***Change Proposal***

**XRN4340 – UK Link Future Release (1.1)**

**Mod reference *(where applicable):***

**CDSP Reference: CP4340**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document Stage | Version | Date | Author | Status |
| ROM Request / Change Proposal | V1 | 24/08/27 | CDSP | Submitted to Change Committee |
| ROM Response |  |  |  | Approved by Change Committee |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| EQR | V1 | 24/08/27 | CDSP | Submitted to Change Committee |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| BER | V1 | 24/08/27 | CDSP | Submitted to Change Committee |
| Change Management Committee Outcome | V1 | 13/09/2017 | CDSP | Approved by Change Committee |
| CCR |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |

***Document Purpose***

This document is intended to provide a single view of a change as it moves through the change journey. The document is constructed in a way that enables each section to build upon the details entered in the preceding section. The level of detail is built up in an incremental manner as the project progresses.

The template is aligned to the Change Management Procedures, as defined in the CDSP Service Document. The template is designed to remove the need for duplication of information. Where information is required in one section but has been previously captured in a previous section, the previous section will be referenced.

The summary table on the front page shows the history and the current status of the Change Proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Section*** | ***Title*** | ***Responsibility*** |
| 1 | Proposed Change | Proposer / Mod Panel |
| 2 | ROM Request / Change Proposal | Proposer / Mod Panel |
| 3 | ROM Request Rejection | CDSP |
| 4 | Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Analysis | CDSP |
| 5 | Change Proposal: Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 6 | EQR: Change Proposal Rejection | CDSP |
| 7 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of delivery date | CDSP |
| 8 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR) | CDSP |
| 9 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 10 | Business Evaluation Report (BER) | CDSP |
| 11 | Business Evaluation Report (BER): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 12 | Change Completion Report (CCR) | CDSP |
| 13 | Change Completion Report (CCR): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 14 | Document Template Version History | CDSP |
| ***Appendix*** | | |
| A1 | Glossary of Key Terms | N/A |

# *Section 1: Proposed Change*

Please complete section 1 and 2 and specify within section 2 the output that is required from the CDSP

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Originator Details** | | | | |
| **Submitted By** | Matt Rider | | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2745 |
| **Email Address** | [Matt.rider@xoserve.com](mailto:Matt.rider@xoserve.com) |
| **Customer Representative** | Dave Turpin | | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2761 |
| **Email Address** | [Dave.turpin@xoserve.com](mailto:Dave.turpin@xoserve.com) |
| **Subject Matter Expert/Network Lead** | Emma Lyndon | | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2538 |
| **Email Address** | [emma.j.lyndon@xoserve.com](mailto:emma.j.lyndon@xoserve.com) |
| **Customer Class** | | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  iGT | | |
| **Overview of proposed change** | | | | |
| **Change Details** | | As a result of UK Link Programme (Release 1) implementation, several critical changes have been identified for delivery in Q4 2017. The Release 1.1 delivery is focused on changes that need to be implemented by the end of 2017. There are 5 changes that have been identified for the Release 1.1 of which 4 of them are defects and 1 is an OFGEM initiative.  The Customer Class mentioned above only relates to the Change that needs funding for delivery while the 4 defects will be internally funded.  The below 5 changes have been represented at SDG who proposed a priority for the change and ChMC ratified and approved the priority of the change provided by SDG:  **UKLP113 Notification of Formula Year AQ and SOQ -** There is a requirement to notify Users at Month -5 of changes to the Rolling and/or Formula year AQ/SOQ following the monthly calculation/update process. This change is to deliver the offer addendum process (the S91) for the Formula year AQ value.  Service Area 6: Annual Quantity, DM Supply Point and Offtake Rate Reviews  **UKLP249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes –** An Ofgem lead imitative which requires amendments to file formats pertaining to vulnerable customers.  Service Area - 16 Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence  **UKLP272 Capacity Referrals raised in error following nomination –** Amendment of rules to not issue a referral in the instance when the User has requested prevailing SOQ/SHQ values but the SOQ/SHQ is >16 /<24 (in line with CA GEN rules).  Service Area - 1 Manage supply point registration  **UKLP279 Pending Capacity amendment with ratchet –** Update existing functionality to consider pending capacity amendments when a ratchet occurs.  Service Area - 1 Manage supply point registration  **UKLP305 MOD431 Validation against file header & data in records** – To include a check to ensure the Shipper sending the SPI (as per the header) is the same Shipper within record. This change has been raised to validate that; the recipient within the file header is the same as the Shipper short code within records, where any discrepancies are found – these should be rejected.  Service Area - 1 Manage supply point registration | | |
| **Reason(s) for proposed service change** | | The below changes are required as they are defects from Release 1 UK Link:   * UKLP113 Notification of Formula Year AQ and SOQ * UKLP272 Capacity Referrals raised in error following nomination * UKLP279 Pending Capacity amendment with ratchet * UKLP305 MOD431 Validation against file header & data in records   The Following change is required due to an Ofgem initiative:   * UKLP249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes | | |
| **Status of related UNC Mod** | | MOD431 Approved | | |
| **Full title of related UNC Mod** | | MOD 431 – Validation against file header & data in records | | |
| **Benefits of change** | | The Release 1.1 is focussed on delivery changes that have a specific need date that is before the end of the year 2017. This delivery will ensure that the 4 defects identified from Release 1 will get fixed and improve the efficiency of the process.  The OFGEM RFI is to establish better sharing mechanisms for vulnerable customer data in order to align processes across both Gas and Electricity. | | |
| **Required Change Implementation Date** | | November /December 2017 – Implementation Date will be confirmed at the end of the detailed Design phase. | | |
| **Please provide an assessment of the priority of this change from the perspective of the industry.** | | High (4 high changes)  Medium (1 medium)  Low  Rationale for assessment:  The Changes added on Release 1.1 have a need date on the defects to be implemented by the end of this year while the Vulnerable Customer Codes Change will need to be implemented by February 2018. | | |

# *Section 2: Initial Assessment / ROM Request / Change Proposal*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Level of Quote/Estimate Robustness Requested** | **Evaluation Services**  Initial Assessment *(Mod related changes only)*  ROM estimate for Analysis and Delivery  **CDSP Change Services**  Firm Quote for Analysis  Firm Quote for both Analysis and Delivery |
| **Has any initial assessment been performed in support of this change?** | Yes  No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this considered to be a Priority Service Change?** | Yes (Mod Related)  Yes (Legislation Change Related)  No |
| **Is this change considered to relate to a ‘restricted class’ of customers?** | Yes (please mark the customer class(es) to whom this is restricted)  No  -----------------------------------------------------------------------------  Shippers  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operators  iGT’s |
| **Is it anticipated that the change would have an adverse impact on customers of any other customer classes?** | Yes (please give details)  No |
| ***General Service Changes Only (please ensure that either A or B below is completed)*** | |
|  | |
|  | |
| 1. If the change is anticipated to require the creation of a new service area and service line please give further details stating proposed name of new service area and title of service line: | |
| NA | |
| ***Specific Service Changes Only:*** | |
| Please detail the proposed methodology (or amendment to the existing methodology) for determining Specific Service Change Charges. | |
| NA | |
| Please detail the proposed basis (that is, Charging Measure and Charging Period) for determining Specific Service Change Charges in respect of the Specific Service. | |
| NA | |
| **Impacts to UKLink System or File Formats** | |
| CR249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes | |
| **Impacts UKL Manual Appendix 5b** | |
|  | |
| **Impacts to Gemini System** | |
| **N/A** | |
| **Please give any other relevant information.** | |
|  | |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Xoserve Portfolio Office | changeorders@xoserve.com |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 3: ROM Request Acceptance*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is there sufficient detail within the ROM Request to enable a ROM Analysis to be produced? | Yes  No |
| If no, please define the additional details that are required. |  |

If the ROM Request is not accepted. Please forward this document to the Portfolio Office for onward transmission to the Change Management Committee

# *Section 4: ROM Analysis*

This ROM is Xoserve’s response to the above Evaluation Service Request. The response is intended to support customer involvement in the development of industry changes.

Should the request obtain approval for continuance then a Change Proposal must be raised for any further analysis / development.

Disclaimer:

This ROM Analysis has been prepared in good faith by Xoserve Limited but by its very nature is only able to contain indicative information and estimates (including without limitation those of time, resource and cost) based on the circumstances known to Xoserve at the time of its preparation. Xoserve accordingly makes no representations of accuracy or completeness and any representations as may be implied are expressly excluded (except always for fraudulent misrepresentation).

Where Xoserve becomes aware of any inaccuracies or omissions in, or updates required to, this Report it shall notify the Network Operators’ Representative as soon as reasonably practicable but Xoserve shall have no liability in respect of any such inaccuracy or omission and any such liability as may be implied by law or otherwise is expressly excluded.

This Report does not, and is not intended to; create any contractual or other legal obligation on Xoserve.

© 2017 Xoserve Ltd

All rights reserved.

|  |
| --- |
| ROM Analysis |
| **Change Assessment**  High level indicative assessment of the change on the CDSP service description, on UKLink and any alternative options if applicable |
| **Change Impact:**  Initial assessment of whether the service change is / would have:   * a restricted class change, * a priority service change * an adverse impact on any customer classes |
| **Change Costs (implementation):**  An approximate estimate of the costs (or range of costs) where options are identified |
| **Change Costs (on-going):**  The approximate estimate of the impact of the service change on service charges |
| **Timescales:**  Details of timescale for the change i.e. 3months etc.  Details of when Xoserve could start this change i.e. the earliest is release X. |
| **Assumptions:**  Any key assumptions that have been made by Xoserve when providing the cost and or timescale |
| **Dependencies:**  Any material dependencies of the implementation on any other service changes |
| **Constraints:**  Any key constraints that are expected to impact the delivery of the service change |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Xoserve Portfolio Office | changeorders@xoserve.com |
| Requesting Party | As specified in ROM Request |

# *Section 5: Change Proposal: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Change Proposal is approved. An EQR is requested |  | | |
| Approved Change Proposal version |  | | |
| The change proposal shall not proceed |  | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the Change Proposal until a later meeting |  | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires the proposer to make updates to the Change Proposal: |  | | |
| Updates required: | | | |

# *Section 6: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Change Proposal Rejection*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Proposal Rejection | | | | |
|  | **Yes** |  | **No** | Is there sufficient detail within the Change Proposal to enable an EQR to be produced?  If no, please provide further details below. |
|  | | | | |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 7: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of Delivery Date*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Notification of EQR Delivery Date | |
| Original EQR delivery date: | 02/08/17 |
| Revised EQR delivery date: | NA |
| Rationale for revision of delivery date: | NA |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 8: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Manager | **Lee Chambers** | Contact Number | 0121 623 2852 |
| Email Address | [lee.chambers@xoserve.com](mailto:lee.chambers@xoserve.com) |
| Project Lead | **Matt Rider** | Contact Number | 0121 623 2745 |
| Email Address | [matt.rider@xoserve.com](mailto:matt.rider@xoserve.com) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the proposed change on:   1. CDSP Service Description 2. CDSP Systems | The proposed changes have an impact on the UK Link system ( SPA, RGMA and AQ processes). The changes will also impact file formats.  Identified system impacts include but not limited to:   * AMT * BW * CMS * EFT * Portal * UK Link |
| Approximate timescale for delivery of ‘business evaluation report’ | August 2017 |
| Estimated cost of business evaluation report preparation. | This is a zero cost EQR. |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Restricted class change’ assessment (where provided)? | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Adverse Impact’ assessment (where provided)? | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Priority Service Change’ assessment (where provided)? | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| **General service changes** | |
| Does the CDSP agree with the assessment made in the Change Proposal regarding impacted service areas? | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
|  |
| **Specific service changes** | |
| Does the CDSP agree with the proposal made in the Change Proposal regarding specific change charges? | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Please provide a draft amendment of the Specific Service Change Charge Annex setting out the methodology for determining Specific Service Change Charges proposed in the Change Proposal | NA |
| EQR validity period: | 30 business days from the date of issue |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 9: Evaluation Quotation Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The EQR is approved |  | | | |
| Approved EQR version |  | | | |
| The Change Proposal shall not proceed. The Change Proposal and this EQR shall lapse |  | | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the EQR until a later meeting |  | | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires updates to the EQR: |  | | | |
| Updates required: |  | | | |
| **General service changes only**  (The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the change proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR) | | | | |
| 1. Does the committee agree with the assessment of the service area(s) to which the service line belongs and the weighting of the impact? | | Yes  No | | |
| 1. If no, please enter the agreed service area(s) and the weighting: | |  | | |
| **Specific service changes only**  (The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the Change Proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR) | | | | |
| 1. Please confirm the methodology for the determination of Specific Service Change charges | |  | | |
| 1. Please confirm the charging measure and charging period for the determination of Specific Service Change charges | |  | | |

# *Section 10: Business Evaluation Report (BER)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Implementation Detail** |
| 1.) Detail changes required to the CDSP Service Description |
| UKLP249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes – Service Area 16 |
| 2.) Detail modifications required to UK Link |
| As a result of the Change Proposal UKLP249, the following UK-Link changes will be required;  The following interfaces will need modifications; CNC, CNR, CNF, CFR, EDL, IDL, IQL, EQL, IIL, EWS & CRS  1. There will be master data set up required for the newly introduced codes  2. Data cleansing will be required for the newly introduced codes  3. New validations will be introduced to reject any redundant/existing retained codes  4. File format change for description and label changes (to be confirmed during Detailed Design)  5. Changes will have to be made in BW and Portal screens. With a number of amendments to be made to all identified impacted Functional Specification documents. |
| 3.) Detail changes required to appendix 5b of the UK Link Manual |
| Any changes to file formats will be managed as per the UK Link Manual. |
| 4.) Detail impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP |
| No impact currently identified to the operating procedures and resources of the CDSP |
| 5.) Implementation Plan |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Phase** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | | Detailed Design | 04/09/2017 | 29/09/2017 | | Build | 02/10/2017 | 27/10/2017 | | Test | 30/10/2017 | 08/12/2017 | | Implementation\* | 09/12/2017 | 09/12/2017 | | Post Implementation Support | 11/12/2017 | 11/01/2018 |   \*The Implementation date will be confirmed at the end of the Detailed Design phase. |
| 6.) Estimated implementation costs |
| For UK-Link Future Release 1.1 the costs to deliver CR249 are as follows;  Total BER Cost to be funded by DN/iGTs from Market Change Budget (Service Area 16) - £127,006  Noted: Internal Resource Costs (RTB) of £51,130 |
| 6a.) How will the charging for the costs be allocated to different customer classes?  (General Service Changes only) |
| UKLP249 New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes – Service Area 16 - 100% DN Operators and iGTs  Please mark % against each customer class:   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | National Grid Transmission | | 100% | Distribution Network Operators and IGT’s | |  | DN Operator | |  | IGT’s | |  | Shippers | | 100% |  | |
| 7.) Estimated impact of the service change on service charges |
| N/A |
| 8.) Please detail any pre-requisite activities that must be completed by the customer prior to receiving or being able to request the service. |
| Ofgem decision on SPAA CP 17/370 Refining the Needs Codes Information (alternative A). The decision will be made via the Industry Governance Process by the end of September 2017. |
| ***Implementation Options*** |
| Please provide details on any alternative solution/implementation options:  This should include:  (i) a description of each Implementation Option;  (ii) the advantages and disadvantages of each option  (iii) the CDSP preferred Implementation Option |
| There are two implementation options identified, they are as follows;  **CDSP Preferred Implementation Option**  In order for future UK Link change to be delivered efficiently and promptly following implementation of UKLP R1, a project has been established to deliver the full scope for a target implementation date in early December 2017.  This would allow 5 CRs (including UKLP249) that have need dates prior to Release 2 delivery to implement system solutions and ensure that impacts to business processes would be removed.  The advantage of delivering UKLP249 within Release 1.1 is that Shippers and Transporters licence conditions will be met to ensure that vulnerable customer data is recorded accurately.  The solution for CR249 would be implemented as part of the release, but will not be effective until the 01/02/18.  **Do nothing:**  This option is not recommended as Design Gaps within UK Link would remain and an Ofgem initiative would not be delivered. |
| Restricted Class Changes only  Is there any change in the view of the CDSP on whether there would be an ‘Adverse Impact’ on customers outside the relevant customer class(es)? |
| Yes (please give detail below)  No |
| Dependencies: |
| The CDSP is dependent on an Ofgem decision as to whether the required Vulnerable Customer Needs Code changes are delivered in Release 1.1 as per Change Proposal UKLP249 or in a to be defined future release as per Change Proposal UKLP273.  Agree testing strategy with market participants via Defect Release Group (DRG). |
| Constraints: |
| None currently identified. |
| Benefits: |
| | **Change Reference** | **CR Title** | **Benefit(s)** | | --- | --- | --- | | UKLP113 | Notification of Formula Year AQ & SOQ | * Delivers the requirement to create the missing trigger for the offer addendum process by providing the Annual AQ to Shippers * Compliance to UNC MOD432 section - G1.6.6 implies we will notify the user of the 'New formula year AQ & SOQ | | UKLP249 | New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes | * Facilitates an Ofgem request to make improvements to the priority services register in relation to vulnerable customers and GTs would meet their Licence Obligations * Aligns vulnerable customer needs codes between gas and electricity markets * Maps existing vulnerable needs codes to new vulnerable need codes | | UKLP272 | Capacity referral raised in error following Nomination | * Will ensure that the requirement to amend rules so NOT to issue a referral where UK Link is referring a nomination to DN’s when the User has requested prevailing SOQ/SHQ values but the SOQ/SHQ is >16 /<24. In this scenario no referral is required and an offer should be issued to User (providing all other validations pass) | | UKLP279 | Pending capacity amendment with Ratchet | * Delivers a requirement within the UK Link system for current functionality to fix a pending capacity amendment when a ratchet occurs. The incorrect (lower value) could go live resulting in further ratchets that should not be applied | | UKLP305 | MOD 431 – Validations against the SPI file header and data within records | * Ensures compliance to UNC MOD431 * A requirement to validate that; the recipient within the file header is the same as the Shipper Short Code within records, where any discrepancies are found these should be rejected | |
| Impacts: |
| | **Change Reference** | **CR Title** | **Implication of not implementing the CR** | | --- | --- | --- | | UKLP113 | Notification of Formula Year AQ & SOQ | * First notification is due to be issued March 18 of a snapshot taken on 1st December 2017. This will be for the formula year effective as of 1st April 2018 * Incorrect Billing values from 01/04/18 would be submitted to customers as the correct formula year is unavailable, leading to incorrect invoicing of external customers * Impacts Networks as they use the formula year SOQ for charging purposes | | UKLP249 | New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes | * Non delivery of this change would mean that GTs would be in breach of the new licence condition introduced from 1st February 2018 | | UKLP272 | Capacity referral raised in error following Nomination | * Non delivery of this change would mean an increase in the number of referrals to DNs which will increase their workload. This would have downstream implications with Xoserve issuing Offers to Shippers | | UKLP279 | Pending capacity amendment with Ratchet | * If this change is not implemented for a pending capacity amendment when a ratchet occurs, the incorrect (lower value) could go live resulting in further ratchets that should not be applied | | UKLP305 | MOD 431 – Validations against the SPI file header and data within records | * Would be in breach of UNC MOD 431 and the risk of data disclosure of incorrect Shipper portfolio information being sent to a wrong Shipper | |
| Risks: |
| The key risks with the delivery of this project are:   * There is a risk that this project may experience delays to the planned timescales because this is the first UK Link release post UKLP Go Live, it will be developing and executing a new set of processes and system development lifecycle. This is not a practised delivery model (e.g. Gemini). Also the project is to be governed by a new and developing industry model that hasn’t been utilised previously * There is a risk that any delays to the delivery of this project will encounter the Christmas code freeze and the contingency date is estimated to be in mid-January 2018 leading to increased costs * As a key learning from UKLP, the implementation date for this project will be defined at the end of the Detailed Design Stage gate; this may lead to a delay from the anticipated implementation date in December 2017 causing additional costs to the project |
| Assumptions: |
| The CDSP are proceeding with delivery of Release 1.1. based on the assumption that Ofgem will approve the Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes changes as specified in UKLP249. |
| Information Security: |
| The Solution Design for UKL FR1.1 will conform to Xoserve’s Information Security Policies/Procedures. |
| Out of scope: |
| Any Xoserve system changes not within the defined scope of R1.1 (5 CRs) |
| Please provide any additional information relevant to the proposed service change: |
| None currently identified. |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 11: Business Evaluation Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The BER is approved and the change can proceed | Yes/Approved | | |
| ***Modification Changes Only***  Please ensure that the Transporters are formally informed of the Target Implementation Date | | | |
| Approved BER version | V1.0 | | |
| The change proposal shall not proceed and the BER shall lapse | NA | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the BER until a later meeting | NA | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires updates to the BER: | NA | | |
| Updates required: | | | |

# *Section 12: Change Completion Report (CCR)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Overview | | | |
| The initial scope of R1.1 was to deliver 5 changes identified as critical for delivery in Q4 2017. Of these 5 changes, 4 were classified as defects (UKLP113, 272, 279 & 305) with the other change (UKLP249) being an Ofgem initiative.  R1.1 commenced at risk with regard to UKLP249 as the required decision from Ofgem as to which ‘Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes’ change (UKLP249 or UKLP273) had yet to be made at the point of project commencement, with a decision expected by the end of September 2017.  However, during the Detailed Design stage of the project it was stated that the required Ofgem decision was not expected until at least mid-November 2017. GTs as the funding customer for this change recommended that a decision to descope the change from the R1.1 project was made to the ChMC due to the timescales required by customers to implement this change successfully.  As a result of this a decision was reached at ChMC on 11/10/17 to continue with the change in scope of R1.1 Detailed Design and then de-scope UKLP249 from R1.1. This change and UKLP273 would then be added to the R2 scope and would include the SPAA change variant as directed by Ofgem. The Detailed Design work completed would be utilised to support the R2project.  The R1.1 project delivered code enhancements to existing SAP ISU & BW functionality via the remaining four changes that made up the revised scope of R1.1  As a result of the R1.1 changes there has been no impact on either operating procedures or CDSP resources. By delivering the code enhancements within the scope of delivery for R1.1 it has ensured that impacted business processes are running as expected and do not breach the rules of UNC.  As these changes were internal facing to Xoserve, there were no actions required from customers prior to the implementation date of the 8th December 2017. | | | |
| Please detail any differences between the solution that was implemented and what was defined in the BER. | | | |
| The BER defined delivery of 5 change requests as the scope of Release1.1.  As a result of a decision reached at ChMC on 11/10/17 it was agreed to remove CR249 from the scope of the project and for this change to be considered in scope of the R2 project along with UKLP273.  This decision resulted in the scope of delivery for R1.1 reducing to the 4 changes categorised as deferred defects from the UKLP (R1). | | | |
| Detail the revised text of the CDSP Service Description reflecting the change that has been made | | | |
| N/A | | | |
| Were there any revisions to the text of the UK Link Manual? | | | |
| Yes (please insert the revised text of the UK Link manual below)  No | | | |
| Proposed Commencement Date | N/A | Actual  Commencement Date | N/A |
| Please provide an explanation of any variance – N/A | | | |
| Please detail the main lessons learned from the project | | | |
| The main lessons learned captured during the project lifecycle of Release 1.1 are as follows;   * Xoserve attendance at regular DRG forums to provide updates on the progress of the project worked well (+) * The testing of the Stage Gating process principles as part of the R1.1 project lifecycle proved to be successful (+) * Defining the Test Scenarios & Test Cases early as part of the Detailed Design workshops proved successful, this enabled the testing stage to commence without delay (+) * It was agreed to commence Detailed Design for UKLP249 at risk until a firm decision had been reached by Ofgem on the solution option. This meant that initial design wholly concentrated on UKLP249 solution (CP 370B) of which aspects of this design has been reused in R2 for XRN4449 (CP 370A) (-) | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Service change costs |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Approved Costs (£) | £127,006 | Actual Costs (£) | £29,480 |   Reasons for variance between approved and actual costs: The difference in the approved costs value against the actual costs value is as a result of the de-scoping of one of the original change items (UKLP249 – New Vulnerable Customer Needs Codes) at the completion of the ‘Analysis’ stage of the project as per direction received from Ofgem.  Please note that benefits from concluding the Detailed Design analysis work for UKLP249 have been realised as this enabled the following gathered information to be re-used during the analysis in R2 for UKLP273;   * Requirement of new priority codes/re-mapping of priority codes * Requirement of data cleansing migration requirements * Rejection codes functionality relating to priority codes   The BER also included ‘Noted’ Internal Resource Costs (RTB) of £51,130  The actual ‘Noted’ Internal Resource Costs (RTB) associated to work undertaken on change UKLP249 were £4,943 |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 13: Change Completion Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The implementation is complete and the CCR is approved |  | | | |
| Approved CCR version |  | | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the CCR until a later meeting |  | | Date of later meeting: |  |
| The committee requires further information |  | | | |
| Further information required: | | | | |
| The committee considers that the implementation is not complete |  | | | |
| Further action(s) required: | | | | |
| The proposed changes to the CDSP Service Description or UK Link Manual are not correct | |  | | |
| Amendments to CDSP service description / UKLink manual required: | | | | |

# *Section 14: Document Template Version History*

The purpose of this section is to keep a record of the changes to the overall version template and the individual sections within. It will be updated by the CDSP following approval of the template update by the Change Management Committee.

**Version History:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 | Approved |  | CDSP | Version Approved by Change Committee |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**--- END OF DOCUMENT ---**

# *Appendix One: Glossary*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** |
| Adverse Impact | A Service Change has or would have an Adverse Impact on Customers of a particular Customer Class if:  (a) Implementing the Service Change would involve a modification of UK Link which would conflict with the provision of existing Services for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class;  (b) the Service Change would involve the CDSP disclosing Confidential Information relating to such Customers to Customers of another Customer Class or to Third Parties;  (c) Implementing the Service Change would conflict to a material extent with the Implementation of another Service Change (for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class) with an earlier Proposal Date and which remains Current, unless the Service Change is a Priority Service Change which (under the Priority Principles) takes priority over the other Proposed Service Change; or  (d) Implementing the Service Change would have an Adverse Interface Impact for such Customers. |
| General Service | A service provided under the DSC to Customers or Customers of a Customer Class on a uniform basis. |
| Non-Priority Service Change | A Service Change which is not a Priority Service Change |
| Priority Service Change | A Modification Service Change;  or  A Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made). |
| Relevant Customer class | A Customer Class is a **Relevant Customer Class** in relation to a Service or a Service Change where Service Charges made or to be made in respect of such Service, or the Service subject to such Service Change, are or will be payable by Customers of that Customer Class |
| Restricted Class Change | Where, in relation to a Service Change, not all Customer Classes are Relevant Customer Classes, the Service Change is a **Restricted Class Change**; |
| Service Change | A change to a Service provided under the DSC (not being an Additional Service), including:  (i) the addition of a new Service or removal of an existing Service; and  (ii) in the case of an existing Service, a change in any feature of the Service specified in the CDSP Service Description,  and any related change to the CDSP Service Description |
| Specific Service | A service (other than Additional Services) available under the DSC to all Customer or Customers of a Customer Class but provided to a particular Customer only upon the order of the Customer. |