

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4777**

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** | Acceptance of Contact Details Updates | |
| **Date Raised** | 1st October 2018 | |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | EdF | |
| **Sponsor Name** | Elly Laurence | |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com | |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | David Addison | |
| **Xoserve Contact Details** | [David.addison@xoserve.com](mailto:David.addison@xoserve.com) / 07428 559800 | |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / With DSG / **Out for review** / Voting / Approved or Rejected | |
| **Section A2: Impacted Parties** | | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  IGT | |
| **[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.  )** | | |
| Prior to the Project Nexus Implementation Date, Shippers were able to submit, and have accepted, Contact Detail updates with the same effective date as the date on which the transaction was submitted to UK Link systems even where they were not processed on the day of receipt by the CDSP.  Following Nexus implementation such transactions have been rejected. This CP seeks to develop a solution that reverts the outcomes of such Shipper transactions to those experienced prior to Nexus. | | |
| **Proposed Release (Feb/Jun/Nov/Minor)** | To be confirmed. | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | 10 Working Days  20 Working Days  30 Working days  Other: | |
| **[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?* | | Reverting UK Link Application functionality will eliminate the need for multiple system changes for User systems.  Contact detail is maintained in UK Link systems for a variety of reasons. Eliminating erroneous rejections will enable optimal data to be available to consumers of this information. |
| **Benefit Realisation**  *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | | At implementation of this change. |
| **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 identified. |
| **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 0%  Distribution Network Operator 0%  IGT 0% | |
| **Service Line(s)** | DSC Service Area 3: Record, submit date in compliance with UNC | |
| **ROM or funding details** |  | |
| **Funding Comments** |  | |
| **Section A7: ChMC Recommendation** | | |
| **Change Status** | Approve – Issue to DSG  Defer – Issue for review  Reject  Approved, this change will proceed to DSG; this was the verdict from the ChMC meeting on 10th October. | |
| **Industry Consultation** | 10 Working Days  20 Working Days  30 Working days  Other: | |
| **Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)** | XX/XX/XXXX | |
| **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)

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1 | FA | 01/10/18 | EL | First Draft |
| 2 | FA | 02/10/18 | Heather Spensley | Appendix 1 added |
| 3 | With DSG | 12/10/18 | Xoserve | Notes from ChMC on 10th October Added |
| 4 | With DSG | 19/10/18 | Xoserve | Notes from DSG on 15th October added to section C |
| 5 | With DSG | 22/11/18 | Rachel Taggart | Notes from DSG on 19th November added to section C |
| 6 | Out for Review | 11/01/19 | Xoserve | Solution Review Change Pack – January 2019 |
| 7 | With DSG | 30/01/19 | Rachel Taggart | Notes from DSG on 21st January 2019 added to section C |

**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 |

**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** | |
| **15th October 2018**  The description of the change, and the change prioritisation was presented to DSG (slide 63). Prior to the Project Nexus Implementation Date, Shippers were able to submit, and have accepted, Contact Detail updates with the same effective date as the date on which the transaction was submitted to UK Link systems even where they were not processed on the day of receipt by the CDSP.  Following Nexus implementation such transactions have been rejected. This CP seeks to develop a solution that reverts the outcomes of such Shipper transactions to those experienced prior to Nexus.  It was agreed to make the following changes to Appendix One of the Change Proposal:   * This change does involve the processing of customer data * There would be an impact to external systems, depending on the solution options presented   **19th November 2018**  DA presented slides 41 and 42 to DSG. DA presented the solution options and sought to obtain DSG advice for how Xoserve can better target the solution options by eliminating any inappropriate options.  The requirements DA talked through can be found on slide 41. Slide 42 indicates the following five solution options:  1. Do Nothing – Continue to reject records where the effective date = receipt date, and the file is received after published deadline. [Not Recommended] 2. Additional instances of contact batch processing. 3. Application amendment to allow Effective Date (ED) of contact as Processing Date -[X] Supply Point System Business Days. 4. Allow retrospective Effective Dates. 5. Application amendment to allow Effective Date (ED) of contact as Received Date.  DA indicated that Option 5 was his preferred solution option.  EL from EDF is the proposer for the Change and provided her opinion on the solution options presented by DA. Option 1 is not an option as it wouldn’t satisfy EDF’s requirement, and is therefore not feasible from a customer perspective. Option 2 would satisfy the requirements. EL was concerned by Option 3; she said that the processing date would need to be properly defined in order for the option to work, and questioned how Xoserve would validate it against the current supplier. EL stated that Option 4 would be riddled with validation issues. EL said that Option 5 seemed sensible.  JB from Npower expressed his support for Option 5. He suggested that if it proved complex to timestamp the file on, or soon after receipt, to use the file generation date in the header.  **Outcome from DSG: DSG recommended Options 2 and 5 to progress for a High Level Solution Option Impact Assessment. Options 1, 3 and 4 were noted, but were not to be progressed.**  **21st January 2019**  Megan Troth stated that after agreeing to Solution option 2, this change was first proposed for November 19 release however it was descoped for this Release and is now being proposed for a Minor Release. The Change Pack is currently out for Representation responses and internally it has been confirmed it can go as a Minor Release therefore we are hoping to get into the next Minor Release. Change Pack is open till 25th January.  **Action: DSG to review the Change Pack which requests Industry support for the decision to go into a Minor Release** | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section D1: Solution Options** | |
| **High Level summary options** | |
| **Change Pack included below** | |
| **Implementation date for this solution option** | Minor Release (Date TBC) |
| **Xoserve preferred option; including rationale** | Option 2: Validate the EFFECTIVE DATE with the RECEIVED DATE |
| **DSG preferred solution option; including rationale** | Option 2: Validate the EFFECTIVE DATE with the RECEIVED DATE |
| **Consultation close out date** | 25/01/2019 |

**Section D: DSC Change Proposal High Level Solution Options**

**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)** | **N/A** |
| **Associated MOD Number(s)** | **N/A** |
| **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)*  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)*  Logging and processing of customer data  *(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 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations |
| **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  ☐ Other *(please provide details below)* |
| **Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?** | Yes *(please provide details below)*  This will be identified during Capture.  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** | 30% |