**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Request details | | | |
| Change Request Title | **Standardisation of Interfaces within the Smart Data Services** | | |
| Change Request Number | CR023 | | |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | **Large Supplier Constituency / Business Process and Requirements Working Group (BPRWG)** | | |
| Risk/issue reference | MHHS-DIN-199 | | |
| Change Raiser | *Graham Wood and Haz Elmamoun (on behalf of the Large Supplier Constituency)* | Date raised: | *18/05/2023* |

***For further guidance on how to complete this document please see the supporting Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants. The guidance will support raising a change and responding to a change request via Impact Assessment. The Change Raiser should consider sharing the draft Change Request Form with impacted programme parties, prior to submission to PMO. The guidance, as well as other key documents are referenced below and can be found via the MHHS website.***

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| MHHS Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants |
| MHHS Change Control Approach |
| MHHS Governance Framework |
| Ofgem’s MHHS Transition Timetable |

### Part A – Description of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser when raising the Change Request.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Part A – Description of proposed change | |
| **Issue statement:**  *(what is the issue that needs to be resolved by the change)*  This CR seeks to avoid cost and inconsistency in the design by adding ***OPTIONAL*** standardised messages to support the Meter Data Retriever SDS sub-role. Parties would be able to choose to implement this or come to bilateral arrangements as currently designed.  Standardisation can be achieved by adding additional routing to current DIP messages and creating variants of existing messages.  There are three key drivers behind this change:-   1. The CR is required to fully support customer own appointment of an SDS for non-domestic. It enables the customer to choose an SDS without being constrained by the bilateral arrangements the supplier has already in place. It also enables the customer to avoid being charged twice for DCC read data by using the supplier as MDR. 2. Promotion of competition within the SDS role   This CR will reduce cost, improve standards of end-to-end performance and increase competitive choice through consistency of design by integrating via a standard mechanism via the DIP for all SDS Sub-Role options and combinations. Bilateral agreements by contrast will lock in participants and act as a barrier to new entrants and create an ongoing maintenance overhead.   1. Standardisation and formalisation of SDS sub-roles available if required to support Qualification and SIT   It would be easier to evaluate a participant if interactions between sub-roles are standardised.  As party can be ‘partnered’ with any other party for SIT, the implementation of bilateral flows mean that if there is a change of service provider changes would be required to systems of both parties, increasing cost.  By design the Target Operating Model supports different entities fulfilling Market Participant roles to promote innovation and reduce cost to serve.    The current proposals encapsulated in the MHHS-E2R001 TOM End-to-End Solution Architecture and the MHHSS\_SPOPC001 Operational Choreography does not incorporate standard DIP integration between the sub-roles within SDS  e.g. a Supplier choosing to utilise an existing DCC Adapter to provide the SDS with the consumption data would be required to create be-spoke bilateral integration.  Should the Supplier choose to move to a different SDS provider (or even DCC Adapter) the bilateral arrangements would need to be replaced at a cost and delay.    Without this change the TOM makes Customer Own appointed Data Services in the non-domestic sector problematic. Bilateral agreements will hinder the customer’s ability to appoint its own data and metering service providers.  The current position would require the supplier to have a bilateral arrangement in place with multiple providers. Non-domestic suppliers may have to create bilateral agreements with several MDRs in order to facilitate customer choice, in addition to each MDR developing bespoke solutions which could be unique to each MDR/SDS combination.  In addition, 2 MDR alternatives to single a SDS fulfilling all sub-roles are difficult if only bilateral arrangements are available:   1. **Suppliers as their own MDR.**   This would necessitate communicating reads and profiles received from the DCC to the Processing Service Smart (PSS).  In today’s world we have standardised DTN flows to interface with Data Collectors. The reads (daily or monthly billing) could be sent across using the DIP PUB-041, but there is no standardised process or interface for the supplier to communicate the profile values to PSS. This means that each supplier would need to agree bilateral formats and GDPR compliant transport mechanisms with each of the SDS(PSS) vendors it signs up. This adds an additional cost on both the suppliers and the SDS vendors – which would normally be included in the design of the programme since it introduced the MDR role.       1. **Third party MDRs qualifying as an MDR only.**   We anticipate this occurring where suppliers outsource the MDR activities to their adapter service providers. There are no interfaces or processes which allow the MDRs to communicate with the PSS (or vice versa).  Additionally, there is no established way for these MDRs to interact with other industry participants in standard scenarios such as appointment, change of consent, read/profile provision to PSS, update device details (following MEX for example). | |
| **Description of change:**  *(what is the change you are proposing)*  This problem would be avoided if additional optional standard interfaces were implemented as part of the MHHS Programme.  The availability of standardised interfaces between the sub- roles where the sending and receiving parties are from different organisations would make qualification more meaningful – there would be addition assessment criteria to measure a key activity within the TOM.  To promote healthy competition in the industry for the MDR sub-role, we propose that the following approach to interfaces is introduced - the key is to reuse what exists, including reuse of existing patterns following the design principle of “reuse before buy before build”.  In order to support the two MDR scenarios above the following interfaces need to be available:-   1. **Appointment/ De-appointment**  * New “defined” Start/Stop Interface to be created for exchange between SDS (PSS) and MDR. * Use of this message would be optional - MDR & SDS pairings could choose to either use the standard or a mutually agreed mechanism * Exchange of the “Start MDR / Stop MDR” interface could be sent via the DIP or via mutually agreed mechanism   Advantages:   * Creation of New MDR Start/Stop IF would not impact existing IF’s – so reduced impact on parties who have already designed / built * Limited impact on Registration Service – as avoids issues with request rejections, de-appointment or adding MDR as a third party agent * All other SP appointments are now actively managed by the REGS to ensure continuity of appointment – so would need MDR Auto De-appointment functionality to avoid this being a “new gap” * As MDR is still effectively down-stream of SDS then no need to extend existing test scope   Additional Considerations:   * MDR Role already recognised by the DIP, however, this avoids requiring the MDR being a formal signatory to the DIP Manager Code, in a way in which there are not currently. * DIP Cost model (when defined) may need to consider the implications of optional use, where previously a universal service offering would have been in place   **2. Routing Changes**  **MTDs - Change of Meter-** send IF/PUB-006 (Notification of Metering Service MTD Update to Registration) to any appointed MDR to see the inventory  **Consent** – send IF/ PUB-026 (Notification of Registration Supplier Data Item Changes) to any appointed MDR  **Smart Metering System Operator Update** - send IF/ PUB-026 (Notification of Registration Supplier Data Item Changes) to any appointed MDR  Change Required:   * Update Routing table on impacted Interfaces * Avanade to create new end points for MDR   Additional Considerations:   * MDR Role already recognised by the DIP, however, MDR would need to be a formal signatory to the DIP Manager Code if DIP transport mechanism used * Negligible impact in DIP message volumes   **3. Meter Reads & Consumption**  **Meter Reads** – MDR will send a variant IF/PUB-041 (Smart / Advanced Readings) which the MDR will send to the PSS/SDS via the DIP  **Profile Data** – send a variant of IF/PUB021 (UTC Settlement Period Consumption Data) – containing only blocks M0, B44, B046 and B047 (this is similar to the DCC response (SR 4.8.1 – for Import and SR 4.8.3 – for Export) which the MDR will send to the PSS/SDS via the DIP  Change Required:   * New IF-021 Variant to exchange consumption information between MDR & SDS(PSS) * Change existing IF-041 to extend existing ‘billing register’ section to include register start/stop times, & days of operation   Advantages:   * A new IF-021V interface would reduce impact on parties that had already designed/built * Message content could be slimmed down to remove unnecessary data items improving performance   Additional Considerations:   * MDR Role already recognised by the DIP, however, MDR would need to be a formal signatory to the DIP Manager Code if DIP transport mechanism used * DIP Cost model (when defined) may need to consider the implications of optional use, where previously a universal service offering would have been in place. If the supplier is acting as MDR to support Customer Own then this presumably is not an issue. * Potential impact in DIP message volumes of IF-021V – but this CR is more likely to be used in non-domestic area where volumes are lower   All these interfaces exist in one form, or another already and simply require repurposing for the SDS sub-roles – an exercise that has already been performed for the DTN flows which are continuing post MHHS go live. | |
| **Justification for change:**  Standardisation will harmonise the operational choreography and end-to-end performance. Data and messages can be tracked consistently improving the auditability of the end-to-end service. Error management and resolution will also be consistent.  The CR facilitates Customer Own appointments for Data Service Provider for non-domestic customers. Customer choice would otherwise be inhibited if a supplier was not able to support a bilateral arrangement with the customer’s chosen DSP. This would result in a customer having to turn to a supplier who did have the appropriate bilateral interface in place or agree to the supplier’s preferred DS.  The absence of standardised interfaces inhibits competition - it only supports the SDS performing the MDR role. Bilateral agreements will inhibit new MDR role entrants and lock suppliers into SDS contracts. This is not in the best interests of the energy industry and therefore we recommend that there may be an activity to standardise the interactions between MDR and other industry participants – namely the SDS (Acting as PSS), which would lead to introducing competition in the market for the new MDR role.  This change needs to be implemented as soon as possible so that Suppliers and Data Services can factor this into their Migration and MHHS baseline designs. In the non-domestic area this means that migration would no longer be held up by having to agree bilateral arrangements between multiple suppliers or data services. | |
| **Consequences of no change:**  *(what is the consequence of no change)*  Suppliers will have to make bilateral arrangements within the SDS role - it will be either costly or prevent competition in the sub role as suppliers may choose to fulfil the MDR role itself in all instances.   1. It will be costly to establish and support combinations of Customer own data services – and may be prohibitive - inhibiting customer choice 2. This will be a barrier to new service providers entering the market as they will need to set up separate new arrangements with different suppliers or indeed the reverse for new non-domestic suppliers 3. Delay to Migration – some MPANs could only be migrated when the bilateral arrangements with the Customer Own Data Service is agreed – we have in excess of 10 different Customer Own NHHDCs and HHDCs. 4. It would be suppliers to change service provider 5. It would be difficult suppliers and Data Services to participate in SIT if intended supplier/ DS comibination were not paired together. Any pairing between a Supplier and Data Service that did not intend to enter a commercial arrangement would result in technical debt to develop bilateral interfaces. 6. It will be harder to evaluate a data service for participant qualification (SIT, qualification or post go-live qualification) – standardised interfaces make that evaluation simpler and more consistent.   Suppliers and Data services will encounter cost in 2 scenarios: 1. Changing Data Service Partner and 2. Supporting Customer Own Service Providers.   1. A supplier would have to evaluate whether the cost of changing service provider makes commercial sense – considering the criticality of such a step this would be at least a Medium cost project attracting a high amount of risk 2. In non-domestic supply Customer Own agents are common for Industry and Commercial customers – so a large supplier could expect to have to build and maintain 10 or more separate agreements – we estimate this would incur a Medium to High cost. | |
| **Alternative options:**  *(What alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)*  Continue with TOM as is | |
| **Risks associated with potential change:**  *(what risks related to implementation of the proposed change have been identified)*  Extension of DIP flows and more DIP traffic – however the longer-term plan is to replace DTN with DIP and in any case the DIP needs to be capable of managing significant data volumes.  The overall benefit will outweigh the impact of additional work as there is cost benefit and customer benefit of traceability of data and consistency of performance as well as lower customer costs going forward. This also gives a proven transition path from DTN to DIP. | |
| **Stakeholders consulted on the potential change:**  *(Please document the stakeholders, or stakeholder groups that have been consulted to date on this change. The Change Raiser should consult with relevant programme parties in the drafting of the request, prior to submission to PMO).*  Large Supplier Constituency, MHHS Programme, Supplier Agent | |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** | ASAP as it affects design and build |

### Part B – Initial Impact of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser before being submitted to the MHHS PMO.***

***Please document the benefits of the change and to delivery of the programme objectives***

|  |
| --- |
| What benefits does the change bring |
| *(list the benefits of the change and how this improves the business case)*  Enables Customer Own appointments which would otherwise be costly to set up  Enables full interoperability of SDS sub roles as envisaged by the TOM  Encourages competition and innovation within the SDS role.  Enables new entrants into SDS sub-roles.  Introduces a more meaningful way to assess Market Participant Qualification to SDS sub-role – otherwise this will always be based on assessing bilateral interfaces. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Objective | Benefit to delivery of the programme objective |
| To deliver the Design Working Group’s Target Operating Model (TOM) covering the ‘Meter to Bank’ process for all Supplier Volume Allocation Settlement meters | This CR allows the TOM to operate as envisioned and simplifies interactions for customer own Data Services. |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation | Results in standardisation of data delivery |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) | Makes Qualification (within SIT or after it) of SDS sub-roles simpler to assess. |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable | Reduces time and cost to develop multiple bilateral interfaces within SDS roles |
| To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case | Fully realises TOM and reduces cost to serve |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes | Standardised interfaces are critical for industry interactions – bilateral arrangements do not benefit the industry as a whole and are a regressive step compared with the current interactions between for example Supplier and Data Collector |

**Guidance *– Please document the known programme parties and programme deliverables that may be impacted by the proposed change***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impacted areas | Impacted items |
| Impacted Parties | All Suppliers, All DS, DIP Service Provider and DTN |
| Impacted Deliverables | End to End Solution Architecture, SDS requirements, method statement and process maps;, method statement and process maps, Target Operating Model, Interfaces Catalogue, Operational Choreography |
| Impacted Milestones | M9 |

**Note *– Please refer to MHHS DEL174 Change Request Guidance for Programme Participants for information on how to score the initial assessment.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial assessment | | | |
| Necessity of change |  | Expected lead time | 4>20 working days |
| Rationale of change |  | Expected implementation window |  |
| Expected change impact | Medium |  |  |

**Guidance *– Please include a reference and link to any additional documentation which the change relates to.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: | |
| **Title** | **Reference** |
| MHHSP-DES138-Interface Catalogue v5.1.2 | [***Link***](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BE278FDEF-24DD-47A6-B115-BC523115FCFE%7D&file=MHHSP-DES138-Interface%20Catalogue%20v5.1.2%20(clean).xlsb&action=default&mobileredirect=true&DefaultItemOpen=1) |
| MHHSP- DES196- D-Flow and Interface Mapping v0.4 | [***Link***](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BC47AA024-BF14-4E1F-8D83-0D0475566EC6%7D&file=MHHSP-DES196%20-%20D-Flow%20and%20Interface%20Mapping%20v0.4.xlsx&action=default&mobileredirect=true&DefaultItemOpen=1) |
| MHHSP-BP003-Change of Service - Data Service v5.0 | [**Link**](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/Design%20Documents/Forms/Redlined%20Design%20Artefacts%20Release%20Notes.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents%2FMHHSP%2DBP003%2DChange%20of%20Service%20%2D%20Data%20Service%20v5%2E0%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents) |
| MHHSP-BP004-Data Collection-v5.0 | [**Link**](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/Design%20Documents/Forms/Redlined%20Design%20Artefacts%20Release%20Notes.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents%2FMHHSP%2DBP004%2DData%20Collection%2Dv5%2E0%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents) |
| MHHSP-BP005-Data Processing-v5.0 | [**Link**](https://mhhsprogramme.sharepoint.com/sites/Market-wideHalfHourlySettlement/Design%20Documents/Forms/Redlined%20Design%20Artefacts%20Release%20Notes.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents%2FMHHSP%2DBP005%2DData%20Processing%2Dv5%2E0%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FMarket%2DwideHalfHourlySettlement%2FDesign%20Documents) |

### Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment

### Note – *This section will be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

### *All Impact Assessment responses will be considered public and non-confidential unless otherwise marked. If there are any specific elements of the response (e.g. costs) that are confidential, please mark the specific sections as confidential rather than the response as a whole. The MHHS Programme will publish all Impact Assessment responses and redact any confidential information as noted.*

**Guidance – Programme Participants are required to:**

**Respond with ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’, deleting as appropriate. If the respondent agrees, they can provide additional evidence to further support the assessment. If the respondent disagrees or abstains, they should provide a detailed rationale as to why.**

**Add any additional effects that have not already been identified. In doing so, they should provide as much detail as possible to allow a robust assessment to be made.**

**Proceed to Part C.2 for Impact Assessment Recommendation response once completed.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment (complete as appropriate) |
| **Effect on benefits**  *If implemented the CR will enable suppliers to operate competitive environment within the SDS role – this will enable the MHHS programme to more effectively realise the benefits of the TOM as suppliers will not be locked into bilateral interface agreements.*  *SDS sub-role SIT and Qualification will be easier to evaluate as their interfaces will be standardised* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on when a benefit will be realised; who will realise the benefit; the extent to which the benefit will be realised.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the benefit will be delayed by X weeks; the change means Y population will also realise the benefit.* |
| **Effect on consumers**  *Standardisation of interfaces within the SDS role will promote competition and offer the opportunity to reduce or contain the cost to serve.*  *Non-domestic customers will be able to have a choice of data or metering service without being inhibited by the bilateral agreements the supplier maintains.*  *Simpler means to assess qualification will reduce the chance of customer detriment and cost to implement.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on service delivery to consumers; will there be a cost impact to consumers; will there be a choice impact to consumers?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. what is the scale of the effect? Will the effect be permanent?* |
| **Effect on schedule**  *There will be an initial delay due to an analytical phase – new sub-roles will need to be referenced in the affected DIP and/ or DTN flows.*  *Implementation of the CR will streamline SIT and Qualification.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the schedule/milestones be directly impacted; will the schedule/milestones be indirectly impacted.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will delay the project by X days; the change will require additional resource to complete (though detail resource in resource section); the delay can/cannot be recovered by condensing Y activity.* |
| **Effect on costs**  *Increased cost due to analysis phase – but cost savings during SIT, Qualification. All interfaces required do exist and would need to be repurposed for the new roles.*  *Avoid change within the SDS roles post MHHS should suppliers wish to renegotiate with providers of the sub-roles – the cost of which will ultimately land with the consumer.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the change cause a loss of income; will the change cause additional cost; will the change cause a reprofiling of cost?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. whether it is capital or operating expenditure that will be affected; what period costs will be affected in; what the rough order of magnitude of the cost impact will be and if organisation will be able to absorb it?* |
| **Effect on resources**  *Unable to quantify additional resource demand for analysis or reduction of resource for SIT / qualification as this would need to come from the MHHS programme.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will there be an impact on tools or equipment; will there be an impact on staff capacity; will there be an impact on staff skills or capability?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will require X additional staff for Y period of time; the change requires Z training or support.* |
| **Effect on contract**  *CR will impact contracts between Suppliers and the SDS sub-roles – this will be offset through the benefits obtained by standardisation.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on contracts with sub-contractors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with vendors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with regulators/ESO.*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the changes will require new contracts to be created; the changes will variations to existing contracts; the changes will affect ability to meet contract requirements.* |
| **Risks**  *There is a risk of delaying milestone M9, but offset as*  *De-risks lengthening the SIT phase as interfaces within the SIT participants will be interoperable.*  *De-risks qualification as it will be simpler to assess candidate participants’ solutions.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.*  *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will existing risks be affected; will new risks be created?*  *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will affect the likelihood of a risk occurring, the change will affect the impact the risk would have, the change will require additional controls and mitigation.* |

### Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation

### Note – *This section must be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

**Guidance – The primary reporting metric of the Impact Assessment is the recommendation response. The consolidated response will be presented to the relevant governance group(s) and decision maker(s) with the totals for ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’. As such, please ensure this section is completed before the form is returned to MHHS PMO. Provide detailed rationale and evidence in the commentary field.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation (mandatory) |
| **Recommendation**  *Change Raiser to provide initial recommendation.*  **It is recommended by the Change Raiser the change is approved.** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection.* |

**Impact assessment done by:** <Name>

**Guidance*: If you are a third party responding on behalf of another Programme Participant, please state this in your response.***

**Impact assessment completed on behalf of:** <Name>

### Part D – Change approval and decision

**Guidance*: The approvals section will be completed by the MHHS PMO once the Impact Assessment has been reviewed.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part D - Approvals |
| **Decision authority level**  <Based on the impact assessment, state who is required to make a decision concerning this change> |

**Guidance** - ***This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO and Change Owner following the review of the impact assessment and decision reached by the SRO.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part D – Change decision | | | | |
| Decision: |  | Date | |  |
| Approvers: |  |  | |  |
| Change Owner: |  | | | |
| Action: |  | | | |
| **Changed Items** | **Pre-change version** | | **Revised version** | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |

### Part E – Implementation completion

**Guidance *- This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Part E – Implementation completion | | | |
| Comment |  | Date |  |

**Guidance *– The Closure Checklist in MHHS DEL175 Change Log must also be completed by MHHS PMO at this stage.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Checklist Completed | Completed by |
| Yes/No |  |

**Guidance – *This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process and should be* used to add any appropriate references of the change once it has been completed.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| References | | |
| **Ref** | **Document number** | **Description** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |