

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details
<p>Name: Sarah Mower Organisation: Gemserv Email address: sarah.mower@gemserv.com or FSEG@gemserv.com Telephone number: 020 3890 9428</p> <p>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 <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Change Title
<i>Removal of requirement for a Licence Exempt Network Indicator</i>

Change Summary
<i>This request is for the removal of a requirement for a MPAS to hold, populate and send a Licence Exempt Network Indicator to the CSS for Switching purposes.</i>

Change considerations & viewpoint	
<i>Please provide your considerations and views on change using information available to you and stakeholders you have engaged.</i>	
<p>Priority assessment for Change Request</p> <p>An important change; its absence would be very inconvenient, although a 'work-around' is possible</p>	<p>The work-around in this instance would be to continue with the original design, building in extra cost and time.</p>
<p>Base reason for Change</p> <p>Design - Additional requirements/functionality being added to the programme's scope</p>	<p>This is a change to design, but rather than adding functionality it removes the requirement. If there is no Switching benefit to the indicator, then there are no cost benefits to having one.</p>

Rating of Change implementation MEDIUM - Significant consequences requiring redesign or rework; Significant cost impact ; Significant impact to schedule	The development of this indicator could not take place within the remaining time before 'Stage Zero' is required. Therefore it would impact the schedule.
"Do nothing" implications	Industry would need to continue to develop the required change, which would take longer than the Stage Zero implementation, therefore causing a delay to the DBT timescales.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	DNOs, MPAS Provider, ECOES Provider, CSS Provider
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	The Change continues currently designed, but the delivery time is agreed to be later.
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	xxxxxxxxxx
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	DCC, Electricity Suppliers, DNOs, Supplier Agents, BSC representative.

Justification for Change
<p>In the current design, there is a Licence Exempt Network Indicator which would alert the CSS by MPAS that a site being switched is Licence Exempt.</p> <p>It was established during discussions with the DCC, that there is no requirement for the CSS to hold this information for switching purposes.</p> <p>It was agreed though that it would be useful for industry to know if a site is on a LEN, however, this could be displayed via ECOES from a feed from MPAS. In addition, the Line Loss Factor would indicate the status of the MPAN currently.</p> <p>This would therefore remove this requirement from the critical path for CSS and could be evolved under 'BAU' industry change processes.</p> <p>The impact will be less development, and therefore cost, required for existing system providers with in timescales for the Switching Programmes Stage Zero.</p>

Programme Products affected by proposed change
<p><i><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. If possible, can you please also identify which section(s) of the document(s) would need to be changed></i></p> <p><i>D-4.1.5_e2e_solution_architecture_v2.0_1 section 3.15</i></p> <p><i>D-4.2.1 CSS User Requirements Specification v2.1, 4.5.3 RMP-Related Updates</i></p> <p><i>D-4.2.6 CSS Data Migration Plan v2.0, Appendix E</i></p> <p><i>D-4.3.4 E2E Transition Plan - Implementation Approach v1.0</i></p>

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-E30	Date CR submitted	31/12/18
Change request status:	Withdrawn	Current CR version:	0.1
Change Window:	13	Version date:	31/12/18

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Name and organisation: Jenny Boothe – Ofgem
Contact details:	Email address: jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk
PMO Lead:	Name: James Hardy - Ofgem
Contact details:	Email address: james.hardy@ofgem.gov.uk

Initial assessment/Triage	
<i>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.</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]
Change Process Route	<Urgent or Standard>
Change Window	<Could be revised based on IA effort>
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	<Paper Date> <Date of Design Forum>
Approval Authority:	<Programme Manager, Programme Director, SRO, Chair - Design Authority, Security Board>
Target Change Decision Date:	<Date of Approval Authority meeting>
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

<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?>

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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.>

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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.>

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		

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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		
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.	

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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: -

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration

<Insert/embed the assessment of impacts in relation to planned data migration or cleansing activities.>

Checked for completeness (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, testing or diversion of programme resources? Is the change necessary for go-live?>

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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

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

Change Request Decision	
<p>This Change Request was withdrawn following Design Forum on 28 January 2019</p> <p>On review of the CR it was agreed that CR-E30 should be withdrawn. The switching design was baselined on the 2nd June 2018 along with the Outline Business Case (OBC). Within the OBC was an elaboration of the RP2a design that stated the implications of the new design on the existing service providers. The extract below is from the Reform Package Summary Spreadsheet annexed with the OBC. This clearly sets out the requirements for the indicator.</p> <p>Therefore, by withdrawing the CR we have reverted back to the original design.</p>	
Changed Approved:	No
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	Date:
Jenny Boothe	28/01/2019

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

Product approval to be completed by:

--	--

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete