

**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](mailto: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](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "WHAT – What is the required change? WHY – Why is the change needed? WHEN – Detail when the solution should be started/implemented.  )** | | |
| **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 thefirst 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  • 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). | | |
| **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](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "Benefit Description: What, if any, are the intangible and tangible benefits of the change?Benefit Realisation:When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised? Benefit Dependencies:Detail any dependencies that are outside the scope.)** | | |
| **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. | |
| **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**](mailto: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 | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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**](mailto: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 | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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 | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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. | | |
| 1. 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** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |

**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?** | |
| 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  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 | Emma Smith | Representation Matrix created |

**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 |