

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Ofgem

Organisation: Ofgem

Email address: SwitchingPMO @ofgem.gov.uk

Telephone number:

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

Removal of the synchronisation message to the DSP of a validated switch request

Change Summary

This change request seeks to remove the synchronisation message that is sent to the DSP when a registration request has successfully completed validation.

On receipt of this synch the DSP **must** update its system to reflect that it has recorded that a registration request has been validated. At this point the DSP will not undertake any activity that will enable the gaining supplier to prepare commands to the smart meter as there is still the possibility of the registration request being cancelled.

Should this change be accepted costs may be avoided in that functionality to override or delete validation update will no longer be required in the DSP system.

Change considerations & viewpoint	
<i>Please provide your considerations and views on change using information available to you and stakeholders you have engaged.</i>	
Priority assessment for Change Request Potentially an important opportunity to improve on programme cost, schedule or quality	DSP functionality costs may be avoided and therefore reduce overall programme costs. Also, accepting this change request will remove one aspect of testing
Base reason for Change Programme - Changes in the programme's anticipated benefits, Stakeholder/governance additions, change	Removing this validation synch message will remove unnecessary functionality in the DSP.

Rating of Change implementation LOW - Minor consequence requiring some minor redesign or rework; Minor cost impact; Minor impact to schedule	This is low because functionality is being removed from the CSS and the DSP
"Do nothing" implications	The DSP must update its system to record that a registration request has been validated but the inclusion of this function does not have any business value. Therefore keeping this function is building in redundant functionality.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	DSP and CSS
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	N/A
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	No risks identified as a function is being removed from the logical design
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	DSP, DCC design team, Ofgem design lead

Justification for Change

In the early stages of the switching design and business processes it was considered beneficial that key central data service systems should receive synchronised messages for each state of the registration request, i.e. validated, confirmed and secured. It was felt that this approach would help prepare key industry parties that a switch would take place. This view is still appropriate for all the CDSs but this is no longer the case for the DSP.

The DSP manages access control to smart meter devices. On receipt of the 'confirmed' synch message it will allow the gaining supplier to prepare commands that will need to be sent to the smart meter to execute the switch. The, on receipt of the 'secure' synch message it will enable these commands to be executed.

A synch message requires the receiving system to be updated and to reflect the originating system. Therefore, as currently designed, the DSP must update its system on receipt of the 'validated' synch message.

The DSP queried the business benefit of this message. Once received the DSP will not undertake any business activity but must update its system. Given that there is the possibility of the registration request being cancelled after it has been validated the DSP will need to add in additional functionality to remove/delete the validation status from its system if it does not receive a confirmation synch message.

Although, the same is the case for a 'confirmed' synch, at this stage there is more likelihood of the registration request becoming 'secured'. Therefore the 'confirmed' synch message would be the trigger for the DSP to enable the gaining supplier to prepare its commands for the smart change of supplier process.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

ABACUS Processes
ABACUS data architecture model
Solution Architecture
URS
URS 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

Change request No.	CR-E22	Date CR submitted	24 Oct 2018
Change request status:	Withdrawn	Current CR version:	
Change Window:	9	Version date:	

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Name and organisation: Jenny Boothe
Contact details:	Email address: jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk
PMO Lead:	Name: - Sharina Begum
Contact details:	Email address: sharina.begum@ofgem.gov.uk

Initial assessment/Triage	
<i>Change Request withdrawn following assessment at triage and replaced by CR-E23</i>	
Design & Data Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?	
Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Security Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request?	
Major or Minor Change?	[Assessment of effort to complete IA, FTE impact for implementation of change or assessment of consequential impacts]

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

Change Process Route	
Change Window	
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	
Approval Authority:	
Target Change Decision Date:	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment	
<p><i><Insert/embed a summary of overall impacts resulting from the change, for example industry/consumer costs and benefits etc.</i></p> <p><i>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?></i></p>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
<p><i><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.></i></p>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort	
<p><i><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</i></p>	

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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. >

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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.	
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.	
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.	
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.	
Impact on Market Participants		

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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

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

Summary: -

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration	
<i><Insert/embed the assessment of impacts in relation to planned data migration or cleansing activities.></i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan	
<i><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?></i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Security	
<i><Insert/embed the assessment of impacts against the Programme's Security Strategy and baselined security products.></i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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

Change Request Decision

<i><Insert the decision of the Approval Authority together with any conditions of the approval></i>	
Changed Approved:	Yes / No
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	Date:

Next Steps		
<i><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></i>		
<i>If Change Request is approved:-</i>	Role	Date
Products updates to be completed by:		
Ofgem review dates:		
Product approval to be completed by:		