

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Andy Boojers

Organisation: DCC

Email address: andy.boojers@smartdcc.co.uk

Telephone number: 07855277841

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

Updates to functional and non-functional Requirements

Change Summary

The Design Product sets – E2E and CSS – include several requirements specifications. These requirements include functional, non-functional and security requirements sets. Following a 'deep dive' review of the full design product sets, a number of proposed changes have been identified. These have been classified by the following categories.

- **Cosmetic** – immaterial changes to address spelling errors, minor corrections of terminology, improvements to the structure and presentation of the model
- **Corrections** – clarifications, omissions, inaccuracies or inconsistencies that could result in miscommunication or misinterpretation of the design
- **Enhancements** – changes that may impact the solution design

Change considerations & viewpoint	
Stakeholders from OFGEM and DCC have been involved in formulating the candidate log and in the scoping of the change request	
Priority assessment for Change Request A Must; the final deliverable will not work without this change	Changes are required to ensure the design is clearly articulated and consistent across
Base reason for Change Design - Additional requirements/functionality being added to the programme's scope	Clarification of current design and requirements.
Rating of Change implementation LOW - Minor consequence requiring some minor redesign or rework; Minor cost impact; Minor impact to schedule	Low Impact of Change anticipated as changes are corrections and clarifications to the design products. However, full impact will be confirmed following industry CSS provider engagement.
"Do nothing" implications	Impact of not approving this Change Request is that existing issues in the baselined design products will persist. Any suggested enhancements to improve clarity and understanding of the design will not be implemented. There is a risk of extended timelines and associated cost impacts across the wider programme if these changes are not introduced, although quantifying this risk is not feasible.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	-CSS Provider -Address Service Provider -ESPs -Suppliers -Supplier Agents
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	Do Nothing: This would negate any impacts as a consequence of updating the requirements. However, this is not recommended due to the risk of more material impacts identified downstream which are likely to be more costly.
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	None Identified.
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	Scope of Change Request was defined through following engagement: -OFGEM/DCC deep dive on full product set

Justification for Change

The Design Products comprise a set of products that collectively describe the E2E switching design and the CSS design. These products have been elaborated incrementally through the phases of the switching programme and baselined at appropriate stage gates. These products are intended to provide an informative and normative information source to all impacted stakeholders regarding the future state of the industry 'system'. In the round, the product set will direct stakeholders as to how they are expected to operate and interact with the new switching service and other stakeholders.

Given the significance of the design products as a foundation for the success of the future arrangements, it is imperative that they provide a clear, complete, unambiguous reference point for all impacted parties to base their change initiatives against. This will ultimately benefit consumers through the ensuring the changes required of all industry participants across their process, informational and technological assets in order to operate under the new arrangements are based on a clear design.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

CSS D4.2.1 CSS Functional Requirements Spreadsheet V2.1

CSS D4.2.2 CSS Non-Functional Requirements Spreadsheet V2.1

Proposed changes are contained within the embedded spreadsheet:



CR-E34 - Updates to functional and non-fu

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-E34	Date CR submitted	27/02/2019
Change request status:	Approved	Current CR version:	v1.0
Change Window:	18	Version date:	01/04/2019

Change Advisory Team (CAT) Lead:	Name and organisation: Jenny Boothe
Contact details:	Email address: jenny.boothe@ofgem.gov.uk
PMO Lead:	Name: Matthew Finlay
Contact details:	Email address: matthew.finlay@ofgem.gov.uk

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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? Yes	
Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA? Yes	
Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA? Yes	
Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA? Yes	
Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA? Yes	
Security Impact and resource input required for IA? Yes	
Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request? 1.1. CSS D4.2.1 CSS User Requirements Specification V2.1 E2E D4.1.5 E2E Solution Architecture V2.1	
Major or Minor Change?	Minor
Change Process Route	Standard
Change Window	18
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	04/03/2019 11/03/2019
Approval Authority:	Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	29/03/2019
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matt Finlay	01/04/2019

Impact Assessment	
Benefits – intangible benefits identified as reduced risk of delay caused by design issues Costs – None Identified*. It is envisaged that costs to the wider programme would be minimal, considering the overall materiality of the proposed changes and the current stage of design across the industry. *impact on CSS provider costings is being managed concurrently to the Change Request process.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
Benefits – intangible benefits identified as reduced risk of delay caused by design issues Costs – None Identified*. It is envisaged that costs to the wider programme would be minimal, considering the overall materiality of the proposed changes and the current stage of design across the industry. *impact on CSS provider costings is being managed concurrently to the Change Request process.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme	
Benefits – intangible benefits identified as reduced risk of delay caused by design issues Costs – None Identified*. It is envisaged that costs to the wider programme would be minimal, considering the overall materiality of the proposed changes and the current stage of design across the industry. *impact on CSS provider costings is being managed concurrently to the Change Request process.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort	
Resource effort for making changes is absorbed by DCC cost model, utilising existing headcount. Resource effort required of OFGEM and wider industry parties to review and assure the changes is deemed to fall under 'business as usual' costs of participating in programme activities	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

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.	Green Clear, consistent design products will facilitate the implementation of 'fit-for-purpose' capabilities and solutions across the industry that will enable the achievement of the programme objectives and the positive impacts on customers.
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.	Green See above
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.	Green See above
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.	Green Se above
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.	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.	Green The proposed changes will promote a firm foundation from which to design a robust E2E solution.
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	Not Applicable. The proposed changes will improve the representation of the design at a logical level, and are a means to an end. Adaptability is not materially impacted through improving the representation at this stage of the programme
Impact on Delivery, Costs and Risks		

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

9 Solution cost/benefit	The new arrangements should be designed and implemented so as to maximise the net benefits for customers.	Not Applicable
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 A clearly defined set of requirements will expedite subsequent phases of the programme

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	Green This change includes updates to security requirements will provide a firmer basis for risk identification, the first stage of a rigorous Risk Management process
2 Future Proof Design	Common design approaches will better enable designs to support future developments e.g. A mechanism for achieving non-repudiation	Green The proposed changes will provide a design that will expedite subsequent design activities. An improved foundation will increase the level of productive design time, rather than on wasteful activities such as seeking clarification, rework caused through misinterpretation etc.
3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	Not Applicable
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	Not Applicable
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	Not Applicable
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.	Not Applicable
7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	Not Applicable
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.	Green The proposed changes to the requirements will ensure the business needs being addressed are linked to clear, unambiguous requirements that are 'fit for purpose'
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	Not applicable

Summary: -

The proposed changes are intended to improve the quality of the design products, through a series of cosmetic changes, corrections and enhancements. As a result, the updated products will provide a firmer foundation from which to elaborate both the CSS and broader industry designs.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019
---	----------------------------

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration

<i>None Identified</i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan

<i>Proposed changes are absorbed by DCC switching programme resources. Wider industry engagement will utilise existing programme governance controls to obtain assurance.</i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Impact Assessment – Security

<i>No Impacts Identified.</i>	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Programme Recommendation

Programme Recommended this Change Request for Approval.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Matt Finlay	Date: 01/04/2019

Change Request Decision

<i>Approved</i>	
Change Approved:	Yes
Checked for completeness (Name & Role): Arik Dondi, Head of Switching Arrangements	Date: 03/04/2019

Next Steps

<i>CSS D4.2.1 CSS Functional Requirements Spreadsheet V2.1 and CSS D4.2.2 CSS Non-Functional Requirements Spreadsheet V2.1 are to be updated.</i>		
If Change Request is approved:-	Role	Date
Products updates to be completed by:	DCC	
Ofgem review dates:		
Product approval to be completed by:	DCC	

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete