Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Asif Nawab

Organisation: Smart DCC

Email address: asif.nawab@smartdcc.co.uk

Telephone number: 0203 725 8656

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 Registration Lifecycle statuses and removal of DSP confirmed synchronisation

Change Summary

---Begin note---

This change request has been raised as a result of CR-E23 containing some inconsistencies. CR-E23 was approved at DA in November 2018 but was not implemented due to other programme priorities. It has now become clear that CR-E23 had the following inconsistencies which have been addressed in this CR:

- The matrix table containing the statuses against the different systems that sync occurred to had the "Active" status being sent to all systems. This was incorrect as the "Active" status is a status that is set for a registration by each system after a switch request reaches the state of secured. The status is inferred as a result of the sync which occurs at "Switch Secured"; it is not transmitted. Each system is expected to set the status of "Active" a number of predefined hours after the switch request is set to secured.
- The matrix table containing the statuses against the different systems was only applicable to Switch Requests. This is because there is no "Validated" Registration Request status for an Initial Registration request. Therefore, a secondary matrix table was required to differentiate between Initial Registration Request and Switch Request.

---End note---

This change request will be clarifying Registration Lifecycle statuses within the existing logical design with regards to status changes of the following:

- Registration (during a Registration Request)
- Registration (during the life of a Registration).

Additionally, this change request seeks to clarify what data is synchronised to the Smart Metering Data Service Provider and Central Data Services (CDSs) and seeks to remove the 'confirmed' synch to the Smart Metering Data Service Provider (DSP) only as it is not necessary for the effective management of Smart Metering activities. Without this change, the current design and associated terminology will lead to confusion about the data that is being synchronised, increase the risk of an incorrect solution and retain a process step that could make next-day switching more cumbersome.

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 **An important change; its absence would be very inconvenient, although a 'work-around' is possible**	The existing Registration Lifecycle processes and data content is inconsistent
Base reason for Change **Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope**	NB: Processes and data are BEING ***rationalised***.

Rating of Change implementation MEDIUM - Significant consequences requiring redesign or rework; Significant cost impact ; Significant impact to schedule	This is a medium change as it relates to rationalising processes and clarifying the nature of the data that will be included in the synchronisation messages.
"Do nothing" implications	Will lead to confusion about the data that is being synchronised, increase the risk of bidders submitting an incorrect solution and retain a process step that could make next-day switching more cumbersome
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	Switching Service provider and the Smart Metering Data Service Provider
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	The alternative solution is to remove the validated synch message, but this will reduce the time that the gaining supplier would have to co-ordinate its activities including preparing commands to the smart meter.
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	Minimal risks due to rationalising processes and clarifying the nature of the data
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	Ofgem Design Lead Ofgem DIAT DCC Design Team DCC Data Architect

Justification for Change

The current design includes the synchronisation of messages to the CDSs and the Smart Metering Data Service Provider that identified the Registration Lifecycle Status (Pending, Active, Inactive, Cancelled). Equally, the design included the notification of Registration Request Lifecycle Status (Validated, Confirmed, Secured, Completed, Rejected, Annulled, Withdrawn) to each of the specific Market Participants involved in a switch. Comparison of the values of these states with the processes revealed inconsistencies between the Registration Lifecycle Status values and the synchronisation processes.

To resolve these inconsistencies, this change request proposes to extend the values of Registration Lifecycle Status to include "Registration Confirmed", "Secured Active" and "Secured Inactive", which will be set by CSS at the same time as the Confirmed and Secured statuses of the Registration Request Lifecycle. The complete set of statuses becomes:

- Pending
- **Registration Confirmed**
- **Secured Active**
- Active (note that this Registration status is internal to each system, is inferred by each system following receipt of a Secured Active Registration status, and is never transmitted)
- **Secured Inactive**
- Inactive
- Cancelled.

All decision rules concerning synchronisation will utilise the Registration Lifecycle Status (comparably to the utilisation of Registration Request Lifecycle Status by the rules for notification). Synchronisation decision rules will be expressed to specify which data service is synchronised with respect to each Registration Lifecycle Status value e.g. Smart Metering Data Service Provider will receive only status values "Pending", "Secured Active" and "Secured Inactive" (and not value "Registration Confirmed"). These rules will be made consistent with the processes. By way of explanation, the omission of particular status values is made feasible by recipient data services' use of inference based upon the current time; a method to be confirmed throughout physical design.

Not including this change would result in an inconsistent proposal for state transition update from the CSS, and bidders would have incorrectly designed their solution on this premise.

Registration Lifecycle Status values are in summary synchronised to switching central data services as follows:

Registration Lifecycle Status	Smart Metering	UK Link	MPAS	DES	ECOES
Pending	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Registration Confirmed	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Secured Active	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Active	N	N	N	N	N
Secured Inactive	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Inactive	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 1 Registration status values for Switch Request and Deactivation

As there is no "Pending" registration status for Initial Registrations, please note the following table of values which is only applicable to the Initial Registration scenario:

Registration Lifecycle Status	Smart Metering	UK Link	MPAS	DES	ECOES
Pending	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Registration Confirmed	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Secured Active	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Active	N	N	N	N	N

Table 2 Registration status values for Initial Registration

Programme Products affected by proposed change

The following changes have been determined from an initial impact assessment. Further changes may be identified during implementation of this CR. Any deviation from this list will be clearly articulated, so long as they are within the spirit of this CR.

D-4.1.2 E2E Detailed Design Model:

Decision Rules:

- Annulment window end date rule
- Annulment window open rule
- Check for Active Switch Request Rule
- Domestic objection window end date rule
- Elec active registration notify rule
- Elec confirmed notify Rule
- Elec secured notify rule
- Elec validated confirmed, and secured sync rule
- Elec validated notify rule
- Elec validated sync rule
- Gas active registration notify rule
- Gas confirmed notify rule
- Gas secured notify rule
- Gas validated notify rule
- Gas validated sync rule
- Gas validated, confirmed, and secured sync rule
- Non-domestic objection window end date rule
- Objection consistency rule
- Parent related RMP check rule
- Parent RMP Switch Rule
- Registration RMP rule

- Single pending registration rule
- Switch annulled rule
- Switch request status rule

Processes:

- 1.4.8 Send Initial Registration confirmed notifications and synchronise
- 2.3 Switch Request:
    - 2.3.8 Issue Switch Validated notifications and synchronise – change from 'Switch validated' to 'Registration pending'
    - 2.3.23 Issue Switch Confirmed notifications and synchronise – change from 'Switch confirmed' to 'Registration confirmed'
- 2.3.8 Issue switch validated notifications and synchronise:
    - Change from 'Switch validated' to 'Registration pending'
- 2.5 Execute switch:
    - Change 'Switch secured'/'Secured Switch' to 'Registration Secured Active'
    - Change notification interface to be used in description from RegMgmtRequestNotification to RegNotification
- 2.7.11 Issue switch rejected notification for previously confirmed switch:
    - Replace references to 'Switch validation' and 'Switch confirmed' with 'Pending registration' and 'Registration confirmed'
- 3.3 Deactivate registration:
    - 3.3.5 Issue registration inactive notifications and synchronise change 'Registration inactive' to 'Registration secured inactive'

Interaction Sequence Diagrams:

- Changes to titles required. Also need to check that state changes and when messages sent are correct – as above we believe the messages to DCC will need looking at for initial reg and annulment / withdrawal
- The following ISDs may just need to be replicated for the additional syncs rather than changing.
    - Initial Registration Request - Rejected Validation
    - Initial Registration Request (gas) – Confirmed
    - Initial Registration Request (elec) – Confirmed
    - Execute Initial Registration (gas)
    - Execute Initial Registration (elec)
    - Post Initial Registration Execution (gas trad)
    - Post Initial Registration Execution (elec trad)
    - Post Initial Registration Execution (gas SMETS2)
    - Post Initial Registration Execution (elec SMETS2)
    - Post Execute Switch (gas SMETS2) Post Execute Switch (elec SMETS2)
    - Post Execute Switch (gas trad)
    - Post Execute Switch (elec trad)
    - Execute Switch (gas)
    - Execute Switch (elec)
    - Switch Request (gas) - Switch Confirmed

- Switch Request (elec) - Switch Confirmed
- Switch Request - (gas) Switch Rejected Objection
- Switch Request - (elec) Switch Rejected Objection
- Switch Request - Switch Rejected Validation
- Switch Request - Switch Validation
- Switch Withdrawal (gas - preconfirmed)
- Switch Withdrawal (elec - preconfirmed)
- Switch Withdrawal (gas - post confirmed)
- Switch Withdrawal (elec - post confirmed)
- Switch Annulment - (gas - preconfirmed)
- Switch Annulment - (elec - preconfirmed)
- Switch Annulment - (gas – post confirmed)
- Switch Annulment - (elec – post confirmed)
- Registration Deactivation (gas)
- Registration Deactivation (elec)
- RMP Termination - (gas - pre confirmed)
- RMP Termination - (elec - pre confirmed)
- RMP Termination - (gas - post confirmed)
- RMP Termination - (elec – post confirmed)

D-4.1.6 E2E Operational Choreography:

- Table 2 Electricity Switch dependencies - Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- Figure 12 Switch - Electricity Future Arrangements, Traditional Credit Meter - Remove reference to Smart Metering
- 3.44 Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- 3.45 Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- Table 4 Gas Switch dependencies - Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- Figure 13 Switch - Gas Future Arrangements, Traditional Credit Meter - Remove reference to Smart Metering
- 3.56 Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- 3.57 Remove reference to Smart Metering sync at Switch Confirmed
- Supplier challenge of a GB standardised address link - Change to ME address
- 3.87 - Change to ME address
- 3.88 - Change to ME address

D-4.2.1 CSS User Requirement Specifications

- 4.3 Registration Lifecycle State
- 4.4 Registration Request State

1.1.1. *RMP Creation and State Update [1.2, 2.14, 3.1]*

-
- 4.6.2 Initial Registration Request [1.4]

- Table 3 –Registration Request state transitions

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-E39	**Date CR submitted**	09/04/2019
Change request status:	Submitted to DF	**Current CR version:**	v0.2
Change Window:	21	**Version date:**	18/04/2019

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

Inital 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? 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? Yes	
Major or Minor Change?	Minor

Change Process Route	Standard
Change Window	21
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	Paper Date: 18/04/2019 29/04/2019
Approval Authority:	Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	10/05/2019
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**
Matthew Finlay	18/04/2019

Impact Assessment	
<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 – 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 – 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 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		
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.	

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

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: -

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:**

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

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:		