

Action Table (as at 13 May 2020)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Min Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0108	08/01/20	7.8	Xoserve (ES) to ensure Governance Subcommittee reviews the governance arrangements around change assurance and associated health check for development – carried forward to July.	Xoserve (ES) Carried Forward Review at July meeting	
0216	12/02/20	12	Xoserve to review how they can be clearer when discussing costs which have already spent a proportion of their budget – carried forward to July.	Xoserve (ES)	Carried Forward Review at July meeting
0501	13/05/20	5.0	Xoserve (RT) to add a colour coding key to the Planned Outages slide of the presentation.	Xoserve (RT)	Pending
0502	13/05/20	8.5	Xoserve (PO/JR) to discuss with industry the need for reviewing CPs approved for capture and their potential impact on change prioritisation.	Xoserve (PO/JR)	Pending
0503	13/05/20	8.6	Xoserve (PO) to update the UK Link POAP to ensure it is consistent with progress made against the various CPs.	Xoserve (PO)	Pending
0504	13/05/20	12.2	Xoserve (MD) to ensure a new exceptions issue is added to the Issue Register and a link to the register is added to the Amendment Invoice webpage.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
0505	13/05/20	12.2	Xoserve (MD) to consider how to ensure the unresolved exceptions issue does not reoccur and provide potential solutions if needed.	Xoserve (MD)	Pending
0506	13/05/20	12.3	Xoserve (JR) to consider if there is an options for consolidated and separated meeting packs.	Xoserve	Pending
0507	13/05/20	12.4	Xoserve (JR) to put forward their proposal to managing Shipper Information and Performance Packs via a CP to the industry.	Xoserve (JR)	Pending



DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured
Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

A1: General Details

Change Reference:	XRN 5186			
Change Title:	Modification 0701: Aligning Capacity booking under the UNC and arrangements set out in relevant NExAs			
Date Raised:	27/05/2020			
	Organisation :	Northe	Northern Gas	
Sponsor Representative Details:	Name:	Tracey Saunders		
	Email:	trsaunders@northerngas.co.uk		
	Telephone:	01133975471		
	Name:	Ellie Rogers		
Xoserve	Email:	ellie.rogers@xoserve.com		
Representative Details:	Telephone:	0121 292 185		
	Business Owner:	I IBC		
Change Status:	⊠ Proposal		☐ With DSG	☐ Out for Review
	☐ Voting		☐ Approved	☐ Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

	⊠ Shipper	□ Distribution Network Operator	
Customer Class(es):	☐ NG Transmission ☐ IGT		
	□ All	☐ Other <please details="" here="" provide=""></please>	
Justification for Customer Class(es) selection	Network Exit Agreement wi are not party to the contrac NExA in place through the	he consumer enters into a bilateral th and therefore are impacted. Shippers to but can see within DES where there is Network Exit Agreement Indicator, plus he system which will impact their NExA	



A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

	quirements / i mai (realinea) onange
Problem Statement:	There is no process to ensure that the Supply Point Capacity (Often referred to as "SOQ") and Supply Point Offtake Rate (often referred to as "SHQ") allowed in a NExA (which is a contract between the site operator and the Transporter) and that allowed by the UNC (which is contract between the Relevant Shipper and the relevant Transporter) are aligned. This can result in discrepancies where the Shipper books more capacity on the System than the customer is allowed to use in accordance with the NExA.
	Modification 0701 has been raised and seeks to improve visibility where a consumer has entered into a bi-lateral Network Exit Agreement (NExA) with the relevant Transporter and to link capacity increases with the NExA so that the allowed capacity does not exceed the capacity as agreed in the NExA. This Change Proposal has been raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this Modification. Please note Modification 0701 is currently with Ofgem for a final decision on whether it should be implemented.
	In summary, please see at high level what is required by the CDSP to deliver the Modification solution:
	Enhance what is currently held in UK Link and Data Enquiry Service against NExA sites to include: a. NExA SOQ b. NExA SHQ c. Maintain a history of NExA effective to and from date (inclusive of future dates)
Change Description:	For every NExA site, a check that the current PMSOQ is lower than or equal to the NExA SOQ value is required and correct the PMSOQ for any NExA sites which have a greater PMSOQ than the provided NExA SOQ value. To correct it, the PMSOQ at the NExA SOQ
	The PMSOQ for Class 1 and 2 sites will not be able to exceed the Supply Point Capacity (SOQ) quoted in the NExA. The PMSOQ should be capped at the NExA SOQ, (it should not be able to increase above the NExA SOQ)
	For Class 1 and 2 sites, any requests to change existing System capacity made by the Shipper shall not, where a relevant NExA exists, exceed the DM SOQ and the SHQ set out in the NExA. For any Product Class which has a valid NExA in place.
	a. For any Product Class which has a valid NExA in place (which is recorded in UK Link) and where a Shipper requests a change to existing Capacity, this must always be subject to the Supply Point Nomination referral and sent to the relevant Transporter.
	b. Where the Transporter approves the Capacity request at Nomination referral, when the Nomination is Confirmed by the Shipper (can be up to 6 months from the Nomination



	 Confirmation for the Capacity request against the NExA information to accept or reject. If the effective of the Confirmation is not within the effective date set out within the NExA, the Confirmation will be rejected For a Class 1 and 2 Supply Points the System Capacity shall not ratchet above the daily offtake rate set out in the NExA. If a site with a relevant NExA ratchets above the NExA SC the booked SOQ should not increase to the ratchetted value (above the NExA SOQ) but the ratchet charge should still be applied. For Class 3 and 4 Supply Points: the relevant Transporter should be notified of any SOQ changes as part of Rolling AQ which come within a defined % of the SOQ set out in the NEx 		
Proposed Release:	Release is TBC however we expect this to be a Major Release.		
Proposed	☐ 10 Working Days ☐ 15 Working Days		
Consultation Period:	☐ 20 Working Days	☐ Other [Specify Here]	

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	To improve visibility where a consumer has entered into a bi-lateral Network Exit Agreement (NExA) with the relevant Transporter, and to link capacity increases with the NExA so that the allowed capacity does not exceed the capacity as agreed in the NExA. What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?
Benefit Realisation: Upon implementation	
Benefit Dependencies:	When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised? The benefit is dependent on Modification 0701 being approved for the CDSP to deliver this change. Also, worth noting, not a dependency as such, but there is a Change Proposal (XRN5146) that is seeking to cleanse all NExA information on both the Data Enquiry Service (DES) and UK Link systems prior to this change being implemented, to ensure all data currently held on these systems is accurate and up to date. XRN5146 supports this change. 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.



A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations – Removed

(see Section C for DSG recommendations)

A6: Service Lines and Funding

Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing	Service Area 11: NExA Supply Meter Points It is expected that new Service Lines under Service Area 11 will be required as part of this change.			
Level of Impact	Minor			
If None please give justification	N/A			
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix	The Data Permissions Matrix would need to be updated to reflect the additional data items for NExA sites which are proposed to be added to DES.			
Level of Impact	Minor/			
If None please give justification	N/A			
	Customer Classes/ Funding	Delivery of Change	On-going Budget Amendment	
	☐ Shipper	XX %	XX %	
Funding Classes	☐ National Grid Transmission	XX %	XX %	
·	□ Distribution Network Operator	100 %	XX %	
	□IGT	XX %	XX %	
	☐ Other <please specify=""></please>	XX %	XX %	
ROM or funding details:	ROM Response XRN5094 - Modificati A ROM was produced during the Modification development which indicated that an enduring solution for the UK Link changes will cost at least £66,000, but probably not more than £115,500 to implement. • In relation to the DDP change specifically, (requirement 8), an enduring solution will cost at least £18,000 but probably not more than £35,000 to implement. • Note, the DDP cost is not included in the UK Link cost			
Funding Comments:	Service Area 11 is 100% DN funded which is reflected in the funding class for this change.			

A7: ChMC Recommendation

Change Status:	☐ Approve	□ Reject		□ Defer
	☐ 10 Working Days		□ 15 Worl	king Days



Please select.

If [Yes] please specify <Release>

Industry Consultation:			
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX		
DSC Consultation Issue:	□ Yes	□ No	
Date Issued:	Click here to enter a date.		
Comms Ref(s):			
Number of Responses:			
•			
A8: DSC Voting	Outcome		
	☐ Shipper	Please select.	
Solution Votings	☐ National Grid Transmission	Please select.	
Solution Voting:	☐ Distribution Network Operator	Please select	

Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA

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

☐ Yes

Click here to enter a date.

☐ IGT

 \square No

Meeting Date:

Release Date:

Overall Outcome:



Section B: Change Proposal Initial Review

To be removed if no consultation is required; or alternatively collated post consultation

Organisation:

Name:

B1: User Details

Details:	1 10				
	Email:				
	Telephone:				
		_			
B1: ChMC Indus	try Consultati	ion			
1. Do you think the ch	ange proposed po	oses a material ris	sk/cost to yo	ur organisation and /	
or the market? Pleas	e can you provide	the rationale for y	our respon	se	
2. Do you think the ch	ango proposed wi	ill bonofit your oro	anication a	ad / or the market?	
Please provide any qu				id / Of the market?	
r icase provide arry qu	dantinable outputs	as well as arry as	sampuons.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation					
support this to be imp					
(Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change)? 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)					
4. Do you agree with	the principles of th	is funding as indi	cated in sec	tion A6 (Service Lines	
and Funding)?					
Change Drangestin					
Change Proposal in principle:	□ Approve	☐ Reject		☐ Defer	
Publication of					
consultation	☐ Publish		☐ Private		
response:	_ 1 00.011				
. 55,55561					

Please send the completed forms to: uklink@xoserve.com



Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

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

DSG Date:	Click here to enter a d	ate.	
DSG Summary:			
Capture Document / Requirements:	<insert appropriate="" where=""></insert>		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	□ Reject	□ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / N	lov XX or Adhoc DD/MN	M/YYYY



Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

Solution Option Summary:	
Xoserve preferred	
option:	
(including rationale)	
DSG preferred	
solution option:	
(including rationale)	
Consultation	Click here to enter a date.
closeout:	Click liele to elitel a date.

Impact on Service	
Line(s) and funding	(If differ from evicinal accessment in AC)
(A6) for each	(If differ from original assessment in A6)
Solution Option:	



Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

9							
	Organisation:						
User Contact	Name:	Name:					
Details:	Email:						
	Telephone:						
Organisation's							
preferred solution							
option, including							
rationale taking into							
account costs, risks,							
resource etc.							
Implementation Date:	☐ Approve		☐ Reject		□ Defer		
Xoserve preferred solution option:	☐ Approve		□ Reject		□ Defer		
DSG preferred solution option:	☐ Approve		□ Reject		□ Defer		
Publication of consultation response:	☐ Publish			□ Private			

E2: Xoserve's Response

L	Comments.
١,	Comments:
	to Organisations
١,	
	Xoserve Response



Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN####
Solution Details:	
Implementation Date:	Click here to enter a date.
Approved By:	
Date of Approval:	Click here to enter a date.



Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	
Comm Title:	
Comm Date:	Click here to enter a date.

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	
Close Out Date:	Click here to enter a date.

G3: Change Detail

9	
Xoserve Reference	
Number:	
Change Class:	
ChMC Constituency	
Impacted:	
Change Owner:	
Background and	
Context:	

G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

04. Onange impact Assessment Basinboard (OK Ellik)						
Functional:						
Non-Functional:						
Application:						
User(s):						
Documentation:						
Other:						

	Files								
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed					



G5: Change Design Description							
G6: Associated 0	Changes						
Associated							
Change(s) and Title(s):							
G7: DSG							
Target DSG	Click here to enter a date.						
discussion date: Any further							
information:							
G8: Implementation							
Target Release:	Release: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY						
Status:							

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to $\underline{\mathsf{uklink}} \\ \underline{\mathsf{woserve.com}}$



Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

	Organisati	on:				
User Contact	Nar	me:				
Details:	Em	nail:				
	Telepho	ne:				
Representation Status:		·				
Representation Publication:	☐ Publish				□ Private	
Representation Comments:						
Confirm Target Release Date?	□ Yes		No If [No] please specify alternative			

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com



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 Details

	☐ CMA Order		☐ MOD / Ofgem			
	☐ EU Legislation	☐ License Condition				
Change Driver	□ BEIS	☐ ChMC endorsed Change Proposal				
Туре:	☐ SPAA Change Proposal		☐ Additional / 3rd Party Service Request			
	□ Other <		<lf [c<="" td=""><td colspan="3"><pre><if [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></if></pre></td></lf>	<pre><if [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></if></pre>		
Customer group(s)	☐ Shipper ☐ IG		Т		☐ Network	
impacted if the change is not	☐ Xoserve		G Tran	smission	□ NTS	
delivered:	☐ Other	<lf [c<="" td=""><td>Other] p</td><td>olease provid</td><td>le details here></td></lf>	Other] p	olease provid	le details here>	
Associated Change Ref Number(s):			Associated MOD Number(s):			
Perceived delivery	□ 0-30		□ 30-60			
effort (days):	□ 60-100		□ 100+			
Does the change involve the	involve the lidentifiable person who can b				lease answer the next	
processing of personal data?	directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' - includes MPRNS.		□ No			
A Data Protection Impact Assessment	☐ New Technology		☐ Th	eft of Gas		
(DPIA) will be	☐ Mass Data		☐ Xoserve Employee Data			
required if the change involves the	☐ Vulnerable Customer Data		☐ Fundamental changes to Xoserve			
processing of personal data in any	☐ Other <if< td=""><td><lf [c<="" td=""><td colspan="2"><if [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></if></td></lf></td></if<>		<lf [c<="" td=""><td colspan="2"><if [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></if></td></lf>	<if [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></if>		
of the following scenarios:	(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.					
Change Beneficiary:	☐ Multiple Market Participants		5	☐ Multiple Market Group		
How many market participant or segments	☐ All UK Gas Market Participants			☐ Xoserve Only		
stand to benefit this change?	☐ One Market Group ☐ One Market Participant			ket Participant		
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area:	Choose Item					
	□ One			☐ Two to Five		



Number of Service Areas Impacted:	☐ Five to Twenty			□ All			
Improvement Scale?	☐ 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						
	□ BW		□ ISU		□ CMS		
Primary Application	□ AMT		□ EFT		□IX		
impacted:	☐ Gemini		☐ Birst		☐ API		
	☐ Other		<lf [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></lf>				
	□ AQ		□ SPA		□ RGMA		
Business Process Impacted:	☐ Reads		□ Portal		☐ Invoicing		
,	☐ Other		<lf [other]="" details="" here="" please="" provide=""></lf>				
Any known impacts to external services	□ Yes						
and/or systems as a result of this change?	□ No	_		s] please provide details here>			
Workaround Details							
Workaround in	□ Yes	If [No] please do not continue completing the					
operation?	□ No	[Workaround Details] section			1 1 3 1		
Who is accountable for the workaround?	□ Xoserve		☐ External	Customer	☐ Both		
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?							
	☐ Low	☐ Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)					
What is the Complexity of the workaround?	☐ 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					



Prioritisation Score

Change	
Change	
Prioritisation Score:	
i ilolitioationi occio.	



Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
0.1 For	For Review	27/05/2020	Jai Le Resche	Initial CP draft for review and
	I OI IXEVIEW			approval to submit