

Switching Programme Change Request Form

Part A – For the requestor to fill in

Change Requestor's Details

Name: Gary Morris

Organisation: Smart DCC

Email address: gary.morris@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

Corrections to ABACUS Sequence Diagrams (ISD)

Change Summary

There are a number of discrepancies within the Sequence Diagrams in ABACUS that either refer to an incorrect dataflow reference or that refer to dataflows exchanged between incorrectly identified market participants. Plus, some diagrams on the ABACUS homepage link through to diagrams that are different to what the title implies.

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 changes are required to ensure that the logical design is clearly articulated and consistent

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.
"Do nothing" implications	Existing inaccuracies in the baselined design products will persist.
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	-ESPs -Suppliers -Supplier Agents
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	Do nothing! This would negate any impacts as a consequence of changing the logical design. 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.
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	Changes identified via industry forums, e.g. Ofgem Design Forum.

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 landscape. 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.

Programme Products affected by proposed change

ABACUS Sequence Diagrams:

- ISD - Post Initial Registration Confirmation (elec) (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4695046.svg>)
 - 'Confirm Settlement' from MPAS to Supplier following a D0205 (Supplier to MPAS) should reference a D0172 and not a D0217.
 - 'New Connection Request' (D0142) is documented as being sent from Supplier to Data Collection but should instead be from Supplier to MEM.
- ISD - Post Switch Confirmation (elec) (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4696377.svg>)
 - 'Confirm Settlement' from MPAS to Supplier following a D0205 (Supplier to MPAS) should reference a D0172 and not a D0217.
- ISD - Post Initial Registration Execution (elec SMETS2) (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4619930.svg>)
 - 'Notify Asset/RMP/Supplier' (D0303) is documented as being sent from Data Collection to MAP but should instead be from MEM to MAP.

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

- ISD – Change of Asset Ownership (elec) (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4697799.svg>)
 - 'Notify Change' from Supplier to MPAS should instead originate from the MEM to MPAS and should reference a D0304 and not a D0205.
 - 'Notify Change' from MEM to Supplier should reference a D0304 and not a D0150.
- ISD – Replace meter (elec) (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4697681.svg>)
 - Add instance of 'Notify change of asset/MAP' from MEM to MPAS of a D0312.
 - Amend instance of 'Notify change of asset/MAP' from MEM to Supplier from D0150 to D0149/D0150.
- ISD - Create New related RMPs (<https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4620150.svg>)
 - Supplier to CSS should be sending a RegMgmtRequestSubmission request and not RegMgmtRequestNotification

The following ISDs on the ABACUS Home page <https://dcc2-pub.avolutionsoftware.com/Switchingbaseline/#Content/Diagrams/4631096.svg> link to different diagrams than described:

- When you click on the "Determine objection window" it takes the user to the "Create RMP (gas)" ISD.
- When clicking on the "Post Initial Registration Execution (elec trad)" box it takes the user to the "Post Switch Execution (elec trad)" ISD.
- When clicking on the "Process GB standardised address update" box in the gas column it takes the user to the "Process GB standardised address update (elec)" instead of "Process GB standardised address update (gas)".

Add new participant message from CSS to DSP for RMP status changes (post-creation/operational):

- RECM_SN_02950 Smart Metering RMP Lifecycle Synchronisation

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-E47	Date CR submitted	30/08/2019
Change request status:	Approved	Current CR version:	v1.0
Change Window:	31	Version date:	19/09/2019

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

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?	
Abacus Sequence Diagrams	
Major or Minor Change?	Minor
Change Process Route	Urgent
Change Window	31
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	N/A
Approval Authority:	Design Authority
Target Change Decision Date:	20/09/2019
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Impact Assessment	
The changes are minor and for completeness only.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Impact Assessment – Industry cost	
Nil cost as the changes only reflect the current switching arrangements design.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort

1 day BA.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

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.	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		
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.

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

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		
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.
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)		Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)		19/09/2019

Green - Requestor to complete

Orange – Ofgem to complete

Blue - Impact Assessment Team to complete

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration	
None. The changes are minor and for completeness only.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan	
None. The changes are minor and for completeness only.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Impact Assessment – Security	
None. The changes are minor and for completeness only.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Programme Recommendation	
This Change Request is a result of the development of the CSS Interface Specification. As the subject of this Cr was discussed in the development of the CSS IS this CR is a reflection of that discussion. In essence it is an alignment CR to ensure the Logical design adequately reflects the Physical Design. This change is not significant as its impact is minimal. The recommendation is to approve this CR.	
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Jenny Boothe (Design Lead)	19/09/2019

Change Request Decision	
Approved.	
Change Approved	Yes
Checked for Completeness (Name & Role)	Date
Matthew Finlay (PMO)	19/09/2019

Next Steps		
Change request is to be implemented by updated the impacted Programme Products.		
<i>If Change Request is approved:-</i>	Role	Date
Products updates to be completed by:	DCC	
Ofgem review dates:	Ofgem	
Product approval to be completed by:	Ofgem	