**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Request details | | | |
| Change Request Title | DIP LDSO Interface Processing | | |
| Change Request Number | CR029 | | |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | DAG | | |
| Risk/issue reference | N/A | | |
| Change Raiser | NGED – National Grid Electricity Distribution | Date raised: | 13/07/2023 |

***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:**  The MHHSP-DES138-Interface Catalogue provides for a significant number of new technical interfaces which are designed to be sent to Licenced Distributor Systems Operator (LDSO) via the industry Data Integration Platform (DIP).  In many cases LDSO’s already have existing established internal system interfaces and business processes designed to synchronise this data across systems.  e.g. PUB-001 Notification of Change of Supplier is already catered for by internal interfaces from ERDS/SMRS (i.e. MPRS) to internal LDSO systems.  Other interfaces should be optional for LDSO’s to consume based upon the LDSO’s own business needs.  e.g. PUB-040 Notification of [Calculated] Annual Consumption is sent to both Registration Services and LDSO roles and therefore may, or may not be, required by all LDSO’s.    The duplication of data across existing and DIP interfaces makes ingestion of many of the new DIP interfaces (PUB-) redundant from a business outcome perspective and the requirement to build and test new DIP interfaces in LDSO systems incurs unnecessary development and testing costs which brings no defined benefit to customers. | |
| **Description of change:**  To avoid unnecessary development and testing effort and incurring costs which bring no defined benefit to customers the following caveat will apply to the MHHSP-DES138-Interface Catalogue:  *“Where a DIP message interface (IF-) is directed to the LDSO role then consumption of the incoming PUB- message shall be optional at the discretion of individual LDSO’s providing that:*   1. *the associated Business Process Design’s (BPD) do not require the sending of any outbound DIP interfaces (IF-) in response to receipt/processing of the PUB message* 2. *the LDSO warrants that existing equivalent internal systems interfaces/business processes are implemented for dealing with any corresponding non-DIP requirements e.g. sending of a data flow via the DTN gateway “*   LDSO’s who do not wish to process any of the specified PUB- interfaces are not required to subscribe to those message types in the DIP. Unsubscribed messages will expire within the DIP and be moved to a ‘dead letter’ queue.  For the avoidance of doubt:   1. this Change Request applies to DIP interfaces sent to the LDSO role only. UMSO interfaces are out of scope of this particular Change Request. 2. messages (IF-) originating from ERDS/SMRS will be sent to the DIP in all roles as is currently defined by the MHHSP-DES138-Interface Catalogue (including LDSO). The optionality for the LDSO as to whether to consume the message will apply to the PUB- side of the message interface only.   Business Process Designs (BPD) for each of the impacted interfaces have been reviewed to confirm that there is no downstream impact to other parties or roles other than the LDSO itself  i.e. There are no IF- messages sent from LDSO in response to any of the nominated PUB- messages.  Therefore, there is no deviation from the Operational Choreography in terms of timeframes or potential SLAs.  This change requires a documentary change to the Interface Catalogue and does not alter the MHHS design itself. There is no deviation from the Ofgem MHHS Target Operating Model.  For information listed are the interfaces in scope of this CR:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Interface** | **Description** | **Sending Party\*** | **Receiving Party** | **Comment** | | PUB-001 | Notification of Change of Supplier | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-006 | Notification of Metering Service MTD Update to Registration | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-008 | Registration Service Change of Energisation Status Notification | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-009 | Notification of LDSO Disconnection / CSS De-Registration | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-018 | Notification of Registration Data Item Changes | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-020 | Manage Meterpoint Relationships Response | Registration Service/ LDSO | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-026 | Notification of Registration Supplier Data Item Changes | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-036 | Notification of Registration Supplier Data Item Changes | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-037 | Notification of Service De-Appointment | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-040 | Notification of [Calculated] Annual Consumption | Market-wide Data Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-041 | Smart / Advanced Readings | Supplier / Advanced Data Service and Smart Data Service / Advanced Metering Service and Smart Metering Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. | | PUB-043 | Registration Service Notification of Change in Connection Type | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. (note this does not route to the LDSO on BP011/BP011B but Interface specification has Secondary Routing for LDSO) | | PUB-044 | Registration Service Notification of Change in Market Segment | Registration Service | LDSO | Optional for LDSO to subscribe to and process data flow. (note this does not route to the LDSO on BP011/BP011B but Interface specification has Secondary Routing for LDSO) |   \*Note CR024 is expected to clarify and align sending party roles with existing BSC and REC definitions e.g. Registrations will become ERDS/SMRS  \*Note some of these flows are not originated in the Registration Service – however, LDSOs would like the optionality to subscribe due to their existing system processes | |
| **Justification for change:**  *(please attach any evidence to support your justification)*  Mitigate unwarranted costs whilst reducing change complexity for existing LDSO systems.  Makes optional LDSO DBT requirements for 10+ PUB interfaces but does not impact requirements for any other role or downstream process. | |
| **Consequences of no change:**  *(what is the consequence of no change)*  Significant, un-necessary costs may be incurred by LDSO parties in building and testing new DIP interfaces which provide no additional benefit to customers. | |
| **Alternative options:**  *(What alternative options or mitigations that have been considered)*  LDSO’s who do not wish to process the specified PUB- interfaces are not required to subscribe to those message types in the DIP. Unsubscribed messages will expire within the DIP and be moved to a ‘dead letter’ queue. | |
| **Risks associated with potential change:**  *(what risks related to implementation of the proposed change have been identified)*  This CR reduces the risk of LDSO delivery against the programme plan by:   1. removing the need to build new DIP message interfaces duplicating existing functionality 2. removing the need to unpick equivalent processing from existing internal interfaces 3. reducing the likelihood of data corruption due to messages being processed at different times via multiple interfaces | |
| **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).*  Working group discussions have identified a significant level of support from LDSO’s for processing of these interfaces to be made optional.  Details around the options developed have been discussed in multiple open design forums including Design Resolution Group (DRG). The issue initially was raised by a member of the LDSO community. | |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** | 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)*  This Change Request mitigates unwarranted costs whilst reducing change complexity for existing LDSO systems and reduced risk for the MHHS programme by   1. removing the need for LDSO’s to build new DIP message interfaces duplicating existing functionality 2. removing the need for LDSO’s to unpick equivalent processing from existing internal interfaces 3. reducing the likelihood of data corruption due to messages being processed at different times via multiple 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 has no impact on the MHHS TOM |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation | This CR maintains the delivery of the Settlement Timetable. |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) | The design baseline will be delivered into Code Changes within the Programme. |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable | This CR should reduce the impact and therefore potentially time for delivery whilst maintaining benefits. |
| To deliver Programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case | This CR should allow full realisation of the benefits without potential for more significant costs. |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change Programmes | This CR supports the Design Working Group’s core principle of more real-time processing of data to realise benefits whilst allowing LDSO’s flexibility as to the method of implementation where the impact is constrained to the LDSO itself. |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impacted areas | Impacted items |
| Impacted Parties | LDSO’s and DIP provider (for management of dead letter queue sizes only). |
| Impacted Deliverables | MHHSP-DES138-Interface Catalogue |
| Impacted Milestones | N/A |

**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 |  |
| Rationale of change |  | Expected implementation window |  |
| Expected change impact |  |  |  |

**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**  This CR should allow full realisation of the benefits without potential for more significant costs. |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Effect on consumers**  Reduction in overall cost to serve for consumers |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Effect on schedule**  No impact upon schedule |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Effect on costs**  Avoids unnecessary development and testing costs to build and test new DIP interfaces in LDSO systems which bring no defined benefit to customers. |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Effect on resources**  Avoids unnecessary development and testing effort in LDSO systems. |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Effect on contract**  Believe no impact |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |
| **Risks**  Reduced risk for the MHHS programme by   1. removing the need for LDSO’s to build new DIP message interfaces duplicating existing functionality 2. removing the need for LDSO’s to unpick equivalent processing from existing internal interfaces 3. reducing the likelihood of data corruption due to messages being processed at different times via multiple interfaces |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |

### 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**  **It is recommended by the Change Raiser the change is approved.** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
|  |

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