

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4801**

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** | Additional information to be made viewable in the Data Enquiry Service (DES) portal  |
| **Date Raised** | 25.10.18 |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | npower |
| **Sponsor Name** | James Rigby |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | James.Rigby@npower.co.uk |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | Emma Smith |
| **Xoserve Contact Details**  | Emma.Smith@Xoserve.com |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / **With DSG** / Out for review / Voting / Approved or Rejected |
| **Section A2: Impacted Parties** |
| **Customer Class(es)** | [x]  Shipper[ ]  National Grid Transmission[ ]  Distribution Network Operator[ ]  IGT |
| **Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change** |
| There are a number of data items that are held in UK Link, but aren’t currently viewable in the Data Enquiry Service portal (DES). This change identifies some data items that, if made visible, would enable shippers to more quickly and efficiently resolve operational queries. Additionally, it will mean a reduction in the number of phone enquiries into Xoserve to obtain information not currently on view. Data Items to be made available are captured in the excel doc embedded below. |
| **Proposed Release (Feb/Jun/Nov/Minor)** | **June 2020** |
| **Proposed Consultation Period**  | [x]  10 Working Days[ ]  20 Working Days[ ]  30 Working daysOther: |
| **Section A4: Benefits and Justification**  |
| **Benefit Description***What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?* *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | Make more data available to the Registered User to aid the resolution of queries |
| **Benefit Realisation** *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | Immediately following implementation |
| **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.* |  |
| **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**  | [x]  Shipper 100% [ ]  National Grid Transmission XX% [ ]  Distribution Network Operator XX% [ ]  IGT XX%  |
| **Service Line(s)** | 63 – Service Area 22: Specific Services |
| **ROM or funding details**  |  |
| **Funding Comments**  | Shipper funded change only – please refer to the description of the change for justification.  |
| **Section A7: ChMC Recommendation**  |
| **Change Status** | [x]  Approve – Issue to DSG[x]  Defer – Issue for review[ ]  Reject\*This decision was made at the ChMC meeting on 7th November 2018.This change was approved to proceed to DSG, following the completion of the initial review change pack, at the ChMC meeting on 12th December. |
| **Industry Consultation** | [x]  10 Working Days[ ]  20 Working Days[ ]  30 Working daysOther: |
| **Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)** | 23/11/2018 (six 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**

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1 | For Approval | 30/10/18 | Xoserve | CP raised |
| 2 | For Approval | 07/11/18 | Xoserve | Appendix added |
| 3 | For Approval | 09/11/18 | Xoserve | Proposer updated the change description content |
| 4 | With DSG | 14/11/18 | Xoserve | Approved to go to DSG |
| 5 | With DSG | 22/11/18 | Xoserve | Ratification of the Prioritisation score |
| 6 | With DSG | 28/11/18 | Xoserve | Representation matrix created  |
| 7 | With DSG | 12/12/18 | Xoserve | Result from ChMC on 12th December added |
| 9 | With DSG | 27/12/18 | Xoserve | Notes from DSG meeting on 17th December added |
| 10 | With DSG | 30/01/19 | Xoserve | Notes from DSG meeting on 21st January 2019 added |
| 11 | With DSG | 11/03/19 | Xoserve | Notes from DSG meeting on 4th March 2019 |

**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 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

 |
| 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.
 |
| No response |
| 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)
 |
| In addition to those already proposed we would like the addition of the following data items to also be considered: Supplier end dateDCC GUIDGas pressure Proposed AQ for new MPRNs |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 22. 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** | **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. |
| 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 in terms of efficiency of having data available that is not always received in files. |
| 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, we would support this being delivered in a minor release. No lead time would be required.Queries and suggestions on the functionality proposed:* What is the purpose of the asset and read history, this raises queries of how far back this would be expected for. We do not currently see the benefit in adding these new items
* We would also like to see the following additional data items added
* Uncorrected read on all reads being shown in the read history with a convertor
* Convertor Asset: Dials - this should include both uncorrected and corrected
* ASP Name
* EUC to also be added to SMP Annual history as this can move off the monthly history tab when multiple changes to AQ occur.
 |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 22. 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** | **Npower** |
| **User Contact Details** | **Gas.Codes@npower.com** |
| **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 |
| 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.
 |
| There are clear benefits to having easier access to data that is held in the UK Link system, not least the ability to close customer queries more efficiently. |
| 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)
 |
| Given this change only asks that existing data held in UK Link is made visible, it is not estimated that we would need to change our internal systems to comply, so from this perspective a 6 month lead time would not necessarily be required.  We would expect all decisions as to when such a change was delivered would be taken via prioritisation agreement in the ChMC. |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 22. 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 B4:** SSE did not answer the above questions, but they approve this change in principle.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Scottish Power** |
| **User Contact Details** | **Mark Bellman** |
| **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

 |
| No comment |
| 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, making data like this readily available to query from an Xoserve portal sounds helpful to all.Could an additional request be made for the following requirement.Show the last actual read recorded prior to transfer of ownership, this data is provided in the transfer of ownership file flows so should be available in DES* Could this request be extended to include all reads prior to transfer may be used in the next AQ calculation. i.e the latest read (+ subsequent reads) between 9 & 12 months prior supply, otherwise the earliest read within 3 years.

The only other request would be an indicator that there has been a .JOB (meter change) or .UPD (meter update) rejection since the last meter change or a .U02 (read) rejection since the last read has been updated.e.g.       Last accepted read date = 01/10/2018; last read rejection = 01/11/2018 – Read Rejection indicator = YLast accepted read date = 01/10/2018; last read rejection = 01/07/2018 – Read Rejection indicator = N |
| 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 comment. |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 22. 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 comment |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | Publish |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Eleanor Laurence** |
| **User Contact Details** | **Eleanor.Laurence@edfenergy.com** **/ 07875117771** |
| **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

 |
| 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 – increased visibility of certain aspects of read information and asset history – in fact more data available to users can only be of benefit to us and facilitate faster and simpler query resolution |
| 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 a 3 month lead time |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 22. 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 Date**  | **19/11/18** |
| **DSG Summary** |
| SH presented this Change Proposal to DSG. SH explained that Npower have requested additional information to be presented in the Date Enquiry Service (DES) application. One important consideration is whether the change beneficiaries can receive the additional data items in accordance with what is specified in the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM); the DPM will be reviewed to understand whether the change beneficiaries can receive the additional data items.SH talked DSG through Appendix One, which indicates that this Change Proposal has a prioritisation score of 28%. However, this is due to change as the Change Proposal will have an impact on the Xoserve SAP Business Warehouse (BW) system; the business process impacted is ‘Portal’ i.e. DES, and the impacted parties is across multiple market groups.  |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**  |
| **DSG Summary** |
| **17th December**SH presented slides 32-35 and confirmed ChMC approved to proceed on 12th December. SH stated that there had been several requirements listed on the Change Proposal and we received additional requirements which SH presented to DSG. The requirements will need to be prioritised, timelines given and understand which have system impacts; then discuss with DSG the rationale behind the decisions. Action: DSG to consider• Which of the requested data items should be treated as higher priority?• Can any of the proposed data items be de-scoped?• What considerations or system impacts do you foresee as a result of these data items to be added to DES?**21st January**Simon Harris gave a brief background on the change (slides 72-75). SH referred back to the responses for additional data items and the action on DSG to highlight potential data to de-scope or prioritise to enable us to move forward with this change. SH confirmed we had a couple of responses relating to this action and can keep this open till the next DSG meeting. There is already work in progress looking at prioritising data items based on complexity but a feed into this would be beneficial. LW confirmed with the Proposer, JB that he is happy and that there is no urgency with the requested data items from his perspective. **Action: Simon to update the slides relating to rational to then move forward with what responses received into formal capture.****Action: Simon to engage this week with individuals who responded to the Change Pack concerning the rationale behind the additional data items.** |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**  |
| **DSG Date**  | **18/02/19** |
| **DSG Summary** |
| Richard Johnson (RJ) gave an overview of the change. The purpose of the Change is to add data items to the Data Enquiry Service (DES). XRN4801 was deferred from the November’s ChMC meeting, and was included in November’s Change Pack for initial review; the responses asked for additional data items to be included. Slides 34 and 35 indicate the additional requirements and the rationale, and two additional requirements have been added from other Changes. Slide 37 lists the actions required from DSG, which has expanded. Action **Action 1204 – Additional questions added to existing action 1204 for DSG.** Simon Harris (SH) stated that this change has not gone through formal capture yet and that a MOD may be needed. Still gathering requirements, especially for top two bullet points on Slide 36. SH explained that once scope has been narrowed down then we can prioritise and add timings. There may be different solutions with multiple ways to deliver, which will be broken down in capture. SC stated that she is keen that there isn’t a missed opportunity and that there is some prospects having data available. Also is there duplication once faster switching comes in. SH - DES will still have to be there as faster switching doesn’t hold all the information and this will need to be provided to Shippers. SH stated he will look at CSS, and if duplicated, may de-scope. If there is quick fix it will benefit to put into DES now as CSS may be 2 years away for implementation.   |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**  |
| **DSG Date**  | **04/03/19** |
| **DSG Summary** |
| Simon Harris (SH) gave a brief overview of slides 39-43 detailing the background, data items and rationale which included the additional items and requirements from XRN4674 and XRN4676. SH stated that there were no objections from last DSG and confirmed that he can progress into formal capture and look at solution options. Part of the solution would be how to prioritise and implement working with SME’s to understand any complications in getting data from UKL into BW but once this has been completed, SH will bring solutions options back to a future DSG.  |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

**Appendix 1**

**Change Prioritisation Variables**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change Driver Type**  | [ ]  CMA Order [ ]  MOD / Ofgem [ ]  EU Legislation [ ]  License Condition [ ]  BEIS [x]  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** | [x] 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 [x]  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 [x]  Multiple Market Group [ ]  All industry UK Gas Market participants [ ]  Xoserve Only [ ]  One Market Group [ ]  One Market Participant  |
| **Primary Impacted DSC Service Area**  | Service Area 22: Specific Services |
| **Number of Service Areas Impacted**  | [ ]  All [ ]  Five to Twenty [ ]  Two to Five [x]  One  |
| **Change Improvement Scale?** *How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?* | [ ]  High [ ]  Medium [x]  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 [x]  Customer Testing Likely Required [ ]  Customer Training Required  |
| **Known Impact to Systems / Processes** |
| **Primary Application impacted** | [x] BW [ ]  ISU [ ]  CMS [ ]  AMT [ ]  EFT [ ]  IX [ ]  Gemini [ ]  Birst [ ]  Other *(please provide details below)****DES as well*** |
| **Business Process Impact**  | [ ] AQ [ ] SPA [ ] RGMA[ ] Reads [x] 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)*[x]  No |
| **Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.**  | [x]  Shipper impact [ ]  Network impact [ ]  iGT impact [ ]  Xoserve impact [ ]  National Grid Transmission Impact |
| **Workaround currently in operation?** |
| **Is there a Workaround in operation?**  | [ ]  Yes [x]  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** | 28% |