***Change Proposal***

Transparency of the Rolling AQ Process

**CDSP Reference: XRN4525**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document Stage | Version | Date | Author | Status |
| ROM Request / Change Proposal | V1 | 24/10/17 | Shane Preston | Draft |
| ROM Response | V1 | 17/01/18 | Murray Thomson | Draft |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| EQR |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| BER |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| 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** | Shane Preston | **Contact Number** | 0141 614 5526 |
| **Email Address** | Shane.preston@scottishpower.com |
| **Customer Representative** | Rachel Hinsley | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2854 |
| **Email Address** | Rachel.hinsley@xoserve.com   |
| **Subject Matter Expert/Network Lead** |  | **Contact Number** |  |
| **Email Address** |  |
| **Customer Class** | [x]  Shipper[ ]  National Grid Transmission[ ]  Distribution Network Operator[ ]  iGT |
| **Overview of proposed change** |
| **Change Details** | This change proposal seeks to introduce a number of anonymised metric reports to increase transparency across activities relating to Annual Quantity movement.The additional metrics could be supplied within folder 32 in the secure Sharepoint service provided by Xoserve; which already utilises the use of anonymity.Proposed metrics |
| **Reason(s) for proposed service change** | Project Nexus implementation introduced a monthly rolling Annual Quantity (AQ) process under MOD0432, alongside the formula year AQ. Prior to the implementation of the new arrangements, the outcome of the annual AQ Review process was published to all market participants to provide transparency around the movement in gas allocation volumes, introduced by Modification 0081. The transparency around movements made to gas allocation volumes, under MOD0081, have ceased to continue under the new arrangements.Because there are commercial practices reliant on the accuracy of AQ values, this change proposal seeks to reintroduce a number of those metrics to provide Parties with the same transparency as was apparent prior to Project nexus, thus providing all parties with greater confidence that the accuracy and reliability of AQ’s is maximised.The current reporting metrics introduced by MOD0520A do not provide Parties with the visibility of movements in AQ across the market. Whilst reconciliation does now take place for both LSP and SSP, Parties still require confidence that the accuracy and reliability of AQ’s is maximised. This Change seeks to enhance the transparency across the market movements, whilst protecting company sensitive information by continuing with the anonymity of using code names.With the current volatility around Unidentified Gas (UIG) causing concern across the market, there is a lack of visibility around activity across the market. Without this reporting in place to give assurance and transparency, there is a potential for Parties to question the validity and accuracy of gas allocation, as there is a dependency on other parties to give confidence that reconciliation is taking place on a regular basis across all market participants. Uncertainty around this can result in risk premiums being passed onto customers. We believe that, as this reporting was provided previously and, with the implementation of Project Nexus, the information should be readily available from the new SAP platform that UK Link resides and therefore should not require significant cost to develop.This transparency of gas allocation brought about under MOD0081 has ceased to continue under the new arrangements. This had previously given all Parties a clear understanding of movements in gas allocation across the market. There are commercial practices reliant on the accuracy of AQ values; this change proposal seeks to reintroduce a number of those metric to provide Parties with the same transparency and confidence as was apparent with the annual AQ Review process. |
| **Status of related UNC Mod** |  |
| **Full title of related UNC Mod** |  |
| **Benefits of change** | Transparency, assurance and confidence of gas allocation across the market.Identification of potential issues and indicator towards volatility in UIG associated to movement in gas allocation. |
| **Required Change Implementation Date** |  |
| **Please provide an assessment of the priority of this change from the perspective of the industry.** | [ ] High[x] Medium[ ] LowRationale for assessment: Owing to supporting the investigation of UIG issues |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Level of Quote/Estimate Robustness Requested** | **Evaluation Services**[ ] Initial Assessment *(Mod related changes only)*[x] 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[x] No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this considered to be a Priority Service Change?** | [ ] Yes (Mod Related)[ ] Yes (Legislation Change Related)[x] No |
| **Is this change considered to relate to a ‘restricted class’ of customers?**Consider if the particular change is only likely to impact those who fall under a particular customer classIf it impacts all customer classes (i.e. Transmission, Distribution & Shippers) then choose ‘No’. | [x] Yes (please mark the customer class(es) to whom this is restricted)[ ] No-----------------------------------------------------------------------------[x] 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?**Please refer to appendix one for the definition of an ‘adverse impact’ | [ ] Yes (please give details)[x] No |
| ***General Service Changes Only (please ensure that either A or B below is completed)*** |
| 1. Customer view of impacted service area(s)

For a definition of the Service Areas, please see the ‘Charge Base Apportionment Table’ within the [Budget and Charging Methodology](http://www.xoserve.com/wp-content/uploads/BUDGET-AND-CHARGING-METHODOLOGY.pdf). Please indicate the service area(s) that are understood to be impacted by the change. Please enter ‘unknown’ if relevant. Where the change is likely to impact more than one service area please indicate the percentage split of the impact across the impacted service areas. For example if it is split equally across two service areas then enter 50% in the ‘split’ against each service area. |
|  |
| 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:
 |
|  |
| ***Specific Service Changes Only:*** |
| Please detail the proposed methodology (or amendment to the existing methodology) for determining Specific Service Change Charges.  |
|  |
| Please detail the proposed basis (that is, Charging Measure and Charging Period) for determining Specific Service Change Charges in respect of the Specific Service. |
|  |
| **Impacts to UKLink System or File Formats** |
| None |
| **Impacts UKL Manual Appendix 5b** |
| Mention the updates to be captured in the Appendix 5B of the UK Link Manual due to this Change |
| **Impacts to Gemini System** |
|  |
| **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? | [x] 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 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 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 Change Proposer 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.

© 2018 Xoserve Ltd

All rights reserved.

|  |
| --- |
| ROM Analysis |
| **Change Assessment**The change proposal requests the following reports; these can be grouped into 6 reports…* Report 1: Rolling AQ
* Report 2: Rolling AQ Increase/Decrease
* Report 3: AQ corrections
* Report 4: Rolling AQ impact on full portfolio
* Report 5: AQ of 1 Report
* Report 6: Volume of Override Flag Reads

This assessment was based on the following report specifications.**Requirements discovered to date**1. The reports should be made available on-line
2. The reports should be published 10 business days after the first day of the month after the data collection month.
3. The reports should be anonymised.
4. Class 1 SMPs are excluded.
5. The reports should use both GT and iGT data.
6. Access to these reports is Shipper only; access does not include GTs or iGTs.
 |
| **Change Costs (implementation):**The solution will cost at least **£16k**, but probably not more than **£38,000** to develop.Initial assessment suggests the change only impacts DSC Service Area 6. |
| **Change Costs (on-going):**Operational costs for publication and validation of the reports cost will cost at least **£250**, but probably not more than **£500** per month. |
| **Timescales:*** The change congestion and priorities at the time of Change Proposal submission will determine when the reports can be delivered.
 |
| **Dependencies:**None identified |

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

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: | 09th April 2018 |
| Revised EQR delivery date: | 09th April 2018 |
| Rationale for revision of delivery date: |  |

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 | **Lorraine Cave** | Contact Number | 01216232728 |
| Email Address | lorraine.cave@xoserve.com |
| Project Lead | **Jo Duncan** | Contact Number | 0121 210 2653 |
| Email Address | Joanne.duncan@xoserve.com  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the proposed change on:1. CDSP Service Description
2. CDSP Systems
 | None Identified |
| Approximate timescale for delivery of ‘business evaluation report’ (N.b this is from the date on which the EQR is approved.) | Alongisde the BER |
| Estimated cost of business evaluation report preparationThis can be expressed as a range of costs i.e. *‘at least £xx,xxx but probably not more than £xx,xxx’*. | This is a zero cost EQR |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Restricted class change’ assessment (where provided)?Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | [x] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Adverse Impact’ assessment (where provided)?Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | [x] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Priority Service Change’ assessment (where provided)?Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | [x] 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?This should refer to whether the proposing party considers the service change to relate to an existing service area or whether is constitutes a new service area. | [x] 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?This should refer to the proposed methodology (or amendment to existing methodology) for determining the specific service charges and the proposed basis for determining the specific service change charges. | [x] 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 | N/A |
| EQR validity period: | 3 Months |

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 |
| There have been no changes identified to the CDSP Service Description. |
| 2.) Detail modifications required to UK Link |
| There are no changes required to the ore SAP UKLink systems as this will be a repot developed in SAP BW. |
| 3.) Detail changes required to appendix 5b of the UK Link Manual |
| No changes have been identified. |
| 4.) Detail impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP |
| These Reports will be generated by resources at Xoserve and there will be a small ongoing cost to the CDSP for publication and validation of these reports on a monthly basis.  |
| 5.) Implementation Plan |
| If the BER is approved in the April ChMC Meeting it is anticipated that the reports can be delivered towards the end of April 2018 for testing and then delivery is likely to be towards the end of May 2018 depending on timely completion of the testing. |
| 6.) Estimated implementation costs |
| It is estimated that the building of these reports will cost TO BE ADDED |
| 6a.) How will the charging for the costs be allocated to different customer classes? (General Service Changes only) |
| Please mark % against each customer class:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | National Grid Transmission |
|  | Distribution Network Operators and IGT’s |
|  | DN Operator |
|  | IGT’s |
| 100 | Shippers |
| 100% |  |

 |
| 7.) Estimated impact of the service change on service charges |
| There is no anticpated impacts to the current service charges. |
| 8.) Please detail any pre-requisite activities that must be completed by the customer prior to receiving or being able to request the service. |
| The customer must ensure that resources will be vailable for testing of the reports that are anticipated to be delivered. |
| ***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 |
| **Do Nothing:**This option is not recommended as this is a customer request for greater transparency across the market movements.**Recommended Option:**To proceed with the development and delivery of 6 reports, to increase the transparency around the activities relating to the Annual Quantity Movement across the market. These reports shall:* Be available online utilising the secure SharePoint site and folder 32, this will ensure the use of anonymity
* They will be published 10 business days after the previous month
* They will all be anonymised and use both GT and iGT data
* Access will only be granted to Shippers
* Class 1 SMPs will be excluded

These reports shall be created on SAP BW and have no impact to the core UKLink System, the reports that will be delivered are as follows:* Report 1: Rolling AQ
	+ This shows the volume of AQs calculated along with the movement of AQ within the industry and is linked to the previous report 1 from the Mod 081
* Report 2: Rolling AQ Increase/Decrease
	+ This shows the volume of AQs calculated along with the movement of AQ within the industry and is linked to the previous report 2 from the Mod 081. It captures the number of MPRNS where the AQ has increased or decreased
* Report 3: AQ corrections
	+ This is a new report that captures the AQ corrects sent and accepted by the MPRN count and volume movement.
* Report 4: Rolling AQ impact on full portfolio
	+ This is similar to report 10 from Mod 081 and shows the impact of AQ movement on the full portfolio.
* Report 5: AQ of 1 Report
	+ This is a new report which captures where the volume of AQ is 1 within the market.
* Report 6: Volume of Override Flag Reads
	+ This is another new report which identifies the volume of Override Flags within the market and the impacts on the AQ calculation

The advantages of this option are as follows:* Xoserve will be meeting the customers’ requirements to satisfy the AQ transparency requirements
* These reports will aid the confidence and assurance of gas allocation across the Market
* They can also be utilised to identify any issues or trends to assist with the unpredictability of UIG which is linked to the movement of Gas allocation
* There are no other system impacts other than the reports being built into SAP BW

The disadvantages of this option are as follows:* Will add to the current change congestion of the team that will be delivering the report
* Manual validation is required on a monthly basis so that these reports can be issued as and when specified
 |
| Restricted Class Changes onlyIs 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)[x] No |
| Dependencies: |
| Testing Resources shall be required from the Customer to identify if the reports are fit for purpose. The Report delivery is dependent upon an efficient turn around time of any testing and correspondence bewteen CDSP and the Customer. |
| Constraints: |
| N/A  |
| Benefits: |
| The main benefit is that the movement of AQ throughout the market is transparent and therefore helps should be able to assist with the UIG process. |
| Impacts: |
| Other than adding to the current change congestion there are no foreseeable impacts of delivering this report. |
| Risks: |
| There is a small risk that delivering this change may add to the current change congestion, which may impact but not limited to:* Environments
* Resources
* Prioritisation of delivery
 |
| Assumptions: |
| It is assumed that these reports should be sufficient for the transparency of the movement of AQ throughout the market. It is also assumed that the Customer will provide adequate resources to test the reports when they have been developed.  |
| Information Security: |
| The SharePoint site is a secure storage facility which is currently being used to store secure documents which has very stirct controls and access in place to prevent any breach of data. |
| Out of scope: |
| Any other requirements which are not stipulated within this Change Proposal are considered out of scope. |
| Please provide any additional information relevant to the proposed service change: |
| The attached descriptions of the reports as per the ROM |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| Change Overview |
| Please include detail on the following for the chosen implementation option: modifications to UKLink, impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP. Actions required of the customer prior to the commencement date |
| Please detail any differences between the solution that was implemented and what was defined in the BER. |
|  |
| Detail the revised text of the CDSP Service Description reflecting the change that has been made |
|  |
| 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 |  | Actual Commencement Date |  |
| Please provide an explanation of any variance |
| Please detail the main lessons learned from the project |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Service change costs |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Approved Costs (£) |  | Actual Costs (£) |  |

Reasons for variance between approved and actual costs: |

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; orA 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. |