

## 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 D-10.2 Service Management Requirements spreadsheet V1.0

#### Change Summary

##### Introduction

During the tender for Project 1 (Service Management requirements for Address and Registration Service) we spotted a small number of inconsistencies in the D-10.2 Service Management requirements spreadsheet and received several clarification questions from bidders that resulted in a need to amend the underlying requirements.

A clarification response has already been issued to correct this and this CR is to ensure that the D-10.2 Service Management Requirement spreadsheet is update and aligned to ensure its clear to the CSS Providers.

In the D-10.2 Service Management requirements spreadsheet, three requirements were added to show that the new CSS service providers must use the CSS Service Management System (CSS SMS) and existing provides of CDSs have the option to also use the CSS SMS if they should so wish or create an interface between their SMS and the CSS SMS.

Therefore, this Change Request is structured to split the requirements applicable to CSS Service Providers, and those applicable to the **existing providers of CDS as well as amending the wording to add further clarity.**

##### **Requirements applicable to CSS Service Providers only:**

**SM015** was intended to state that all CSS SPs must use the CSS Service Management System, however the use of word 'integrate' may have caused confusion. Please see below for specific detail on the changes:

**SM015 Wording to be changed to (red text is the change):**

"The SP shall **be required to use (via an automated interface e.g. API or e-bonding or directly)** the Switching Service Management System (Switching SMS) to support the management of services, functions, processes and ensure that the Switching SMS tickets are generated and updated at all times."

**Requirements applicable to Existing CDS Providers only:**

**SM016** and **SM017** apply to existing providers of CDSs only so the removal of 'CSS Service Providers' within the 'Applicable To' column is required. These requirements were intending to state that the existing Providers **of CDS** may use CSS SMS but alternately may provide interfaces between its SMS, and the CSS SMS.

**SM016 Wording to be changed to (red text is the change):**

"The SP shall **ensure that all Service Management tickets are logged and updated promptly in the** Switching Service Management System (Switching SMS). **Records in the Switching SMS must be considered the master version and be kept up to date at all times.**"

**SM017 Wording to be changed to (red text is the change):**

The SP shall have the option **to use (via an automated interface e.g. API or e-bonding or directly)** the Switching Service Management System (Switching SMS) to support the management of services, functions, processes and ensure that Switching SMS tickets **be kept up to date at all times.**

**Note:** The key requirement is that the CSS SMS must be up to date at all times and an accurate status for all Switching tickets.

**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 should be minimal as the bidders have already received the clarification responses and should fully understand the requirements being asked on them. These changes are to bring the baselined documents up to date.

**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 (SM0015-17)**

**An important change; its absence would be very inconvenient, although a 'work-around' is possible**

**SM0015-17:**

Changes are made to improve requirement quality, clarity and consistency following bidder queries. This will provide bidders and DCC Commercial teams with a higher quality requirements baseline for when conducting negotiations.

**Base reason for Change (SM0015-17)**

**Design - Additional requirements/functionality being added to the programme's scope**

**SM0015-17:**

Changes made to improve clarity of requirements at the request of bidders.

<b>Rating of Change implementation (SM0015-17)</b>  LOW - Minor consequence requiring some minor redesign or rework; Minor cost impact; Minor impact to schedule	<b>SM0015-17:</b> Changes are simple to make and are to improve requirement clarity.
<b>"Do nothing" implications</b>	<b>SM0015-17:</b> Bidders may submit responses based on incorrect assumptions or reading of requirements due to a lack of clarity.
<b>Potential stakeholders affected by the Change</b>	<b>SM0015-17:</b> CSS Service Provider bidders and Existing Providers of CDSs
<b>Alternative sought to reduce negative impact</b>	<b>SM0015-17:</b> DCC has already responded directly where bidders have submitted clarification questions.
<b>Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change</b>	<b>SM0015-17:</b> Risks are low around the implementation of these changes as they only impact the requirements spreadsheet.
<b>Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted</b>	<b>SM0015-17:</b> CSS Service Provider bidders and Existing Providers of CDSs

<b>Justification for Change</b>
<p>After the tenders were issued, we received questions from bidders seeking further clarity on the requirements and we also spotted an inconsistency within the 'Applicable To' column. These changes to the requirements are needed to ensure that the clarification responses are added to the baselined documents and the 'Applicable To' column is amended to ensure that the new CSS service providers and existing provides of CDSs CSS are clear on the requirements being asked of them.</p> <p>The impact of not approving these changes are that the baseline documents will not be in line with the bidders understanding and service providers will not have the clarity around the requirements being placed on them.</p>

<b>Programme Products affected by proposed change</b>
D-10.2 – Service Management Requirements (requirements spreadsheet)

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

<b>Change request No.</b>	CR-E21	<b>Date CR submitted</b>	15/10/18
<b>Change request status:</b>	Approved	<b>Current CR version:</b>	0.3
<b>Change Window:</b>	8	<b>Version date:</b>	08/01/19

<b>Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:</b>	Name and organisation: Jenny Boothe – Ofgem
<b>Contact details:</b>	Email address: <a href="mailto:jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk">jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk</a>
<b>PMO Lead:</b>	Name: James Hardy - Ofgem
<b>Contact details:</b>	Email address: <a href="mailto:james.hardy@ofgem.gov.uk">james.hardy@ofgem.gov.uk</a>

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.	
<b>Design &amp; Data Impact and resource input required for IA?</b> <b>No impact</b>	
<b>Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?</b> <b>No impact</b>	
<b>Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?</b> <b>No impact</b>	
<b>Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?</b> <b>No impact</b>	
<b>Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?</b> May need to updated the drafting of the Service Management schedule	
<b>Security Impact and resource input required for IA?</b> No impact	
<b>Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request?</b> D-10.2 – Service Management Requirements (requirements spreadsheet)	
<b>Major or Minor Change?</b>	Minor. Limited changes required to the product

<b>Change Process Route</b>	Standard
<b>Change Window</b>	8
<b>To be submitted to the Design Forum on:</b>	<Paper Date> 09 January 2019 <Date of Design Forum> 16 January 2019
<b>Approval Authority:</b>	<Programme Manager, Programme Director, SRO, Chair - Design Authority, Security Board> Arik Dondi, Design Authority Chair
<b>Target Change Decision Date:</b>	<Date of Approval Authority meeting> 29 January 2019
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role): Jenny Boothe</b>	<b>Date: 18/01/19</b>

Impact Assessment	
<p>The change to the requirements are needed to provide prospective bidders more clarity on how where their service must be configured, operated, and maintained.</p> <p>From a cost perspective, this change will give bidders more information for ensuring they meet the requirements when proposing their solution.</p>	
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role): Jenny Boothe</b>	<b>Date:18/ 01/19</b>

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
<p>This will not have any impact on Industry costs as these changes have already been provided to the bidders to ensure they are fully aware of the updated requirements. This change is to bring the requirements in line with the clarification responses.</p>	
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role): Jenny Boothe</b>	<b>Date:18/ 01/19</b>

Impact Assessment – Programme		
This will not have an impact on the programme as this change is to bring the requirements in line with the clarification responses.		
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> <b>Jenny Boothe</b>		<b>Date:18/ 01/19</b>

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort		
It is anticipated that making the changes will take around 1 hour for a DCC Service Architect. Cost of change is zero as only the DCC SMS requirements is to be changed.		
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> <b>Jenny Boothe</b>		<b>Date:18/ 01/19</b>

Impact Assessment –Programme Design & Architectural Principles		
Design Principle	Description	RAG Status & Summary
<b>Impact on Consumers</b>		
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

**Green** - Requestor to complete

**Orange** – Ofgem to complete

**Blue** - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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
<b>Impact on Market Participants</b>		
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
<b>Impact on Delivery, Costs and Risks</b>		
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
<b>Architectural Principle</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>RAG Status &amp; Summary</b>
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:** - These changes to the requirements are needed to ensure that the clarification responses are added to the baselined documents.

<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> Jenny Boothe	<b>Date:</b> 18/ 01/19

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration	
N/A	
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> Jenny Boothe	<b>Date:</b> 18/ 01/19

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan	
N/A	
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> Jenny Boothe	<b>Date:</b> 18/ 01/19

Impact Assessment – Security	
N/A	
<b>Checked for completeness (Name &amp; Role):</b> Jenny Boothe	<b>Date:</b> 18/ 01/19

Programme Recommendation	
approve	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Jenny Boothe	Date:18/ 01/19

Change Request Decision	
Approved by Design Authority	
Changed Approved:	Yes
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	Date:
Arik Dondi, DA Chair	29/01/2019

Next Steps		
<p>&lt;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 &amp; approval&gt;</p>		
D-10.2 – Service Management Requirements (requirements spreadsheet)		
<b>If Change Request is approved:-</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Products updates to be completed by:</b>	DCC	15/02/2019
<b>Ofgem review dates:</b>		28/02/2019
<b>Product approval to be completed by:</b>	Ofgem	28/02/2019