Switching Programme
Change Request Form

Ofgem use only:

Change request No.	CR-E18	**Current CR version:**	v.5
Change request status:	Approved	**Version date:**	09/11/18
Change Window:	8		

Please submit this completed form to the Ofgem Switching Programme PMO Team (SwitchingPMO@ofgem.gov.uk)

Change Requestor's details – Change Requestor to complete

Name: Andrew Wallace/Phil Bryan

Organisation: DCC Switching Programme

Email address: andrew.wallace@ofgem.gov.uk / phil.bryan@smartdcc.co.uk

Telephone number: 020 3263 9818 / 07743816702

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 – Change Requestor to complete

Registration Deactivation elaboration

Change summary – Change Requestor to complete

A Registration Deactivation Request may be submitted that is subsequently amended or revoked later. CSS should have the ability to suitably adjust the records of Registration Lifecycle Status (Active/Inactive) that it holds in such circumstances.

To retain a fully auditable record that is consistent, coherent and complete within secondary data services as well as CSS (the mastering data service), a Timestamp will be captured from the Registration Deactivation Request in addition to the Registration Lifecycle Status From Date, as follows:

Registration Lifecycle Status Source Capture Timestamp –

The point in time at which a lifecycle status is recorded by a data service. In circumstances in which the record of the event is passed from one data service to another, this shall be the capture time of the originating or source data service and not the time at which the event is passed-on.

Amendments to a registration deactivation will be achieved by creation of an overriding Registration Lifecycle Status set to "Active" with an identical Registration Lifecycle Status From Date and a corresponding (later) Registration Lifecycle Status Source Capture Timestamp. All data services must read the Registration Lifecycle Status with the latest Registration Lifecycle Status Source Capture Timestamp to obtain the most recent amendments of registration deactivation.

A Registration Lifecycle Status will only override a previously submitted Registration Lifecycle Status if its From Date is identical to the previous Registration Lifecycle Status's From Date.

Once a registration deactivation has been overridden in this way, the registration is considered"Active" and may continue on its natural lifecycle.

The inclusion of a Registration Lifecycle Status Source Capture Timestamp in itself places no restrictions upon the timing of submission of a Registration Deactivation Request. If Registration Lifecycle Status data is used by other data services e.g. UK Link or MPAS, it will be for the industry code that governs that service to determine when the Registration Lifecycle Status shall be deemed effective from.

Justification for change – Change Requestor to complete
Data services must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate alterations following the submission of a Registration Deactivation Request. Failure to do so will result in complex operational-workarounds that will degrade the reliability of registration data.

Requested Decision Timing – Change Requestor to complete
As soon as possible to provide clarity to the CSSP and to industry participants.

Programme Products affected by proposed change – Change Requestor to complete
<Please outline which product(s) are expected to be impacted by the proposed change. You **must** include the relevant product version number(s) and publication date(s) here> D-4.1.2 E2E Detailed Design Models V2.0 22nd June 2018 D-4.1.3 E2E Data Architecture and Data Governance V2.0 22nd June 2018 D-4.2.1 CSS User Requirements Specification V2.0 22nd June 2018

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Jenny Boothe
Contact details:	Henny.boothe'ofgem.gov.uk 0203 263 9818
PMO Lead:	Sharina Begum
Contact details:	Sharina.begum@ofgem.gov.uk

Change Assessment Team – Initial Assessment (Triage)
<Please provide a summary of the initial assessment made by the Change Advisory Team (CAT) which includes Ofgem PMO, Design, Implementation, Alignment, Commercial, Regulatory and Security Workstream Leads and DCC. **NB - THIS MUST DETAIL THE PROGRAMME PRODUCTS IMPACTED BY THE CHANGE REQUEST**.>
Change has a Design Impact? This CR has a limited impact on the design as it is an further elaboration of ab existing process Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18 Role: Design Lead
Change has an Implementation Impact (including Programme Plan)? <Would the change impact programme timelines, procurement process, other parties implementation activity?> No Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18

Role: Design Lead

Change has an Alignment Impact?

No

Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18

Role: Design Lead

Change has a Commercial/Procurement Impact?

No

Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18

Role: Design Lead

Change has a Regulatory Impact?

No

Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18

Role: Design Lead

Change has a Security Impact?

No

Name: Jenny Boothe Date: 10/10/18

Role: Design Lead

Change IA Effort	Minor
Change Process Route	Full
Change Window	8
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	22/10/18 29/10/18
Approval Authority:	DA
Target Change Decision Date:	09/11/18

Checked for completeness by: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	20/10/18

Impact Assessment – Overall

Effort to change products prior to CSS procurement completion will be very small in comparison to costs to resolve later in the Programme.

There is a clear benefit gained by the increased clarity of the design by way of the avoidance of specification and development costs, both to CSS and industry services.

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort

DCC Programme effort required to update identified products is estimated to be 2 FTE for 1 day.

Upstream services will require modification to populate and interpret Registration Lifecycle Status Source Capture Timestamp but are believed to be cost neutral in comparison to

alternative integration patterns involving generation of data update commands and data reconciliation.

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

Impact Assessment – Programme OBC

<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts against the Programme's Outline Business Case (OBC), especially taking account of any costs and/or benefits to external parties.>

No impact

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

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.	Allows registration deactivation errors to be corrected as they should be - within the operational services
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.	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.	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.	No impact
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.	No impact
6 Design – simplicity	The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible.	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.	Allows registration deactivation errors to be corrected within the scope of the overall design
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	This provides a flexible approach to correcting registration deactivation errors.
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.	No impact
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.	No impact

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	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	No impact
3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	No impact
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	No impact
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	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.	No impact
7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	No impact
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.	No impact
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	No impact

Summary: -

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**

Impact Assessment –Programme Plan

<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts against the Programme Plan. Ensure coverage of what the change does to programme timelines, taking into account impact on the procurement process, parties' implementation activities or diversion of programme resources?>

No impact

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

Impact Assessment – Security

<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts against the Programme's Security Strategy and baselined security products.>

No impact

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

Programme Recommendation

<Insert the Programme's recommendation for decision, note this could be a minded to decision in advance of Design Forum>

Approve

Assessment completed By: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Andrew Wallace	20/10/18

Next Steps

<If the change is approved, insert a summary of next steps including which products are to be updated as a result of this CR and details of any stakeholder engagement required>

Change Request Decision

Approve

Change Approved:	**Yes**
Decision maker: (Name & Role)	**Date:**
Arik Dondi Chair, DA	09/11/18