DSC Change Proposal

Change Reference Number: XRN4789

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour ▰

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour ▰

Section A1: General Details	
Change Title	Updating Shipper Reporting Packs and glossary
Date Raised	10/10/2018
Sponsor Organisation	E.ON
Sponsor Name	Kirsty Dudley
Sponsor Contact Details	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
Xoserve Contact Name	Emma Smith
Xoserve Contact Details	Emma.Smith@Xoserve.com
Change Status	Proposal (Initial Review) / **With DSG** / Out for review / Voting / Approved or Rejected

Section A2: Impacted Parties	
Customer Class(es)	☒ Shipper (part A & B of A3)
	☒ National Grid Transmission (Part B of A3)
	☒ Distribution Network Operator (Part B of A3)
	☒ IGT (Part B of A3)

Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

This Change Proposal has two elements of change:

Part A is specific to the changes to the shipper reporting packs and therefore only Shippers are expected to comment on part A.

Part B is relevant to all customer groups, aiming to seek views from all customers around a full review and possible rationalisation on all reporting currently provided by Xoserve.

Part A

The Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) is picking up momentum and to ensure that Shippers have the best MI, this change proposal has been raised initially for PAC and the DSG to review to ensure that reporting for both align and Shippers have access to consistent and informative data to ensure they can spot trends, resolve issues. Currently the Shipper reports have sections which relate to </> 73200kWh however PAC often look at things now relating to class rather than threshold of use.

With the introduction of the CDSP MI tool the access to data may change but the data requirements should be consistent regardless on if it is emailed or downloaded – this activity is to try and complement other data activities rather than replace them.

General Shipper Pack Comments:

• The glossary is not a glossary but more a guidance document. It could benefit from a rewrite (once the final report design is approved).

• Report dates and reporting periods – the reports don't include a data period or a creation month so it would be good to add timings into each description in the glossary so parties are clear the periods covered and the month of issue.

• The splits are done by threshold not class – should they be class now? Or both? Needs to be clearer in the guidance why it is split a certain way and ensure it correlates to code requirements.

• More a nice to have, but, it would be good to link the data and the tabs better e.g. by clicking on the

summary table it took me to the data tab.

• .Should any data extracts e.g. correction factors / blank MAM IDs be on a single data tab or amalgamated data tab so that the reporting is consistent, currently a different approach is taken for the data items.

Things not in the glossary but are currently included in Shipper Packs – should they be added?

Data tab:

• Shipper Meter Read Performance

• Shipper Meter Read Rejections

• Industry Meter Read Rejections

• Shipper Meter Read Frequency

Consideration points for the reporting packs:

1)RGMA Traffic Flow

• With changes to SPAA Schedule 22 occurring as of November 2018 will this reporting still be in accordance to the requirements or will it become out of date?

• Does this mirror the cut off dates which are in the schedule and will also be the new requirements come Nov

2) Confirmed no asset

• Six months from when – it is not clear what the trigger point of the 6months is, is it from the first of the month, the report date or something else – see general comments about timings

3) No Reads – 2 years, 3 years and 4 years

• 2, 3 and 4 years from when – it is not clear what the trigger point of these years are., Is it from the first of the month, the report date or something else? – It is also broken down into six sections but this is not clear when reading the glossary

4) Meter Point Status

• No comments

5) Meter status

• No comments

6) Incorrect Meter Read Factor and Units

• Does not appear to be any data associated with this – where is this? Should it be added into the glossary description?

7) Must reads

• No comments

8) Potentially Incorrect Correction Factors

• Not clear why this data is not in the data tab and has its own data tab – should be consistent and either separate all or amalgamate?

9) Blank MAMS

• The order of the glossary does not match the summary page – blank MAM is at the bottom in the reporting but it is after the correction factors in the glossary

10) USRV

• Does this need to be in there anymore? Can it be deleted?

11) Dead report

• No comments

12) Theft analysis

XOserve

• Not clear the period the auto closures cover e.g. June/July – Can more detail be added as to when the report is up to?

13) Count of Supply Points

• The glossary description doesn't include IGTs but these are now also included in the pack

Not all comments raised may need addressing via IT/reporting changes many we believe can be resolved through updating the guidance information produced.

Part B

During the Unidentified Gas (UIG) workgroup and Change Management Committee (ChMC) development there have been targeted discussions around management information (MI) produced; and whether it was timely to conduct a full review with rationalisation of customer MI. Xoserve have already committed to provide UIG performance reporting as part of XRN 4695 (UIG taskforce); on developing the MI it became apparent that similar information was being sent from other sources e.g. shipper performance pack & PARR reporting. Therefore, to reduce duplication of effort and/or confusion around similar reports providing slightly different output due to minor differences in the scripting e.g. split by AQ or by class depending on the reporting.

Part B is seeking to deliver effective and consistent reporting which acts as the first view of potential issues, the ChMC/UIG discussions believe that reporting should act as the 1st trigger for issue identification and resolution and if left undetected or unresolved could be picked up by e.g. the PAC. The reporting shouldn't provide inconsistent messaging which possibly could be the case today.

Xoserve presented a number of options with a recommendation of option four.(slide 4).

Review of
Customer Manu...

Proposed Release (Feb/Jun/Nov/Minor)	RX / DD/MM/YYYY – as recommended by DSG
Proposed Consultation Period	☒ 10 Working Days ☐ 20 Working Days ☐ 30 Working days Other: as directed by DSG depending on the changes proposed

Section A4: Benefits and Justification	
Benefit Description *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?*	The benefits of this change are to introduce a more robust supporting document which is understandable for new and existing parties.
Benefit Realisation *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?*	From document publication.
Benefit Dependencies *Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change, this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the projects has not got direct control of.*	None.

Section A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.	

Final DSG Recommendation	Approve / Reject / Defer
DSG Recommended Release	Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

Section A6: Funding		
Funding Classes	☒ Shipper	100%

	☐ National Grid Transmission	XX%
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	XX%
	☐ IGT	XX%
Service Line(s)	Service Area 18: Provision of user reports and information	
ROM or funding details		
Funding Comments	This will be Shipper Funded only	
Section A7: ChMC Recommendation		
Change Status	☒ Approve – Issue to DSG ☒ Defer – Issue for review ☐ Reject *This decision was made at the ChMC meeting on 7th November 2018. The sponsor wanted an initial review and for DSG to see the change. At the ChMC meeting on 12th December, this change was approved to proceed to DSG.	
Industry Consultation	☒ 10 Working Days ☐ 20 Working Days ☐ 30 Working days Other:	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	23/11/2018 (5 responses received which approved the change in principle)	
DSC Consultation		
Issued	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Date Issued		
Comms Ref(s)		
Number of Responses		
Section A8: DSC Voting Outcome		
Solution Voting	☐ Shipper	Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	☐ National Grid Transmission	Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	☐ IGT	Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
Meeting Date	XX/XX/XXXX	
Release Date	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA	
Overall Outcome	Approved for Release X / Rejected	

Please send the completed forms to: box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com

Section B: DSC Change Proposal: Initial Review
(to be removed if no consultation is required; or alternatively collated post consultation)

User Name	Graham Wood
User Contact Details	Graham.Wood@centrica.com

Section B1: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

Review still in progress

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

We are continuing to review this change; however we set out some initial thoughts below.
•　Where data is not currently provided to support the reports, the provision of this information would be extremely useful.
•　Detailed report definitions are required, as it is not currently clear how performance is being measured in some areas e.g. Meter Read Performance.
•　Reports should be aligned. The Shipper pack is out of data in some areas & does not measure performance on the same criteria as the PAC reports.
•　We support the other considerations contained within the change proposal, particularly around measurement criteria.

3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

Review still in progress

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Review still in progress

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Alison Neild
User Contact Details	Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com

Section B2: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

No, regarding Part A, as this is understood to be documentation changes to the report to provide clarity on what the data refers to within the glossary.

Regarding Part B, this references the review activity and therefore would need to be assessed when the proposed solution is provided as a result of that activity.

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

Part A: No
Part B: Answer would need to revisit when the review process has been completed.

3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

We would not support extensive change to the shipper performance pack at this stage if a wider review is being undertaken.

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Yes

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Scottish Power
User Contact Details	Mark Bellman

Section B3: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

No response

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

Yes, the benefits quoted are *The benefits of this change are to introduce a more robust supporting document which is understandable for new and existing parties.*
I think there would be real benefits in a review of content, layout, etc. of the pack, as it is currently does not make for easy-reading to someone not familiar with it, and it may be useful to add information more helpful measures which allow us to compare to National performance.

3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

No response

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

No response

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Eleanor Laurence
User Contact Details	Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com / 07875117771

Section B4: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

No

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

Yes – any enhancements to the existing reporting can only be beneficial. The proposed changes in section A seem sensible. With regards to section B – where possible to streamline & combine operational reporting into a single MI report/distribution list this would be favourable but should be mindful to have no negative impact on current report frequency i.e. if current frequency is 2 weekly, this should not become monthly solely to combine with shipper report. Therefore maybe weekly, fortnightly, monthly and quarterly MI could be combined into their respective groups of reports

3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

Yes with 3 months lead time

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Yes

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Kirsty Dudley
User Contact Details	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com

Section B5: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

> **1.** Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

Part A
As part A focusses on revamping the glossary and aligning reporting to metrics which are more akin to the post nexus world our view is costs will be minimal in this area.
We support all the areas mentioned and believe they all need some form of amendments e.g. wording changes in the glossary or changes in the reporting to match how things are grouped (Class rather than LSP/SSP).

Part B
Based on the current discussions it is possible that more costs will be required to deliver this element of the solution which may in turn influence Part A to ensure it remains aligned and robust to how the PAC and UIG MI reporting works.

Overall
Our overall view is that reporting needs to be linked to obligations in code, act as an early indication if something is right or even if something is wrong – this allows parties to identify where there might be an issue so they the correct it. It needs to also be measured in a consistent way to reporting seen by PAC to avoid inconsistent messages; there should be overall synergies in the way reporting works. Over time reports have been bolted into the Shipper packs because independently they resolve an issue, however, there are also similar reports which can deliver the same thing. We are potentially saturated with MI but what is given needs to be meaningful and beneficial to the party and to the industry.

> **2.** Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

Part A
Yes, the refinements will ensure that consistent and accurate understanding of what is in the Shipper pack, this will benefit both existing and new entrants as the glossary and the reporting will be informative and robust.

Part B
Further work and articulation for Part B is required and if it becomes clear it is independent to Part A then consideration of XRN separation might be needed. Currently we consider the developments for Part B a potential influencer on what happens to Part A and rather than change the glossary to be in keeping with reporting today, only to change it quite quickly afterwards to meet the developments in Part B, we would at this stage be happy to consider them together.

Overall
It would be good for Part A and Part B to be reviewed in more detail and to understand exactly where the 'overlaps' are, where things are independent and if necessary move those areas into a new XRN and allow the independent elements of Part A to progress as potentially minor refinements.

> **3.** Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

Part A

We would view these as more housekeeping refinements and could be delivered as a minor release or aligned to a major release with a minimum of 3 months' notice, however, as some of our MI is linked to the MI reviewed it is preferred to have 3-6 months to allow for internal MI changes.

Part B
The solution needs to be developed more on this but we could apply the same suggestion as to Part A as long as it is not reviewed as larger impacts.

Yes with 3 months lead time

4.	As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Part A
As this is focussing on Shipper pack, yes we support it being Shipper funded.

Part B
If the benefits of the changes are wider than Shippers then costs should be reviewed and proportionally allocated to the parties who are receiving the benefit. If the more detailed 'capture' review identifies that Part B only benefits Shippers then again we would be happy for it to be Shipper funded.

Overall
The XRN could be drafted to have the independent changes which only impact Shippers so it can be Shipper funded and another XRN created for the overlapping or wider impacting changes.

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Mark Jones
User Contact Details	mark.jones@sse.com

Section B6: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response

Our only concern would be losing data in the Shipper Pack, this is a good way to highlight all the potential data items requiring work in one simple easy to digest place and so would be keen not to remove any data items from this report.

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

Yes, as it would provide more MI and potentially increase the number of focus areas for shippers to improve settlement data. The only assumptions are that shippers change their processes to act on the MI and that PAC will have powers over poor performance.

3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)

We would support this change in a minor release, with a minimum of 4 months lead time.
Agree with option 4 as the best way forward.

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 18. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Yes.

Change Proposal in principle	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish

Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Summary	

19th November 2018

Alison Cross (AC) presented this Change Proposal to DSG. AC explained that Xoserve issue Shipper Reporting Packs to all portfolio Shippers on a monthly basis. Specifically, they are issued to the Shipper Operational contacts. Xoserve can provide who receives the reporting packs within individual organisations on request – contact Alison if you require this information.

XRN4789 was raised to review and amend the existing pack to fulfil the following purposes:
– To ensure fit for purpose and aligned with PAC reporting
– To provide shippers with access to consistent and informative data to be able to spot trends and resolve issues

XRN4789 was approved at the ChMC meeting in November for an initial review Change Pack with the industry and to proceed to DSG. AC encouraged DSG to provide reps in response to the Change Pack (Comm reference: 2140.5) before the Change Pack closes out on 23rd November.

AC explained that the current scope for the change has been split into two parts: Part A and Part B.

Part A for Shippers to consider whether they want to do an initial review and amend the existing Shipper Reporting Pack. Further details can be found on slide 34.

Part B is for all customer groups to provide a full review of Xoserve Management information. Again, further details can be found on slide 34.

LW pointed out that the Shipper Reporting Packs have been in place since pre-Nexus.

AC presented appendix one; the Change Proposal has a prioritisation score of 25%. There were no comments on the scoring.

Action 1115: DSG to support Xoserve with the development of requirements for XRN4789 Updating Shipper Reporting Packs

Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	N/A

Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Summary – 17th December 2018	

AC presented slides 29-31. This change has been split into 2 parts at the request from ChMC in November. Part A is for Shippers only to review the existing Reporting Pack; 5 responses were received and approved in principle. Part B has been included in the CP for all customers with regards to completing a full review of Management Information. Part B will be reviewed separately and may require a separate Change Proposal to progress.

Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	N/A

Section C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Summary – 18th February 2019	

Jane Goodes (JG) gave an update of the change starting with Part A. The requirements gathered and agreed with Kirsty Dudley (KD) and currently looking at solutions. A session has been completed to look at the scale of the reports. We are concentrating on the Glossary as this will be a benefit immediately. JG stated that working with Customer Advocates and SME's to get a mocked up glossary and then bring to DSG with solution options.

JG explained that Part B looks at the review of reports on a wider scale. After investigation and due to the scale of this part, a new change has been raised (XRN 4857 – Report Review) led by our Data office. The Data team will work with 3rd party, rationalising & optimising what we generate. Look at all externally published and internally generated reports but not internal to Xoserve. JG stated that we are looking at how we engage with customers and updates given at DSG. KD said she is not comfortable to strip out part B until she can review XRN4857 and confirm there are no gaps and that all Packs aligned e.g. Shipper, UIG. It was agreed for JG to work with KD so there are explicit requirements. KD stated that it will be helpful that we have a Glossary and Pack that anyone, new or who are not a Shipper, can understand. It is understood that completing Part A first may mean the Glossary will have to change again once Part B is implemented.

Action 19 – 0213 Contact Kirsty to gather requirements for XRN4789 Part B to add into the new XRN raised with Data.

Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	N/A

Section C4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Summary – 4th March 2019	

> Jane Goodes (JG) gave overview of the change. The Glossary is in flight, with a positive response from the proposer. The proposed format is very simple in a word document with version control. JG expressed the example is to show the proposed format and to ignore the content as this would need SME input. The document is to be meaningful to the user in the how, what and why. JG stated that there are discussions on having the link to the website as to how to resolve issues. Elly Laurence (EL) requested if there would be extract period included e.g. Communitive report from ** date to **date, or ran monthly on ** date. JG to check with the SME and add where applicable.
> The SME looking into the solution of the reporting is looking to change to Class rather than AQ banding. Solution option the Architect has suggested is to redesign using a Tab per topic with a summary on page. The full HLSO can be viewed on slide 52 which will cost approximately £20K
> EL queried whether there was any overlap between this change and any other tool. JG and ES are looking into all changes to see where value change can be completed now in a timelier manner than other changes in progress. Need to look at all changes before confirming. In regards to EL question to inform multiple teams when sample reports available; ES stated to work with the Data Office to get plan to see how big this is, and where there are cross overs. Will keep working on this and bring back to DSG with timelines and sample reports.

Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	N/A

Appendix 1

Change Prioritisation Variables

Xoserve uses the following variables set for each and every change within the Xoserve Change Register, to derive the indicative benefit prioritisation score, which will be used in conjunction with the perceived delivery effort to aid conversations at the DSC ChMC and DSC Delivery Sub Groups to prioritise changes into all future minor and major releases.

Change Driver Type	☐ CMA Order ☐ MOD / Ofgem ☐ EU Legislation ☐ License Condition ☐ BEIS ☒ ChMC endorsed Change Proposal ☐ SPAA Change Proposal ☐ Additional or 3rd Party Service Request ☐ Other *(please provide details below)*
Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered	☒ Shipper Impact ☐ iGT Impact ☐ Network Impact ☐ Xoserve Impact ☐ National Grid Transmission Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)	
Associated MOD Number(s)	
Perceived delivery effort	☒ 0 – 30 ☐ 30 – 60 ☐ 60 – 100 ☐ 100+ days
Does the project involve the processing of personal data? *'Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' – includes MPRNS.*	☐ Yes *(If yes please answer the next question)* x☐ No
A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the delivery of the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:	☐ New technology ☐ Vulnerable customer data ☐ Theft of Gas ☐ Mass data ☐ Xoserve employee data ☐ Fundamental changes to Xoserve business ☐ Other *(please provide details below)* *(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.)*
Change Beneficiary *How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?*	☐ Multiple Market Participants ☐ Multiple Market Group ☐ All industry UK Gas Market participants ☐ Xoserve Only ☒ One Market Group ☐ One Market Participant
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	Service Area 18: Provision of User Reports and Information
Number of Service Areas Impacted	☐ All ☐ Five to Twenty ☐ Two to Five ☒ One
Change Improvement Scale? *How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?*	☐ High ☐ Medium ☒ Low
**Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?**

Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?		
☐ Safety of Supply at risk	☐ Customer(s) incurring financial loss	☐ Customer Switching at risk

Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?		
☐ Customer System Changes Required	☐ Customer Testing Likely Required	☒ Customer Training Required

Known Impact to Systems / Processes		
Primary Application impacted	☒ BW ☐ ISU ☐ CMS ☐ AMT ☐ EFT ☐ IX	

XOserve

	☐ Gemini ☐ Birst ☒ Other *(please provide details below)*
Business Process Impact	☐AQ ☐SPA ☐RGMA ☐Reads ☐Portal ☐Invoicing x☐ Other *(please provide details below)* Business Reporting in the impacted business area
Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?	☐ Yes *(please provide details below)* ☒ No
Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.	☒ Shipper impact ☐ Network impact ☐ iGT impact ☐ Xoserve impact ☐ National Grid Transmission Impact
Workaround currently in operation?	
Is there a Workaround in operation?	☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes who is accountable for the workaround?	☐ Xoserve ☐ External Customer ☐ Both Xoserve and External Customer
What is the Frequency of the workaround?	
What is the lifespan for the workaround?	
What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround?	
What is the Complexity of the workaround?	☐ Low *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)* ☐ Medium *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)* ☐ High *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)*
Change Prioritisation Score	25%

Document Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
1.0	For Approval	22/10/2018	Emma Smith	N/A
2.0	Proposal – Initial Review	09/11/2018	Emma Smith	Included in the November Change Pack for an initial review.
3.0	Appendix one added	14/11/2018	Emma Smith	
4.0	Proposal – Initial Review	22/11/18	Rachel Taggart	Ratification of Priority score
5.0	Representation Matrix	28/11/18	Richard Johnson	Representation Matrix created
6.0	With DSG	14/12/18	Richard Johnson	Notes from ChMC on 12th December added
7.0	With DSG	27/12/18	Richard Johnson	Notes from DSG on 17th December added
8.0	With DSG	26/02/19	Charan Singh	Notes from DSG on 18th February added
9.0	With DSG	11/03/19	Charan Singh	Notes from DSG on 4th March added

Template Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
3.0	Approved	17/07/18	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11th July
4.0	Approved	07/09/18	Emma Smith	Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1