Department for Education

# Education Data Division - Request for Change Form for CBDS

## Section 1 - Details of Change

## (To be completed by the RFC Originator / CBDS Administrator)

| **Project / Service:** | **Type of Change:** | **RFC 837** |
|---|---|---|
| CBDS | Amendment to data item 100492 | |

| **Name and team/company of RFC Originator:** | |
|---|---|
| **Kirsty Bennett DDU EDD** | |
| **Originator Contact No:** | **Originator email address:** |
| 01325 340432 | Kirsty.bennett@education.gsi.gov.uk |
| **Date RFC Raised:** | **Date change required:** |
| 20 August 2015 | Following sign off of this RFC |
| **Priority:** | **1 = Top** - Ministerial or legislative requirement<br>**2 = High** - Senior official customer requirement or clear net benefit / efficiency saving to EDD, department or MIS suppliers<br>**3 = Medium** - Customer requirement, marginal net benefit<br>**4 = Low** - Nice to have, net cost, does not affect functionality, cosmetic change |
| 3 | |

| **EDD Contact:** |
|---|
| Queries.SUPPLIER@education.gsi.gov.uk |
| **Change Title:** |
| Amendment to Unique Candidate Identifier (UCI) |

**Data item / Rule Number:**

Unique Candidate Identifier (UCI)

Data item 100492

**Description of change:**

The amendment of valid values & item level validation, to allow for 6th character to be 'B' for international centres.

| Data Item Name | Description | Type and Format | Code set / Valid Values | Item Level Validation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unique Candidate Identifier (UCI) | A UCI is a 13 digit character code allocated to a student the first time they are entered for an externally assessed qualification and is used to identify the individual throughout their modular courses. | A(13) | 999999999999A<br>or<br>99999B999999A | Character Position Data Example<br>- 1 to 5: The centre number [e.g. 99999]<br>- 6: 0 (zero) for UK centres and B for international centres [0 or B]<br>- 7 to 8: Year that the candidate enrolled [e.g. 15]<br>- 9 to 12: The candidate number allocated by the centre [e.g. 0001]<br>- 13: Check character calculated / allocated automatically [e.g. A] |

**Reason for change (including benefits):**

Currently CBDS lists the UCI data format as 999999999999A which does not take account of the UCIs allocated by a small number of international centres where character 6 will not be numeric (i.e. B)

**Impact of not doing the change:**

Some UCIs could be incorrectly recorded.

**ISB view of the proposed change:**

**Funding availability:**

Not applicable

**Impact assessment to be undertaken by:**

Core software suppliers

Internal colleagues

| **Date consulted:** | **Response requested by:** |
|---|---|
| **20/08/15** | **07/09/15** |

## Section 2 - Impact Analysis

## (To be completed by Impact Assessors)

**Software Suppliers' Summary of Impact Assessment:**

Supplier 1

- We support this change.
    - Given that this will mean an updated CBDS item, this means that the CTF (and possibly ATF?) specification may need an update to take account of the change:
        - We would be happy to accept this change as a mid-year update to CTF 15.0 on the understanding that we would make the required change to allow for the additional possible values if & when a suitable opportunity arises in our release cycle. Note that until then our software would continue to ignore/reject codes that do not match the current UCI definition.

**DfE Internal Colleagues' Summary of Impact Assessment:**

I support this change. Software suppliers may not be able to implement the change immediately but as the RFC is addressing an existing problem, this is not a reason to delay.

**Alternative Solutions / Workarounds (if appropriate):**

**Estimated Cost of Change:**

**Impact Assessed by (name):** **Date:**

## Section 3 - Outcome / Decision

## (To be completed CBDS administrator)

**Review Meeting:** **CBDS Administrator Review Meeting**

| **Attendees:** Kirsty Bennett, Gary Connell | **Date of Review Meeting**: 14/09/15 |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **Brief Summary of Discussion:**<br><br>Impact assessments considered, agreed that the impact on CTF will be minimal since the international centres that use the different number format wouldn't usually be sending CTFs anyway. There may be more of an impact on ATFs but it will still be minor. As the RFC is addressing an existing problem we will approve. | |
| **Accept / Reject:**<br><br>Accept | **Deferred to:** |
| **Type of Funding:** | **Fund Holder Agreement:** |
| **If Defer, provide details** | |
| **If Accept, provide details:**<br><br>Creation of new data item 100581 Unique Candidate Identifier (UCI) which supersedes 100492 due to change in valid values | |
| **If Reject, provide details:** | |