**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Request details | | | |
| Change Request Title | Alignment of Data Item Names and Descriptions | | |
| Change Request Number |  | | |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | N/A | | |
| Risk/issue reference | N/A | | |
| Change Raiser | Sarah Jones / Retail Energy Code Company | Date raised: | 7/6/23 |

***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)*  As part of the interface tranche of MHHS code drafting, RECCo has reviewed the information contained within the MHHS Interface Catalogue (DES138) and identified a number of areas where changes to the DIP interface names should be progressed in order that these better align to enduring code terminology. | |
| **Description of change:**  *(what is the change you are proposing)*  In order to translate the MHHS interface catalogue (in the DES138) into the Energy Market Data Specification, RECCo is seeking to align MHHS interface names to enduring code terminology to avoid future inconsistencies.  To meet this aim, we have identified four areas where changes should be made.   1. Removal of references to Metering Service within the interface name. Existing terminology will be retained e.g. MEM in the REC and MOA in the BSC. 2. Replacement of references to Service Providers with Supplier Agents within the interface name, Existing terminology will be retained with Data Services and Metering Services defined as Supplier Agents in both the BSC and REC. 3. Replacement of references to Registration / Registration Service with SMRS. To differentiate from the CSS and ERDS, following agreement with BSCCo that DIP interfaces fall under the scope of the SMRS. 4. Replacement of references to CSS De-Registration with CSS Registration De-Activation to reflect REC code terminology.   Redlined changes to the DIP interface names have been included as Attachment 1. | |
| **Justification for change:**  *(please attach any evidence to support your justification)*  This CR is being progressed to support the MHHS drafting activities to allow the data within the MHHS data catalogues to be translated into the Energy Market Data Specification as efficiently and robustly as possible.  Whilst the MHHS design artefacts have been baselined and are being used by parties to support design, build and test activities, it is important that the enduring provisions held in the Energy Market Data Specification are clear and unambiguous. Changes are therefore being proposed where the MHHS design has used terminology that will not be retained within enduring code drafting. | |
| **Consequences of no change:**  *(what is the consequence of no change)*  If the DIP interface names are not amended, new duplicate definitions will need to be introduced into the codes to reflect terms used in interface names that will not be used elsewhere. This approach is inefficient and could lead to confusion, particularly for new entrants post MHHS implementation. | |
| **Alternative options:**  *(What alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)*  No alternative options have been considered. A spreadsheet of all proposed changes is attached to this CR and should any items be contentious then they could be removed, rather than rejecting the CR in its entirety. | |
| **Risks associated with potential change:**  *(what risks related to implementation of the proposed change have been identified)*  There is a risk that lack of clarity in the DIP interface names will lead to inefficiencies / errors being introduced into market participant code review activities and add confusion particularly for new entrants post MHHS implementation | |
| **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).*  RECCo and the REC Code Manager have discussed this issue with industry stakeholders via the REC MHHS Stakeholder Advisory Group and MHHS Code Drafting Working Group. The proposed changes have also been raised via the design issue process and the design team has fed back that changes to interface names would require a CR to be raised. | |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** | ASAP    the interface tranche of code drafting is scheduled to be issued for consultation in August 2023. |

### 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)*  The change amends the MHHS design to align the MHHS interface catalogue (DES138) to existing code terminology.  This will allow MHHS code drafting to progress in a timely manner and provide clarity to market participants on how DIP interfaces defined within the MHHS interface catalogues align to existing terminology. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 | Ensures the MHHS interface catalogue can be efficiently and unambiguously translated into the enduring code governed drafting. |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation | N/A |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) | Ensures the MHHS interface catalogue can be efficiently and unambiguously translated into the enduring code governed drafting. |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable | Prevents a delay to the MHHS interface code drafting tranche due to difficulty in translating the information within the MHHS interface catalogue. |
| To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case | N/A |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes | N/A |

**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 Programme Participants |
| Impacted Deliverables | DES138 Interface Catalogue |
| Impacted Milestones | M6 – we do not anticipate an impact on M6 however this has been recorded as the relevant milestone for code drafting activities |

**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 | 3 – Potentially Important Change | Expected lead time |  |
| Rationale of change | Solution | Expected implementation window |  |
| Expected change impact | Low |  |  |

**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** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 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**  The change amends the MHHS design to align to existing code terminology.  This will allow MHHS code drafting to progress in a timely manner and provide clarity to market participants on how DIP interfaces defined within the MHHS interface catalogue align to existing data. |
| *<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**  No impact on consumers have been identified. |
| *<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**  Progressing this change to the MHHS design artefacts will allow the interface catalogues to be translated into the Energy Market Data Specification and avoid issues / queries being raised through the code drafting workstream which could lead to a delay in approving the MHHS code drafting. |
| *<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**  Minimal impact to the programme to update the design artefacts.  The change would avoid additional RECCo and industry resource costs to support code drafting activities where the ambiguities are not resolved ahead of the industry drafting consultation. |
| *<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**  Minimal impact to the programme to update the design artefacts.  The change would avoid additional RECCo and industry resource to support code drafting activities where the ambiguities are not resolved ahead of the industry drafting consultation. |
| *<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**  No impact identified |
| *<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 that lack of clarity in the DIP interface names will lead to inefficiencies / errors being introduced into market participant code review activities and add confusion particularly for new entrants post MHHS implementation |
| *<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 Disagree Abstain** |
| *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** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |