As described in CR-E42, these changes are not required and the current CR will ensure consistency on this particular issue across all design products. C324 proposed changes to ISDs are rejected on the basis that they are likely to be impacted by CR-E41 'Update to Registration Request Status, Registration Status and supporting business rules'. Business Rules and Decision Services Changes C315 & C320 are proposed to be rejected due to subsequently being identified as unnecessary.

Programme Products affected by proposed change
D-4.1.2 E2E Detailed Design Models D-4.1.3 E2E Data Architecture and Data Governance

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

Part B – For Ofgem Use Only

Change request No.	CR-E45	**Date CR submitted**	28/05/2019
Change request status:	Approved	**Current CR version:**	v1.0
Change Window:	24	**Version date:**	14/06/2019

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

Inital assessment/Triage	
Design & Data Impact and resource input required for IA? Yes	
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	
Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request? 1.1. D-4.1.2 E2E Detailed Design Models D-4.1.3 E2E Data Architecture and Data Governance	
Major or Minor Change?	Minor

Change Process Route	Standard
Change Window	24
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	Paper Date: 10th June Date of Design Forum: 17th June
Approval Authority:	Arik Dondi – Chair, Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	28th June 2019
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	06/06/2019

Impact Assessment	
Minor change with no discernible impacts	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
None identified – change raised to reverse obsolete changes raised in previous CR and make several cosmetic adjustments	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme	
No impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort	
No impact on DCC resources identified	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.

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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
6 Design – simplicity	The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.

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	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
2 Future Proof Design	Common design approaches will better enable designs to support future developments e.g. A mechanism for achieving non-repudiation	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
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.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles

7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
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.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles

Summary: -

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration	
No impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan	
No impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Security	
No impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Programme Recommendation	
Recommendation for Approval received.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	14/06/2019

Change Request Decision	
Approved.	
Changed Approved:	**Yes**
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	14/06/2019

Next Steps		
Change Request Approved.		
If Change Request is approved:-	**Role**	**Date**
Products updates to be completed by:	DCC	
Ofgem review dates:		
Product approval to be completed by:	Ofgem	