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# A1: General Details

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Reference: | XRN4888 | | | |
| Change Title: | Removing Duplicate Address Update Validation for IGT Supply Meter Points via Contact Management Service (CMS) | | | |
| Date Raised: | 04/03/2019 | | | |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | BUUK | | |
| Name: | John Cooper | | |
| Email: | [John.Cooper@bu-uk.co.uk](mailto:John.Cooper@bu-uk.co.uk) | | |
| Telephone: | 01359 302450 | | |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Paul Orsler | | |
| Email: | [Paul.orsler@xoserve.com](mailto:Paul.orsler@xoserve.com) | | |
| Telephone: | 0121 623 2060 | | |
| Change Status: | Proposal | | With DSG | Out for Review |
| Voting | | Approved | Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Customer Class(es): | Shipper | Distribution Network Operator |
| NG Transmission | IGT |
| Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Change Description: | As an IGT, I need Xoserve to process my address updates in order to reflect the most accurate and up to date information associated to address details held against IGT Supply Meter Points in UK Link systems.  The current duplicate address validation performed within Contact Management Service (CMS) was not designed with a full understanding of IGT address management processes, particularly those associated to the new housing development market. As such, CMS restricts IGTs in their ability to keep IGT Supply Meter Point address data up to date in line with changes that are made to plans on new housing developments.    IGTs are therefore seeking to remove the duplicate validations performed on address updates, in order to ensure address changes to IGT Supply Meter Points can be made within UK Link systems, as and when housing development plans are updated.  As part of this change enduring reports and management information (MI) will need to be developed and implemented. Reports will need to provide detail of the address amendments that have resulted in a duplicate addresses being created in UK Link systems. Reports are proposed to be issued to IGTs, who in turn will be responsible to investigate and take the relevant course of action. Management Information should also be created to demonstrate whether improvements are being made to Supply Meter Point address data quality, and to quantify whether further improvements can be made to the process.  No data migration or cleansing activities are required to be delivered as part of this change, with IGTs continuing to work closely with Xoserve operational teams to work around the limitations that exist with the current process, | |
| Proposed Release: | The proposer requests that this change be implemented as soon as possible, and supports this being assessed as a candidate for a Minor Release if necessary. | |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | 10 Working Days | 20 Working Days |
| 30 Working Days | Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | For new housing developments there are often changes which result in bulk address updates being required. For example:   * Changes to the site layout, plots being removed etc. * Changes to the street naming * removal of house numbers (such as 13) which cause consequential changes to multiple addresses.   Currently, for these bulk address updates, CMS will apply duplicate address validation to the new changes based against the existing UK link database. This validation does not, therefore, take into account the whole suite of changes being proposed by the IGT and apply validation for duplicates against the proposed addresses. The current swapped address process only accounts for instances where there is a like for like swap (i.e. 2, The Street is swapping directly with 3, The Street). If, however number 2 is becoming number 3 and number 3 is becoming number 4 and then number 4 is becoming number 2 the proposed change would fail duplicate address validation even though, once all changes are processed, there would be no duplicate addresses.  These addresses, therefore, go through 2 validation processes in Xoserve system:   * Firstly, through automation (where rejections will initially occur) and then; * Secondly, manually, where the data/addresses can be challenged and therefore amended, as required. The second part of this validation is resource intensive for Xoserve and IGTs often leads to delays and backlogs in changes being made to these addresses whilst rejections are being challenged and resolved via CMS.   The above validation is causing issues as we are still in new development stages, and therefore addresses may also need amending a 3rd/4th time, due to developer/design changes, or shipper requirements. Removing the duplicate address validation or IGT initiated changes will reduce the amount of resource being spent providing the second check on the change within UK Link systems.    IGTs would be required to proactively monitor duplicate addresses on their networks. To address this, it would be beneficial as part of this change, to develop reporting for IGTs that pulls out any genuine duplicate addresses. This would ensure that IGTs are provided information of instances where duplicate addresses occur and therefore be able to correct data. |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | Immediately after implementation of this change. |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | None |
| *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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Final DSG Recommendation: | *Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.* | | |
| Approve | Reject | Defer |
| DSG Recommended Release: | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | | |

# A6: Funding

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Funding Classes: | Shipper | XX % |
| National Grid Transmission | XX % |
| Distribution Network Operator | XX % |
| IGT | 100 % |
| Other <please specify> | XX % |
| Service Line(s) | **TBC with Xoserve and ChMC (see funding comment below)** | |
| ROM or funding details: |  | |
| Funding Comments: | This change closest aligned to Service Area 2: Provide query management – However this Service Area isn’t currently funded by IGTs.  No alternative Service Areas can be used to cover a 100% IGT funded change. Agreement to be sought with Xoserve and ChMC on the most appropriate way to fund this change.  It was acknowledge at the ChMC meeting on 13th March 2019 that there is currently no DSC Service Area that indicates IGTs as being 100% responsible for the associated funding.  28/03/2019 – Xoserve is reviewing the DSC service lines to assess whether a new one is required. | |

# A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13th March 2019

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Industry Consultation: | 10 Working Days | | 20 Working Days | |
| 30 Working Days | | Other [Specify Here] | |
| Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve) | 29/03/2019 | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | Yes (initial review) | No |
| Date Issued: | 15/03/2019 | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 2264.2 – RJ – ES | |
| Number of Responses: | 7 reps: 6 approvals and 1 rejection | |

# A8: DSC Voting Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Please select. |
| National Grid Transmission | | | Please select. |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Please select. |
| IGT | | | Please select. |
| Meeting Date: | Click here to enter a date. | | | |
| Release Date: | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA | | | |
| Overall Outcome: | No | Yes | If [Yes] please specify <Release> | |

Please send the completed forms to: [box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com](mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com)

Section B: Change Proposal Initial Review

# B1: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Northern Gas Networks |
| Name: | Shanna Key |
| Email: | [SKey@northerngas.co.uk](mailto:SKey@northerngas.co.uk) |
| Telephone: | 07779 416 216 |

# B1: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | |
| Yes. We believe removing the duplicate validation from the Contact Management System (CMS) would create the risk of duplicate MPRNs being created on the Supply Point Register, which could lead to registration issues for Shippers and increase the number of unregistered sites. | | | | |
| 2. 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. As this is an issue with the CMS system and Xoserve do these manually (one by one), we feel that taking out the validation is not the right thing to do for the industry due to the risks that could arise from its removal. | | | | |
| 3. 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) | | | | |
| NGN would not support implementation of this change proposal as currently drafted. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| We agree that if this proposal were to be implemented, it should be 100% IGT funded. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B2: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Indigo Pipelines Ltd |
| Name: | Cher Harris |
| Email: | Cher.harris@sse.com |
| Telephone: | 07747559101 |

# B2: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 risks or costs identified | | | | |
| 2. 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, the current Xoserve process is simply not fit for purpose as it was not designed to be used for the new build market that IGTs operate in. Xoserve are rejecting far too many valid IGT-initiated address updates. This does nothing to support the Ofgem drive to improve address data quality. This has been a problem area since Nexus implementation and we welcome this proposal as a step in the right direction. | | | | |
| 3. 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) | | | | |
| We would support this being implemented in a minor release as soon as possible | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| Yes, provided the costs are transparent and reasonable | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B3: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | BUUK |
| Name: | John Cooper |
| Email: | John.cooper@bu-uk.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 01359 302450 |

# B3: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | |
| The change proposal has been presented as an IGT only change. Xoserve are confident that they can separate the validation to only apply to IGT address updates, therefore this should limit any concerns the industry have about opening all address updates to the entire industry. We recognise that any removal or change to validation is likely to be met with caution. To allay this, the additional reporting will enable the industry to see where duplicate addresses exist on IGT networks and allow IGTs to readily resolve and therefore making IGTs accountable.  It must be noted that duplicate addresses are already an issue for the industry. BUUK are aware that address update processes are being wrongly used currently by the industry e.g. upon submitting an address update the *multi service box* is being ticked which allows duplicate address to be submitted without validation. BUUK believe that by formally requesting via the change proposal route for the removal of the validation will ensure that there is sufficient transparency and accountability of our intentions. | | | | |
| 2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. | | | | |
| The change proposed looks to positively improve the quality of address data. Ofgem have set high targets for address improvements on IGTs, specifically around plot to postal addresses. The IGT market contributes to nearly 90% of all new connections and addresses. Due to the relationship between IGTs and housing developers there are always high numbers of alterations to site plans which results in IGTs sending significant volumes of address and plot updates.  The benefits of this change are:   * Actively enhances IGT’s capabilities of updating plot addresses more efficiently, without handling large volumes of incorrect rejections. * Xoserve have been open in admitting that the current CMS system is not geared up to meet IGT requirements. This change will go some way in improving the interface and meet IGT requirements. * Much of the current processing is done manually and often leads to delays in addresses being updated. The change will significantly reduce the amount of manual processing which is required within Xoserve. Due to the current volumes of address updates IGTs are submitting on daily basis, there is a backlog at Xoserve’s end leading to a misalignment of data and delays in UK Link being updated. This change may lead to efficiency savings within Xoserve as it reduces the manual workload required to process IGT address updates. * Improve address data quality, reducing the number of plot addresses and ensuring the correct addresses are being held in UK Link. As mentioned, this is being driven by Ofgem as part of the Faster Switching Programme stage 0 data requirements. | | | | |
| 3. 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) | | | | |
| There would be no functional results as a result of the change required to our own internal systems. BUUK would push for a minor release or the next possible available release date. The change is required now to help support Ofgem’s Faster Switching data requirements. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| The original intent of this change was for it to apply to IGT supply points only. Based on this, IGTs would fund 100% of the change, this would cover off both the validation change and reporting element of the CP. However, if GDNs also determine that they would see benefits from the change and wish for the validation to be removed, we would expect a funding split. This could either be a direct 50/50 IGT/GDN split or based on the proportion of new connections in a given year 19/20. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B4: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities Ltd |
| Name: | Olga Batsari |
| Email: | olga.batsari@wwutilities.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 02920 278579 |

# B4: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | |
| We do not wish to stand in the way of a change that will improve IGT address accuracy but  we have some concerns about the consequential impacts on DN and Shipper processes.  This depends on whether f IGTs use exactly the same CMS transactions/contact as DNs and  Shippers.  The 2 CMS contacts that WWU is using for amendments of address are:  UNC contact for unregistered MPRNs  ADD contact for MPRNs confirmed by a shipper (mainly used by shippers. When  WWU submits an ADD, prior validation is required with the shipper/supplier to make  sure they agree on the ADD address details).  For bulk uploads, we use an EFT template (provided by XOSERVE) and upload files  as .QMP format.  On the “Benefits and Justification” section of the change proposal, an example is provided to  demonstrate where the current process is deemed to fail:  *“ If, however number 2 is becoming number 3 and number 3 is becoming number 4 and then*  *number 4 is becoming number 2 the proposed change would fail duplicate address validation even though, once all changes are processed, there would be no duplicate addresses*.”  On the network side, we overcome these issues by using the “MULTI” indicator on the UNC or ADD contact. See the screen print from a UNC contact below with the relevant field highlighted.  By selecting ‘MULTI’, the user can override the duplication validation rules. This of course should be used sparingly and **only** on the circumstances that is needed rather than a default setting.  In WWU, we use it only for properties that have more than one service on site.  Examples: a hospital with multiple supplies that cannot be differentiated to individual units names or examples like the one above documented by John Cooper.  Validation rules for duplicates are important for data integrity. We should try to avoid removing them and then introducing manual reporting etc. Best practice should be to remove validation rules only when there is a justification for the particular MPRN/site.  If validation is removed for IGT address we have some concern that this may result in duplicate addresses which could in turn lead to inaccuracies with CSEP data.    The field is also available on the bulk upload EFT template. | | | | |
| 2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. | | | | |
| If IGTs work on the same transaction/CMS contact as DNs and Shippers and the ‘MULTI’  indicator that already exists serves their needs, then we do not see any need for the change  request. | | | | |
| 3. 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) | | | | |
| If the changes do not affect in any way the way DNs submit UNCs or ADDs, then a minor release is acceptable.  However, if the CMS contacts the IGTs use are the same as the DNs and Shippers, then we would require testing and confirmation that our process has not been affected.  The processing of UNCs and ADDs affect end users and their MPRNs. Customers expect a  quick turnaround in order to organise contracts with suppliers against a PAF address, gas  meter installation or change over suppliers. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| If the change is still required, then we agree that this should be 100% funded by IGTs. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B5: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | ES Pipelines Ltd |
| Name: | Kev Duddy |
| Email: | [Kev.duddy@espug.com](mailto:Kev.duddy@espug.com) |
| Telephone: | 01372 587 528 |

# B5: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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, ESP believes there is no negative impact on our organisation or the market. | | | | |
| 2. 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, ESP believes this change will bring significant benefit across IGT new connection portfolios. Large scale address updates are necessary due to site variations during the build phase of new housing developments, often determined by the build or sale progress, and the timing of postal information being returned from the local authority.  ESP believes that efficiencies can be gained by both IGTs and Xoserve by removing the existing validation. The current process is unable to support the volume of address updates required by IGTs and is causing a backlog, resulting in misaligned data within UK Link and additional issues being encountered by shippers when trying to register the supply points.  In addition, dual fuel address data quality has been identified by Ofgem as a key requirement of Faster Switching. With the imminent creation of REL addresses linking with the MPAN address in electricity it is imperative that variations on new developments are able to be updated concurrently with the electricity market. | | | | |
| 3. 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. ESP supports a deployment within a minor release, and benefits would be seen immediately. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| Yes, IGTs should fund 100% of the change as it only applies to IGT address updates. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B6: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Southern Electric Gas Ltd and SSE Energy Supply Ltd |
| Name: | Megan Coventry |
| Email: | Megan.coventry@sse.com |
| Telephone: | 02392277738 |

# B6: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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, we do not anticipate any material risk or cost impact. | | | | |
| 2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. | | | | |
| We believe that this change to remove duplicate validation will have a positive impact, making it easier for IGTs keep their address data up to date, therefore improving SMP address quality overall. | | | | |
| 3. 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) | | | | |
| We agree that this change can be implemented as part of a minor release as soon as possible. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| Yes we agree that this change be 100% IGT funded. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

# B7: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence |
| Email: | [Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com](mailto:Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com) |
| Telephone: | 07875 117771 |

# B7: ChMC Industry Consultation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | |
| We believe this has the potential to cause the industry an increased volume of data discrepancies in the future. Where duplicate addresses are allowed and they are not resolved in a timely manner (or worst case scenario, at all).  This could lead us into billing 2 customers for the same site and will make Meter/Address Mix-ups more difficult to validate and subsequently correct.  It is not 100% clear whether this CP is asking for relaxation of this rule for iGT addresses only or to include GT – please could this be clarified.  It is also unclear as to why this is now an issue – there will have always been issues with plot addresses as far as we understand it and are not clear why there is now a proposal to change the process. Without further understanding of the impacts & scale of issue we are unable to support this change. | | | | |
| 2. 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 | | | | |
| 3. 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 functional changes so minimum timescales could apply | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| Yes | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

Version Control

# Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 1 | Proposal | 05/03/2019 | Xoserve | CP Raised |
| 2 | Out for initial review | 15/02/2019 | Xoserve | Sent out for an initial review following ChMC on 13/03/2019 |
| 3 | Out for initial review | 28/03/2019 | Xoserve | Funding section updated |
| 4 | Out for initial review | 29/03/2019 | Xoserve | Reps added (initial review) |

# Template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 3.0 | Superseded | 17/07/2018 | Emma Smith | Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018. |
| 4.0 | Superseded | 07/09/2018 | Emma Smith | Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1. |
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| 6.0 | Approved | 12/12/2018 | Simon Harris | Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12th December 2018. |