

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

SSI Change Governance Process – version 1.0

Purpose

This document is the Self-Service Interface (SSI) governance process produced in accordance with [SECMP0058 'Changes to the governance of the Self-Service Interface'](#).

1. Proposing improvements to the SSI

SEC Parties may propose improvements to the SSI by submitting an SSI Improvement Proposal (SIP) form (Annex F) provided by the Data Communications Company (DCC), to SSIRemedyImprovements@smartdcc.co.uk. Within five Working Days of the proposer sending the SIP, the DCC will endeavour to respond to confirm receipt of the request and advise if there is any additional information it needs. If the DCC requires more time to assess if any additional information is needed, the DCC will inform the proposer and advise a reasonable timescale they can expect to receive the DCC's confirmation.

Where the proposer of a SIP believes it is required as a matter of urgency, the DCC shall validate the urgency of the request and the Panel or a delegated Sub-Committee will determine the timetable that the SIP should follow.

2. Validation and Prioritisation

The DCC will validate the SIP to ensure the requirements are clear and viable and as a minimum, each request will have to meet the capabilities of the SSI and comply with one of the Business Functional Domains contained in SEC Appendix AH. To achieve this the DCC will proactively provide support and guidance to all proposers. Once a SIP has been validated and accepted by the DCC, they will assign the request with a unique ID number and feed this back to the proposer.

DCC will then assess the impacts that the SIP will have on DCC Systems, SEC Parties and any other SIPs already under consideration. As well as the impacts, DCC will also consider the costs of each SIP and apply a category of Small (below £50k), Medium (£50k-£100k) and Large (exceeds £100k). Each SIP will then be prioritised against any other SIP currently under consideration.

Following the DCC's confirmation of receipt of the SIP and the receipt of any further information sought from the proposer, the DCC will complete its validation and prioritisation of each SIP within a reasonable timescale dependent on the scale of each SIP and shall endeavour to provide its findings to the proposer within 20 Working Days. Where this is not possible and the DCC cannot fulfil this timescale, they will inform the proposer and advise a reasonable timescale they can expect to receive the DCC's findings.

3. SSI Improvement Consultation

To maintain efficiency, the Working Group and the DCC propose to issue SSI improvement consultations to the industry in quarterly intervals following the implementation of SECMP0058. A consultation will have the capacity to consult on several SIPs at once with a view to deploying them over a defined time period, rather than consulting on each SIP individually. Subject to the approval of SECMP0058, SSI improvement consultations could be issued by SECAS on behalf of DCC, with each consultation expected to last for a minimum of 15 Working Days allowing all SEC Parties the opportunity to provide their feedback to each SIP.

In the initial period following the approval of this modification and considering DCC's current approach relating to Planned Maintenance of the SSI, it is expected that the current backlog of SIPs will decrease and so it is proposed over the long term, possibly in 2020, that SEC Parties are consulted on a less frequent basis. In any event, the implementation window for a batch of SIPs in a given consultation would not straddle two Regulatory Years.

Each SSI improvement consultation will include the following:

- The proposer of each SIP;
- A description of each SIP;
- The benefits of each SIP;
- The SEC Parties impacted;
- Whether each SIP is seeking to add, amend or remove functionality;
- The anticipated cost range; and
- The anticipated timescales to develop and deploy.

The SSI improvement consultation responses will be collated and the DCC will refine improvements to each SIP where this is required.

4. Panel (or Sub-Committee) Impact Assessment sign-off

All feedback received shall be collated into a single document and referred to the SEC Panel or a delegated Sub-Committee for consideration, where they will consider the scope and cost of the SIPs and approve or reject their progression through to DCC Impact Assessment.

If the decision to approve the DCC Impact Assessment of SIPs following the SSI improvement consultation is delegated to a Sub-Committee and that Sub-Committee deems it cannot form a decision, the Sub-Committee may escalate the matter to the Panel to approve or reject, requesting the DCC Impact Assessment of SIPs, or alternatively advise DCC to refine the solution(s).

5. Panel (or Sub-Committee) Development sign-off

Once the DCC have carried out their Impact Assessment to each SIP, the Impact Assessment(s) shall be considered by the SEC Panel or a delegated Sub-Committee where they will consider any material changes to the scope and cost of the SIPs and approve or reject their progression through to DCC development.

If the development of SIPs is approved, the DCC shall develop the SIPs and continuously assess whether there are any material changes to the scope and costs that were previously considered under the Impact Assessment. If changes have occurred to the agreed scope and costs, DCC shall advise the Panel (or any delegated Sub-Committee).

If the decision to approve the revised scope of SIPs is delegated to a Sub-Committee and that Sub-Committee deems it cannot form a decision, the Sub-Committee may escalate the matter to the Panel, who can approve or reject the revised scope, or alternatively request SECAS issue a second SSI improvement consultation to seek SEC Parties' feedback prior to making this decision.

6. Panel (or Sub-Committee) deployment sign-off

Once the DCC have developed the SIPs, accounting for any agreed revisions in scope, the Panel (or any delegated Sub-Committee) shall consider any changes to the previously agreed scope. If it is deemed that the scope has changed from what was previously agreed, the Panel (or any delegated Sub-Committee) could choose to approve or reject the deployment of the SIPs or advise the DCC to revise the solution(s).

The DCC will propose the implementation approach they would like to take to deploying the now developed SIPs. If the decision to approve the deployment of SIPs is delegated to a Sub-Committee and that Sub-Committee deems it cannot form a decision, the Sub-Committee may escalate the matter to the Panel, who can approve or reject the deployment of the SIPs, or advise DCC to revise the solution(s).

7. Sub-Committee Terms of Reference

It is expected that the review and sign-off for any programme of change to the SSI would be made by the Panel or any delegated Sub-Committee. If the Panel chooses to delegate any SSI improvement related sign-off requirements to a Sub-Committee, the Working Group recommend that the Operations Group is tasked with this role. The Operations Group currently consider SIPs under Planned Maintenance of the SSI and thus there is precedent under this approach. The Working Group considered the current Operations Group Terms of Reference and agreed that this should be amended to add conditions specifically for SSI impacting improvements in terms of quoracy and voting rights. The Working Group also considered the conditions should the Panel choose to form a new Sub-Committee and agreed that conditions in terms of quoracy and voting rights would be required in the terms of reference.

The terms of reference, membership and operation of the SSI improvement consultation process, may be reviewed by the Panel at any time, however at least annually, to ensure that they remain appropriate to reflect the duties and requirements of the SEC. Amendments to these terms of reference will be approved solely by the Panel.