Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details
Name: Steven Poole Organisation: DCC Email address: steven.poole@smartdcc.co.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
Clarification of where Defect Response Times in D4.3.3 E2E Testing Plan will be defined.

Change Summary
Section 15.2.2 of D4.3.3 E2E Testing Plan sets out Defect Types, Classifications and Definitions. This section provides a representative example of how defects may be classified. Clarification is required in relation to Response Time. This Change Request is to clarify and update the E2E Testing Plan to clarify the intent and explain that the detailed Response times will be articulated in the Defect Management Plan produced by the Systems Integrator.

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 **Potentially an important opportunity to improve on programme cost, schedule or quality**	Important change to support Central Switching Service Provider contract development
Base reason for Change **Delivery - Slippage in plan or budget overrun requiring tighter controls**	Current D4.3.3 E2E Testing Plan is unclear in the meaning and timescales for Defect Resolution. The document should refer to the Defect Management Plan where these terms will be fully defined.
Rating of Change implementation VERY LOW - Minimal consequences; Minimal cost impact; Minimal impact to schedule/resources; Minimal risk or impact on other programmes/projects	Very Low - This is a very minor change to the document to ensure clear understanding and interpretation. No impact to schedule
"Do nothing" implications	Has the potential to lead to ambiguity and potential delay in contract negotiation
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	Systems Integrator, Core Switching Service Providers
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	None
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	None.
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	DCC Test Assurance

Justification for Change

The current requirements are open to interpretation and require clarification. There will need to be a common and clear understanding around this area and so as proposed by this change there is a need re word the paragraph to remove the ambiguity and removal of the Defect Service Level (Response Time) Column and as proposed by this change the final classifications and definitions will be fully defined by the SI within the Defect Management Plan they are required to create.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

Section 15.2.2 of D4.3.3 E2E Test Plan.

The changes proposed are:

'Defects also need to be defined in terms of their severity, so they can be prioritised appropriately for resolution within agreed service levels. This will be defined within the Defect Management Plan produced by the Systems Integrator following contract signature (i.e. response times for developing and implementing a fix). The following table is a representative example of Defect Classifications and Definitions. The final classifications and definitions, and service levels with different organisations will be fully defined within the SI Defect Management Plan which will be subject to Ofgem approval.'

Proposal is to also remove the Response Time column from the table below:

Defect Severity & Priority	Definition	
D1 Critical	• Testing process is severely limited or stopped by the existence of the problem. • A key market function is at a standstill and no work around exists. • Fix must be implemented as soon as possible and takes precedence over all nonemergency work in progress. • The error affects a large volume of test scripts to be executed. • Significant testing Impact - more than 50 % of the scripts planned for the day are blocked	
D2 High	• A very complex problem that is not impending progress but requires attention if the test script is to pass the testing stage. • A key market function is operational, however a severe error exists in its processing and the workaround is complex and time consuming • Considerable Testing Impact – more than 25% of the test scripts planned for that day are blocked.	

Defect Severity & Priority	Definition	
D3 Medium	• A problem that is not impending progress, but requires attention if the test script is to pass the testing stage. • A workaround exists. • The occurrence of the problem is low or does not impact key accounts. • Moderate Testing Impact – less than 25% of the test scripts planned for the day are blocked.	
D4 Low	• A problem that do not need addressing prior to moving the next testing phase. • The occurrence of the problem is low or does not impact testing progress. • The changes may be of cosmetic nature. • Minimal impact to testing effort.	

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-E32	Date CR submitted	14/02/2019
Change request status:	Approved	Current CR version:	V1.0
Change Window:	17	Version date:	26/02/2019

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Name and organisation: Nicola Garland
Contact details:	Email address: Nicola.garland@ofgem.gov.uk
PMO Lead:	Name: Matt Finlay
Contact details:	Email address: matthew.finlay@ofgem.gov.uk

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.

Design & Data Impact and resource input required for IA?
NA

Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?
No impact as a result of approving this CR. Failure to implement may delay contract signature for SI and CSS contracts.

Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?
NA

Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?
No impact as a result of approving this CR. Failure to implement may delay contract signature for SI and CSS contracts.

Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?
NA

Security Impact and resource input required for IA?
NA

Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request?
D4.3.3 E2E Test Plan.

Major or Minor Change?	Minor change to D4.3.3 E2E Test Plan to provide clarity that table is illustrative only.

Change Process Route	Urgent
Change Window	As per urgent process
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	As per urgent process
Approval Authority:	Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	Design Authority 22/02/19

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matt Finlay – PMO	21/02/2019

Impact Assessment

No impact as change will provide clarification to ongoing negotiations with SI and CSS Suppliers and ensure no ambiguity.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Industry cost

No cost impact to industry if the change is made. Not making the proposed change could lead to increased cost due to misunderstanding.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort

Resource effort for this change is minimal and would require a copy and paste from the text provided in the change as follows:

Defects also need to be defined in terms of their severity, so they can be prioritised appropriately for resolution within agreed service levels. This will be defined within the Defect Management Plan produced by the Systems Integrator following contract signature (i.e. response times for developing and implementing a fix). The following table is a representative example of Defect Classifications and Definitions. The final classifications and definitions, and service levels with different organisations will be fully defined within the System Integrator Defect Management Plan, which will be subject to Ofgem approval.

The removal of the Defect Service Level (response time) column in the table of section 15.2.2 is also required.

Updated Word Version change controlled link below containing changes proposed:

Redline Version

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

Microsoft Word 97
- 2003 Document

Clean Version

Microsoft Word 97
- 2003 Document

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Programme
No Impact

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

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.	No Impact
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		

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.	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.	No Impact
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	No Impact
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: -

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

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration

No Impact

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan

No Impact

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Impact Assessment – Security

No Impact

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	21/02/19

Programme Recommendation

Recommend to approve Change Request

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Nicola Garland – Senior Implementation Manager	**21/02/19**

Change Request Decision

Approved

Changed Approved:	Yes
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	Date:
Arik Dondi, DA	22/02/2019

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

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> D4.3.3 E2E Test Plan to be updated.		
If Change Request is approved:-	**Role**	**Date**
Products updates to be completed by:	DCC	22/02/2019
Ofgem review dates:		22/02/2019
Product approval to be completed by:	Ofgem	22/02/2019