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

Removal of 'From' and 'Through' dates from inbound CSS messages

Change Summary

The following 'from' and 'through' dates will be generated by CSS upon being informed that a business event has taken place, rather than require the source of the event to provide the information. Therefore they are being removed from the inbound messages within which they are currently provided, as follows:

Retail Energy Group Membership (RECM_SN_CSS04100)
- Retail Energy Company Group Membership Effective From Date
- Retail Energy Company Group Membership Effective Through Date

Market Participant Role Ownership (RECM_SN_CSS05200)
- Market Participant Role Ownership Effective From Date
- Market Participant Role Ownership Effective Through Date

RMP Comms Hub Link (RECM_SN_CSS00100)
- RMP CommsHub Link From Date
- RMP CommsHub Link Through Date

RMP Association (RECM_SN_CSS00500)
- RMP Association From Date
- RMP Association Through Date

RMP DCC Service Event (RECM_SN_CSS00400, RECM_SN_CSS01200)
- RMP Event Effective From Date

- RMP Event Effective Through Date

RMP Asset Ownership Event (RECM_SN_CSS00400, RECM_SN_CSS01200)
- RMP Event Effective From Date
- RMP Event Effective Through Date

Premises Supply Condition Registration Event (RECM_SN_CSS02000)
- Registration Event Effective From Date
- Registration Event Effective Through Date

Justification for Change

The Central Switching Service will require temporal data, in the form of 'from' and 'to' dates, related to business events in order to undertake validation of requests against business rules, to support process orchestration and to maintain an historical record of events. In some cases, CSS acts as an authorised provider of information it has received from other sources and propagates this to other industry parties.

An assessment has been undertaken, during the design of the CSS Physical Interface Specification to identify temporal data elements that CSS can generate using its own time source, rather than rely on information provided from the source of the business event. The determining factors on whether this is viable are:

a) CSS does not require the source event time as an input to business rules processing

b)CSS does not need to pass on the source information (of when the event actually occurred) to other parties within the switching ecosystem.

Where it is acceptable for CSS to generate a date/time that coincides with point at which it becomes aware of the event, then CSS will use its own timesource to generate the time point data and this will stored within CSS, and distributed if required.

This change reduces the complexity of processing logic that must be applied upon receipt of messages that (in the current baseline) contain 'from' or 'to' dates.

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

Change considerations & viewpoint

Priority assessment for Change Request **A Must; the final deliverable will not work without this change**	High This change will ensure that the logical design is updated to reflect decisions made during the translation to the physical messaging model
Base reason for Change **Design - Additional requirements/functionality being addedd to the programme's scope**	Changes are a result of assessment of real physical data sets that have informed physical design decisions that need to be reflected in the logical design.

Rating of Change implementation MEDIUM - Significant consequences requiring redesign or rework; Significant cost impact ; Significant impact to schedule	Low
"Do nothing" implications	'Do nothing' will result in a misalignment between the CSS Physical Interface Specification and the Logical Design Model
Potential stakeholders affected by the Change	Market Participants ESPs OFGEM DCC
Alternative sought to reduce negative impact	N/A
Identify any risks to the implementation of the Change	None identified
Specialists and/or stakeholders consulted	OFGEM DCC CSS Provider Market Participants (via Design Forum)

Programme Products affected by proposed change

D-4.1.3 E2E Data Architecture and Data Governance

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.

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

Part B – For Ofgem Use Only

Change request No.	CR-E50	Date CR submitted	19/09/2019
Change request status:	In Triage	Current CR version:	v1.0
Change Window:	Window 32	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

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?	
Implementation Impact (including impacts to industry readiness, procurement timelines and the Programme Plan) and resource input required for IA?	
Alignment Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Commercial/Procurement Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Regulatory Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Security Impact and resource input required for IA?	
Confirm Programme Products impacted by the change request?	
Major or Minor Change?	[Assessment of effort to complete IA, FTE impact for implementation of change or assessment of consequential impacts]

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

Change Process Route	<Urgent or Standard>
Change Window	<Could be revised based on IA effort>
To be submitted to the Design Forum on:	<Paper Date> <Date of Design Forum>
Approval Authority:	<Programme Manager, Programme Director, SRO, Chair - Design Authority, Security Board>
Target Change Decision Date:	<Date of Approval Authority meeting>
Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	**Date:**

Impact Assessment

The changes set out in this CR were raised during the review and consultation of the CSS Physical Interface Specification, and the subject of various supporting walkthroughs with impacted parties.

No material impacts were identified during this consultation process.

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Industry cost

No industry cost identified

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Resource Effort

FTE effort of DCC:

@2 days to assess changes to messages

@2 days to update the Messaging Model

@0.5 days Quality Assurance

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

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

Andy Boojers, Lead Architect (DCC)

Impact Assessment – Programme
No impacts identified

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.	Green 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.	Green 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.	Green 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.	Green 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.	Green No Impact

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

6 Design – simplicity	The new supply point register and arrangements should be as simple as possible.	Green 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 proposal ensures the physical design accounts for existing constraints and considerations that must be accounted for in terms of the E2E design.
8 Design – flexibility	The new arrangements should be capable of efficiently adapting to future requirements and accommodating the needs of new business models.	Green No Impact
9 Solution cost/benefit	The new arrangements should be designed and implemented so as to maximise the net benefits for customers.	
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 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	Green 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	Green No Impact
3 Standards Adoption	Adopt appropriate standards for products, services or processes. e.g. ISO/IEC 11179 for data definition	Green No Impact
4 One Architecture	One single definitive architecture prevails	Green No Impact
5 Data is an asset	Data is an asset that has value to the enterprise and is managed accordingly	Green 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.	Green No Impact
7 Common vocabulary & data definitions	Data is defined consistently throughout the enterprise, the definitions being understandable and available to all users.	Green 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.	Green No Impact
9 Quality Characteristics	Maintain a comprehensive set of quality characteristics by which to gauge the completeness of requirements for Applications and Services.	Green No Impact

Summary: -

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Data cleansing / migration
Changes to the logical model will be reflected in the physical design and aligned with any required data migration design(s).

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Programme Plan
No change identified

Checked for completeness (Name & Role):	Date:

Impact Assessment – Security
None identified.

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:

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>		
If Change Request is approved:-	**Role**	**Date**
Products updates to be completed by:		
Ofgem review dates:		
Product approval to be completed by:		