Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Paul Harding

Organisation: Data Communications Company

Email address: paul.harding@smartdcc.co.uk

Telephone number: 07891 265695

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

Amendments and clarifications to the Service Management System requirements (D-10.4)

Change Summary

Introduction

During review of the requirements document ahead of the tender pack issuance for Project 4 (Service Management System) we spotted a small number of inconsistencies between some of the document sets, and upon a second review identified some requirements we would like to amend on the grounds of changing operational needs. These can be summarised as providing more detail and granularity regarding our hosting requirements, and reprioritising functionality for staff rostering. Please see below for further detail:

Physically Hosted or Cloud-Based Solution

Currently the requirements in D-10.4 stipulate that a vendor must provide a hosted SMS solution, which as written may be seen to preclude cloud-based platforms. It is therefore proposed that the existing requirement for a hosted solution is amended to make it clear it is an either/or choice rather than a must. This change should be reflected accordingly across the requirements for the SMS and Portal.

SMS001 & SMP001 Wording to be changed too (red text is the change):

If cloud based, the Service Management System SP shall provide and operate a Cloud Based Solution for the Service Management Systems, which shall be in full compliance with DCC's Cloud Adoption Policy and Annex X (see Tender pack). This shall include the provision of:

    a) All data and back-up information hosted in the UK
    b) A dedicated environment
    c) 24x7 support
    d) Management of upgrades, patches or other maintenance

If physically hosted, the Service Management System SP shall provide and operate an IT Hosting Service for the Service Management Systems, which shall include provision of… (see D-10.4 spreadsheet for full requirements).

MoSCoW Ratings

As a final step, we have reviewed the MoSCoW allocations of the SMS requirements, and determined that there are three we wish to change following further discussions with our Operations team. This change was made to increase the granularity of our bidder evaluations, and to provide bidders with a clearer view of our needs. Please see below for a record of which requirements have been changed, and what they have been changed to:

- 'Could to Must' (**SMS013**): "The Service Management System shall capture staff roster and provide forward and historical views including calendars." The rationale for this change is that DCC Operations wish to manage staffing using functionality within the SMS rather than have to manage it across multiple systems or tools.

- 'Should to Must' (**SMS014**): "The Service Management System shall time-record working hours for Service Desk Agents." Linked to the above, to effectively manage Service Desk staffing from within a single tool, DCC Operations requires that the SMS records actual hours works as well as providing a forward-looking view via the calendar.

- 'Could to Should' (**SMS015**): "The Service Management System shall provide absence and leave recording, demand and availability management for Service Desk Agents." Linked to the above, to effectively manage Service Desk staffing from within a single tool, DCC Operations would prefer that the SMS allows for functionality that accounts absence and leave recording as this would be simplest from a system pint of view. However it is seen as a Should rather than a Must as some of this functionality is provided separately by other tools and wouldn't necessarily all need to managed within the SMS.

Change Effort
It is anticipated that making the changes will take around ½ a day for a DCC Service Architect.

Change Cost
Cost of change is zero as it only affects DCC's requirements spreadsheet.

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 possible**	Ideally these requirements would be included as part of the tender packs to provide bidders with enough correct information as possible. However, if necessary these changes can be made during BAFO though it will have an impact on bidder cost estimates in their initial responses.
Base reason for Change **Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope**	The base reason is to offer bidders more clarity around options when proposing their solutions (i.e. cloud based or hosted platform) and to reflect the importance DCC Operations places on managing staffing within the SMS.

Rating of Change implementation LOW - Minor consequence requiring some minor redesign or rework; Minor cost impact; Minor impact to schedule	At this stage the impact of not making the change is fairly low as it can be amended during BAFO, however as stated earlier changes to the requirements following issuance of the tender packs will affect the accuracy of bidder price estimates in their tender responses.
"Do nothing" implications	The longer-term do-nothing implication is that the SMS is not fit for purpose in term of how Operations intend to use it if we aren't clear with bidders around how we plan to use it. It will also affect the cost of the solution if bidders aren't clear about whether a physically hosted or cloud-based platform can be considered.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	Bidders, DCC Operations, Switching Programme
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	Do not make the change now and wait until the BAFO stage before amending the requirements.
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	No risks identified in the implementation of the change
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	DCC Operations and Service Management, DCC Security

Justification for Change

The changes to the requirements are needed to better reflect DCC's operational and business needs, and to provide prospective bidders more clarity when they are proposing hosting solutions.

During review of the requirements document ahead of tender pack issuance for Project 4 (Service Management System) we spotted a small number of inconsistencies between some of the document sets, and upon a second review identified some requirements we would like to amend on the grounds of changing operational needs.

The impact of not approving these changes are that the materials sent out to bidders in the tender packs do not reflect DCC's true requirements. These will then have to be communicated at the BAFO instead, which will negatively impact on the bidders' original cost estimates.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

D-10.4 – Service Management Tools Requirements (requirements spreadsheet)

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

Green - Requestor to complete   **Orange** – Ofgem to complete   **Blue -** Impact Assessment Team to complete

Change request No.	CR-E20	Date CR submitted	19 October 2018
Change request status:		Current CR version:	
Change Window:	9	Version date:	

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Name and organisation: Paul Harding, DCC
Contact details:	Paul.harding@smartdcc.co.uk
PMO Lead:	Sharina Begum
Contact details:	Sharina.begum@ofgem.gov.uk

Inital 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?
Low – impact as the CR is relating to clarifications of the requirements

Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?
Low as this only relates to changes of the capability of the service

Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?
Low – only one product needs to be amended.

Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?
None – this change will be implicit in the design and referred to at BAFO.

Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?
None

Security Impact and resource input required for IA?
None

Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request?
D-10.4 – Service Management Tools Requirements (requirements spreadsheet)

Major or Minor Change?	Minimal impact

Change Process Route	Standard
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 (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	**02/11/18**

Impact Assessment

<Insert/embed a summary of overall impacts resulting from the change, for example industry/consumer costs and benefits etc.

Ensure coverage of Benefits - what will be achieved by making the change, who do those benefits accrue to; Costs - what sort of cost will be imposed as a result of the change, who will those costs fall to, what impact does that have on the programme business case, is there a clear cost benefit equation?>

Change Effort

It is anticipated that making the changes will take around ½ a day for a DCC Service Architect.

No additional costs as these changes will be included at BAFO

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	**02/11/18**

Impact Assessment – Industry cost

<Insert/embed the details of industry costs/benefits resulting from this change, including details of costs impacts if the change is not made. Does the change significantly divert industry resource away from established plans.>

Cost of change is zero as it only affects DCC's requirements spreadsheet

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	2/11/18

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort

<Insert/embed the resource costs in £ or FTE required to enact the change e.g. update documents etc. Covering - Who will bear the costs of making the change? Is resource available

to do the work on the required timescales? Does the change significantly divert resource in the programme away from established plans.>

It is anticipated that making the changes will take around ½ a day for a DCC Service Architect.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

Impact Assessment – Programme

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

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A

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.	N/A
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.	N/A
6 Design – simplicity	The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible.	N/A
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.	N/A
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	N/A
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.	N/A

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.	N/A

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	N/A
2 Future Proof Design	Common design approaches will better enable designs to support future developments e.g. A mechanism for achieving non-repudiation	N/A
3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	N/A
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	N/A
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	N/A
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.	N/A
7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	N/A
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.	N/A
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	N/A

Summary: -

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration	
<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts in relation to planned data migration or cleansing activities.> No impact	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

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, testing or diversion of programme resources? Is the change necessary for go-live?> No impact	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

Impact Assessment – Security	
<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts against the Programme's Security Strategy and baselined security products.> No impact	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

Programme Recommendation	
<Insert the Programme's recommendation for decision, note this could be a minded to decision in advance of Design Forum> Approve	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Jenny Boothe	02/11/18

Change Request Decision

Green - Requestor to complete   **Orange** – Ofgem to complete   **Blue** - Impact Assessment Team to complete

<Insert the decision of the Approval Authority together with any conditions of the approval>

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" style="background-color:#E8742C">Next Steps</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"><If the change is approved, insert a summary of next steps here including which products are to be updated as a result of this CR and details of any stakeholder engagement required. Complete the table below detailing agreed timescales for product update, review & approval></td></tr>
<tr><td>If Change Request is approved:-</td><td>Role</td><td>Date</td></tr>
<tr><td>Products updates to be completed by:</td><td>DCC Service Management team</td><td>Early January 2019</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ofgem review dates:</td><td></td><td>Early January 2019</td></tr>
<tr><td>Product approval to be completed by:</td><td></td><td>Early January2019</td></tr>
</table>

Green - Requestor to complete   **Orange –** Ofgem to complete   **Blue -** Impact Assessment Team to complete