

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Andy Boojers

Organisation: Smart DCC

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

Telephone number: 07855 277 841

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

Reduction of Scope of CR-E34

Change Summary

CR-E34 included a set of 31 changes to be introduced to CSS functional and non-functional requirements.

A number of these were changes to amend references to 'CSS Operation user', as a result of queries raised during the CSS procurement process as to which organisation this referred to. The changes were originally proposed to mitigate any false interpretation by CSS bidders of expectations regarding organisational responsibility of undertaking certain processes, but are now considered obsolete and unnecessary.

In addition, this CR is proposing to remove a requirement proposed in CR-E34, to explicitly cover real-time processing of registration requests, due to being identified as obsolete.

The 'Justification for Change' section further elaborates on all of these changes.

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 A Nice-to Have but not vital, cosmetic change; of no importance	The changes included are considered cosmetic, comprising minor updates to design products only.
Base reason for Change Design - Additional requirements/functionality being added to the programme's scope	Improving clarity and readability of products

Rating of Change implementation Rating Very Low	Assessed as minor cosmetic change only
"Do nothing" implications	Terms used Requirements will be changed in line with CR-E34. No material impact identified but effort required to undertake changes will be spent.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	CSS provider
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	None sought
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	None Identified.
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	CSS provider engaged during commercial/contractual negotiations.

Justification for Change
<p><u>Change items C346 – C364</u></p> <p>CR-E34 proposed changes to amend the terminology in the CSS non-functional requirements relating to 'CSS Operations User' to refer instead to 'System Operator'</p> <p>Subsequent to raising the original change request, the procurement process was successfully completed, during which the use of such terms was clarified. Furthermore, the contract included clarification that these were intended to refer to the 'Contractor'.</p> <p>It is proposed therefore not to include the changes in the non-functional requirements as they considered to be no longer valid.</p> <p><u>Change item C153</u></p> <p>CR-E34 proposed to include a new requirement intended to make explicit the requirement on CSS to process registration requests in near-real time which could be traced back to a</p>

statement within 15.20 CSS Performance of Reform Package (RP2a). However, this proposed inclusion is considered unnecessary, as it can be accounted for through 2 existing non-functional requirements;

- NFR0410 – Switch Latency
- NFR0420 – Acknowledgement Latency

It is proposed therefore that item C153 will not be added to the CSS non-functional requirements.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

D-4.2.1 CSS User Requirements Specification – Requirements spreadsheet

D-4.2.2 CSS Non-Functional Requirements spreadsheet

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-E43	Date CR submitted	28/05/2019
Change request status:	Approved	Current CR version:	v1.0
Change Window:	24	Version date:	06/06/2019

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

Initial assessment/Triage	
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? No	
Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA? No	
Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA? No	
Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA? No	
Security Impact and resource input required for IA? No	
Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request? D-4.2.1 CSS User Requirements Specification – Requirements spreadsheet D-4.2.2 CSS Non-Functional Requirements spreadsheet	
Major or Minor Change?	[Assessment of effort to complete IA, FTE impact for implementation of change or assessment of consequential impacts]

Change Process Route	Standard
Change Window	24
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	Paper Date: 10 th June Date of Design Forum: 17 th June
Approval Authority:	Arik Dondi – Chair, Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	28 th June 2019
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	06/06/2019

Impact Assessment	
No significant impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
None identified – change raised to reverse obsolete changes raised in previous CR and make several cosmetic adjustments	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme	
No impact identified.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort	
No impact on DCC resources identified – this will be accommodated as part of the effort allocated to complete CR-E33	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
6 Design – simplicity	The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
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.	Low level changes with no material impact, so higher principles unaffected.
Architectural Principle		
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	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
2 Future Proof Design	Common design approaches will better enable designs to support future developments e.g. A mechanism for achieving non-repudiation	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
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.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
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.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	Low level changes that do not impact architecture principles

Summary: -

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration

No impact identified.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan

No impact identified.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Impact Assessment – Security

No impact identified.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	07/06/2019

Programme Recommendation	
Recommendation for Approval received.	
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:
Matthew Finlay	14/06/2019

Change Request Decision	
Approved	
Changed Approved:	Yes
Decision Maker (Name & Role):	Date:
Arik Dondi	14/06/2019

Next Steps		
Change Request Approved		
If Change Request is approved:-	Role	Date
Products updates to be completed by:	DCC	
Ofgem review dates:		
Product approval to be completed by:	Ofgem	

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete