

DSC Change Proposal Document

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

A1: General Details

Change Reference:	XRN 5093			
Change Title:	Update of AUC	G Table	to reflect new EUC ban	ds
Date Raised:	Click here to e	nter a d	ate.	
	Organisation :	Gazprom		
Sponsor Representative	Name:	Steve	Mulinganie	
Details:	Email:	steve.mulinganie@gazpromenergy.com		
	Telephone:	0121 288 2107		
	Name:	Ellie Rogers		
Xoserve	Email:	Ellie.rc	gers@xoserve.com	
Representative Details:	Telephone:	0121 2292 185		
	Business Owner:			
Change Status:	Proposal	□ With DSG □ Out for Review		□ Out for Review
Change Status:	□ Voting		⊠ Approved	□ Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

	⊠ Shipper	Distribution Network Operator
Customer Class(es):	☑ NG Transmission	□ IGT -
		□ Other
Justification for Customer Class(es) selection	the UIG share factors that f they receive. Currently the Band 1 and Band 2 and no bandings. Gemini is a National Grid a	is the new EUCs will be reflected within eed the apportionment of UIG values UIG share factors only consider EUC t the four additional categories for both sset, and the HLSO identified Gemini fransmission also receive a vote.



A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Problem Statement:	At present the AUG Table does not fully reflect the combination of End User Categories (EUC) and Product Classes that are utilised by the CDSP. As a result, not all the EUC bands are reflected within the UIG share factors.				
	When the AUG Table was last revised as part of Project Nexus, there were 9 End User Categories and 4 Product Classes, which the table reflected. This allows the AUGE to align the Adjustment Factors it calculates with each End User Category. Since then, EUC Bands 1 & 2 have each been split into four new				
Change Description:	categories by Change Proposal XRN4665 Creation of New End User Categories: • Non-Prepayment/Domestic • Prepayment/Domestic • Non-Prepayment I&C • Prepayment I&C				
	Modification 0711 seeks to update the AUG Table contained in UNC TPD Section E Annex E-1 to reflect the new EUC bands listed above. This DSC Change proposal is required to make the associated changes within UK Link systems to ensure the updated EUC bands are reflected in the UIG share factor values.				
	provide the high level costs and efforts associated with the change.				
Proposed Release:	Major Release required, release TBC Change needs to implemented by 01.10.2021				
Proposed	□ 10 Working Days	□ 15 Working Days			
Consultation Period:	□ 20 Working Days	Other [Specify Here]			

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	The AUGE Table will be updated and new EUCs will be reflected in the UIG share factor values.
	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 upon implementation
	When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?
Benefit Dependencies:	The benefit is dependent upon the modification being approved in order for the CDSP to deliver this change.



Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change,
this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the
projects has not got direct control of.

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

(see Section C for DSG recommendations)

A6: Service Lines and Funding

Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing	Service Area 15: Demand Estimation			
Level of Impact	Minor impact expected but TBC as	s change develo	ops	
If None please give justification	N/A			
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix	No impacts expected			
Level of Impact	None			
If None please give justification	External impacts are not anticipate Manual not expected	ed and changes	to UK Link	
	Customer Classes/ Funding Delivery of Change On-going Budget Amendme			
	⊠ Shipper	100 %	XX %	
Funding Classes	National Grid Transmission	XX %	XX %	
	Distribution Network Operator	XX %	XX %	
	🗆 IGT	XX %	XX %	
	□ Other <please specify=""></please>	XX %	XX %	
ROM or funding details:	$\frac{\text{ROM}}{\text{Based on the ROM, an enduring solution will cost at least £ 115,500}}$ but probably not more than £185,500 to implement. Please note that this is a high level estimate of cost and effort only.			
Funding Comments:	Change expected to fall under Service Area 15: Demand Estimation, this is detailed as 50:50 split between Shippers and DNOs. However, this change is anticipated to only impact shippers, and within previous change XRN4665 (Creation of New End User Categories) the funding was 100% Shipper. This change is proposed to follow the 100% Shipper funding, but to be confirmed by Change Management Committee.			



A7: ChMC Recommendation – Initial Review

Change Status:	⊠ Approve	□ Reject	□ Defer
----------------	-----------	----------	---------

A8: DSC Voting Outcome - Solution Review

Change Status:	⊠ Approve	□ Reject			□ Defer
Industry	⊠ 10 Working Days		🗆 15 Wor	15 Working Days	
Consultation:	20 Working Days		□ Other [Specify Here]		
DSC Consultation Issue:	⊠ Yes		□ No	□ No	
Date Issued:	13/07/2020				
Comms Ref(s):	2634.4 - MT - JR				
Number of Responses:	One approval for Option 2				
	⊠ Shipper Approve			rove	
Solution Voting	☑ National Grid Transmission Approve			rove	
Solution Voting:	🗆 Distributi	on Network	Operator	Plea	ase select.
	GIGT			Plea	ase select.
Meeting Date:	12/08/2020				
Release Date:	June 2021				
Overall Outcome:	□ No ⊠ Yes				

A9: DSC Voting Outcome – Detail Design

Change Status:	Approve Reject			□ Defer	
Industry			🗆 15 Wor	15 Working Days	
Consultation:			Other [Specify Here]		
DSC Consultation Issue:	⊠ Yes		□ No	□ No	
Date Issued:	16/11/2020				
Comms Ref(s):	2718.2 – RT - PO				
Number of Responses:	One approval response				
	□ Shipper		Арр	ove	
Solution Voting:	National Grid Transmission		Plea	se select.	
Solution voting.	Distribution Network Operator		Plea	se select.	
	□ IGT		Plea	se select.	
Meeting Date:	09/12/2020				



Release Date: June 21 Major release

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

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

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

DSG Date:	27/07/2020
	Ellie Rogers (ER) presented this agenda item. ER stated Under XRN5093, the new EUC bands will be assigned an individual UIG weighting factor which will factor into the UIG sharing process. This means the number of weighting factors provided by the AUGE will be updated from 36 to 60 to account for the split EUC01 and EUC02 bands across the 4 classes introduced by XRN4665. ER presented the 2 options outlined within the HLSO. Option 1 – EUC changes in UK Link and GEMINI to accept new UIG factors for accurate nomination, allocation and smearing - EUC band details will remain 3 characters within USS file. The overall impact will be high (UK Link and Gemini, SAP ISU, SAP BW) and is recommended as a Major Release with an XL change size complexity. The high level cost estimate for this change is £175,000 to £250,000
DSG Summary:	Option 2 – EUC changes in UK Link, GEMINI and MarketFlow to accept new UIG factors for accurate nomination, allocation and smearing – EUC to be extended to 5 characters in the USS file helping to future proof the solution. This option has an overall impact of High (UK Link, MarketFlow and Gemini, SAP PO, SAP ISU, SAP BW) and is recommended for a Major release type. The change size complexity is XL with a high level cost estimate of £175,000-£250,000
	ER highlighted that the options within the HLSO are very similar and the only difference is within option 2, the USS file will be updated so that the EUC field has 5 characters rather than 3. ER explained that Xoserve's preferred solution is option 2. This is due to option 2 incorporating the change to character length field within the USS file, which provides a greater level of future proofing. This could give flexibility, should future changes to EUC Bands arise, making it easier to manage e.g. including WAR bands, LDZs which EUCs. Option 2 also ensures the EUC band field are consistent across interfaces (Gemini/AMT/PO/ISU). It was highlighted that the USS is an internal file, therefore this update will not affect external users.
	ER confirmed that the HLSO had been issued out to the industry within a Solution Review Change Pack in July and the deadline to submit



	DSG, ER proposed taking a 'DSG preference' based on the meeting discussions to August ChMC where a decision would be made. EL and HB stated that they have sent this change out for consultation within their organisations and didn't believe there were any comments on solution preference. Both EL and HB agreed to support this preferred solution from the DSG discussions and options explained in this meeting. Based on this, a DSG preference for option 2 will be presented within the August ChMC. ER also highlighted to the group that as part of this change, the AUGE who are the organisation contracted to provide the UIG share factors will as part of this change have to provide 60 UIG share factors rather than 36. As a result, we have recently been informed that there is an additional contract set-up cost to be funded under XRN5093 to deliver their element of the change. An initial cost from the AUGE has been provided. ER confirmed this was just for awareness and the information needed to be discussed in ChMC. PO added this will be fed into the next ChMC meeting to give light on the breakdown of costs and items that are not included within the HLSO estimate.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<insert appropriate="" where=""></insert>		
DSG Recommendation:		□ Reject	□ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / N	lov XX or Adhoc DD/MN	//YYYY

DSG Date:	23/11/2020		
DSG Summary:	PO explained went through the slides, and asked DSG to review the Detailed Design Change Pack that has been issued on this and to confirm that our understanding of customer impact is correct to ensure we do not miss any impacts that we may not currently be aware of. Phanitha explained the detail of this change which can be found <u>here.</u> No specific comments on this change.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<insert appropriate="" where=""></insert>		
DSG Recommendation:		□ Reject	Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

Section D: High Level Solution Options



D1: Solution Options

<u>Overview</u>

This change is based on Modification 0711 - Update of AUG Table
to reflect new EUC bands - and seeks to update the AUG Table
contained in UNC TPD Section E Annex E-1 to reflect the new EUC
(End User Category) bands. EUC Bands 1 and 2 have each been
split into four new categories by previous Change Proposal
XRN4665 "Creation of New End User Categories" as follows:

- Non-Prepayment/Domestic
- Prepayment/Domestic
- Non-Prepayment I&C
- Prepayment I&C

When the AUG Table was last revised as part of Project Nexus, there were nine End User Categories (01 to 09) and four Product Classes (1, 2, 3 & 4), which the table reflected. This change allows the AUGE to align the Adjustment Factors it calculates with each EUC. The Change is required to make the associated changes within UK Link systems to ensure the updated EUC bands are reflected in the UIG share factor values.

The Change Proposal for XRN5093 can be <u>found here</u>. For information, a <u>ROM</u> was completed for Modification 0711.

Solution Option Summary:

Change/Solution Overview

At present the AUG Table does not fully reflect the combination of (EUC) and Product Classes that are utilised by the CDSP. As a result, not all the EUC bands are reflected within the UIG share factors. The purpose of this change is to update the AUGE table with the new EUC Bands.

The High-Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be <u>found here.</u>

The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified two options to deliver the requirements of the change:

Solution Option 1:

Changes in UK Link and Gemini to accept new UIG factor for accurate Nomination, allocation and smearing - keeping EUC band details will remain 3 character within USS file (internal file passing information from Gemini to UK Link).

Solution Option 2:

EUC Changes in UK Link and Gemini to accept new UIG factor for accurate Nomination, allocation and smearing (as per option 2) but



	with the addition of the EUC value to be made 5 character (currently 3) in USS file format.
	Both of the above options look to update the AUGE table and add in the new splits within EUC bands 1 and 2 which will then be reflected within the UIG share factor values. The difference between the two options are whether or not they provide future proofing for potentially upcoming changes, and the systems this will impact.
	For option 1, there will be impacts on Gemini, SAP ISU and SAP BW. The USS file will maintain the 3 character limit for EUC band details, so as there will be no file format change with this, there is no impact on MarketFlow or SAP PO.
	For option 2, there are also impacts on Gemini, SAP ISU and SAP BW. As this option gives the flexibility to be configurable with future changes, there will be a file format change for the USS file. This will allow 5 characters within the EUC band and therefore impacts MarketFlow and SAP PO.
	Both option 1 and 2 fall within the same cost estimate bracket.
	Additional Information for Consideration:
	Please note, due to the added aspect of internal file format change within option 2, it is expected that this will result in a higher cost within the same price bracket than option 1.
	Modification 0711 – Update of AUG Table to reflect new EUC bands has been approved an was implemented on 19 th June 2020 for the transitional solution and on 1 st October 2021 for the enduring solution, in line with this change.
Implementation Date Solution Options:	Both solution options will require delivery within a Major Release, aiming for June 2021 to ensure delivery before the start of the following gas year (October 2021).
Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)	Option 2 Xoserve's preferred solution is option 2 as this will include the change to the EUC band field meaning that all the interfaces are consistent across Gemini/AMT/PO/ISU. This will be the most robust solution for future proofing and will make it easier to manage further EUC band changes if any are introduced at a later date.
DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	It was discussed at the June DSG meeting that the HLSO would go to the next DSG in July. The DSG view from July will be included in the reps presented to the following ChMC.
Consultation closeout:	27/07/2020



Impact on Service Line(s) and funding (A6) for each Solution Option:

(If differ from original assessment in A6)



Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

	Organisation:	SSE Energy Supply Ltd	
User Contact	Name:	Megan Coventry	
Details:	Email:	megan.coventry@outlook.com	
	Telephone:	02392277738	
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Option 2.		
Implementation Date:	Approve		
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve		
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve		
Publication of consultation response:	N/A		

E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response
to Organisations
Comments:Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a
final decision.



Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN5093
Solution Details:	EUC Changes in UK Link and Gemini to accept new UIG factor for accurate Nomination, allocation and smearing (as per option 2) but with the addition of the EUC value to be made 5 character (currently 3) in USS file format.
Implementation Date:	01/06/2021
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	12/08/2020

Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2718.2 – RT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN5093 - Update of AUG Table to reflect new EUC bands (Modification 0711)
Comm Date:	16/11/2020

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For Representation
Close Out Date:	30/11/2020

G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN5093
Change Class:	CDSP Functional System changes



ChMC Constituency	Shipper Users
Impacted:	National Grid (from a Gemini asset owner perspective only)
Change Owner:	Ellie Rogers Customer Change Specialist
	+441212292185 ellie.rogers@xoserve.com
Background and Context:	 Uniform Network Code (UNC) Modification 0711 – Update of AUG Table to reflect the new EUC bands has been raised to update the Allocation of Unidentified Gas (AUG) Table set out in UNC TPD Section E Annex E-1 to include the new End User Categories (EUC) brought in by DSC Change Proposal XRN4665 Creation of New End User Categories. The AUGE is required to populate the AUG Table as set out in UNC TPD Section E Annex E-1. Any mismatch between the Adjustment Factors developed by the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE) and the EUCs that are utilised by the CDSP in demand estimation processes will reduce the accuracy of the AUGE process. When the AUG Table was last revised as part of Project Nexus, there were 9 End User Categories and 4 Product Classes, which the table reflected. This allows the AUGE to align the Adjustment Factors it calculates with each End User Category. Since then, EUC Bands 1 & 2 have each been split into four new categories by Change Proposal XRN4665 Creation of New End User Categories: Non-Prepayment/Domestic Prepayment/Domestic Prepayment/BC As a result, the AUG Table does not currently fully align with the EUCs in effect for demand estimation. The implementation of Modification 0711 will update the AUG table to reflect the new EUCs introduced through XRN4665. Change Proposal XRN5093 was raised to deliver the system solution associated with Modification 0711 changes which involves ensuring the new EUCs have an individual UIG weighting factor which are applied in UIG calculation, apportionment and invoicing processes within CDSP systems. Link to XRN5093 Change Proposal For the full Modification 0711 details, please see the link to the Joint Office website: https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0711 Please note – Modification 0711 has been approved and the implementation effective date of the enduring solution is 01 October 2021.



G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Demand Estimation, Billing, Smearing, UIG Share Factors
Non-Functional:	None
Application:	SAP IS-U, SAP BI/BW and Gemini
User(s):	Shipper Users National Grid (from a Gemini asset owner perspective only)
Documentation:	None
Other:	Not Applicable

		Files	3	
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

G5: Change Design Description

XRN5093 looks to update the Unidentified Gas (UIG) processes to take into account the updated AUG Table contained in UNC TPD Section E Annex E-1 which has split the EUC Band 1 & EUC Band 2 into four categories:

- 1. Non-Prepayment/Domestic
- 2. Prepayment/Domestic
- 3. Non-Prepayment I&C
- 4. Prepayment I&C

UIG is included in the outputs of Energy Balancing and is part of a Shipper's daily cash out. UIG is fairly shared out using Product Class and EUCs. In order to do this, an independent expert (the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert - AUGE) provides a table of weighting factors that assign the correct amount of UIG to the different Product Class of Supply Meter Points (SMPs).

UIG is shared out using the AUG table, assigning the correct amount of UIG to different Product Class of SMPs. This is used in daily gas nomination and allocation processes. Daily measured or estimated gas throughput in each LDZ is weighted using the AUG table factors to assign daily UIG to Shippers based on their throughput by SMP, Product Class and EUC.

XRN5093 will ensure the UIG calculation, apportionment and invoicing processes utilise the new categories mentioned above for EUC Band 1 and EUC Band 2.

Individual UIG weighting factor needs to be attributed to each split EUC by the AUGE and applied by the CDSP within the downstream processes.

The appointed AUGE have been made aware of the changes introduced under Modification 0711 and under their contract with the CDSP, will be providing the UIG weighting factors for each EUC (including the split EUCs) in line with the updated AUG Table which will go live on 01 October 2021.

Please note that we believe this change impacts CDSP systems and process only and therefore do not anticipate that Shippers will have to make any mandatory system changes



their side to accommodate the Modification 0711 changes. Existing processes and documentation will remain as is for Shippers and following the implementation of XRN5093 Shippers will simply be assigned daily UIG based on each EUC in line with the updated AUG Table. Shippers may have built modelling and simulation systems which use the current UIG Weighting Factors to assess/estimate their share of UIG for a given day. If they still wish to use those modelling/simulation systems, they would need to make an equivalent change in their systems. If upon receipt and review of this Change Pack, you believe there will be customer system changes as a result of this change, please confirm within the representation period.

For reference, the section below details the system changes for the CDSP to accommodate the changes under XRN5093:

Internal S12 File Changes

5. S12 file is an internal file which is created by the Customer Performance Analysis Team annually. The file provides UIG weighting factors from the AUGE table to Gemini and other downstream systems and will need to be updated to include the new EUC bands and UIG weighting factors. This file is loaded into Gemini system for further processing.

<u>Gemini</u>

- 6. S12 and USS file format changes will be carried out in Gemini to allow the new UIG weighting factors. *Please note that these are both internal file formats and therefore Shippers are not required to make changes in their systems to accommodate the file format changes.*
- 7. Structural changes to internal existing tables to accommodate new EUC bands and UIG weighting factors.
- 8. The internal Gemini USS file generation batch job will be modified to accommodate the new UIG weighting factor values to SAP billing processes within SAP IS-U.
- 9. Gemini Nomination and Allocation processes will be updated to utilise the new UIG weighting factors

UK Link- SAP IS-U

The following internal processes/files will be amended to allow the new EUC bands and UIG weighting factors within SAP IS-U systems.

- 10. USS file changes within SAP IS-U system.
- 11. Energy adjustment for Monthly throughput Process from Gemini
- 12. Smearing Process

UKLink - SAP BI/BW

- 1. To confirm, there are no external reporting impacts.
- 2. There are two internal BI reports which need to be updated to future proof the solution and allow configurable values. The changes required in SAP BW to reflect the new EUC bands and UIG factors in these reports will be carried out.

Key things to note:

 The new table inserted into UNC TPD E: Annex E-1 as part of Modification 0711S will be effective from 1st October 2021 as provided in UNC Final Modification Report



- 4. Data Cleanse activities are not anticipated. Current processes would just need to be updated to include the additional weighting factors for the split EUCs.
- 5. Service Area 15: Demand Estimation We do not anticipate an additional Service Line being necessary. This should be covered under an existing line as it is simply increasing the number of weighting factors.

G6: Associated Changes

Associated	Madification 0711 Undate of ALIC Table to reflect new FLIC bands
Change(s) and	Modification 0711 - Update of AUG Table to reflect new EUC bands
Title(s):	

G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	N/A
discussion date:	
Any further	XRN5093 has been to DSG for discussion and agreement on the
information:	proposed solution option which has been agreed by ChMC

G8: Implementation

Target Release:	: July 2021 Major Release	
Status:	For Approval	

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to <u>uklink@xoserve.com</u>



Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

	Organisation:	Scottish Power		
User Contact Details:	Name:	Helen Bevan		
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com		
	Telephone:	01416145517		
Representation Status:	Support			
Representation Publication:	Publish			
Representation Comments:	None.			
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»		

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a
to Organisations	final decision
Comments:	

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



Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
V1	With DSG	20/02/2020	Chan Singh	Updated with ChMC outcome from the meeting on 12 th February
V2	With DSG	04/08/2020	Chan Singh	Updated with discussions from DSG 27 th July 2020
V3	For approval	06/08/2020	Kate Lancaster	Updated with High Level Solution Options and Industry Response.
V4	Approved	12/08/2020	Jai Le Resche	Updated with Solution outcome from the ChMC meeting on 12 th August.
V5	Approved	26/08/2020	Rachel Taggart	Updated with Change Pack responses for Solution review
V6	With DSG	02/12/2020	Chan Singh	Updated CP with discussions from DSG 23 rd November 2020.
V7	For Approval	03/12/2020	Rachel Taggart	Updated with Detail Design Change Pack
V8	Approved	11/12/2020	Rachel Taggart	Updated with Solution outcome from the ChMC meeting on 9 th December



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 □ ChMC endorsed Change Proposal				
	□ SPAA Change Proposal □ Additional or 3 rd Party Service Request				
	□ Other(please provide details below)				
Please select the customer	Shipper Impact				
group(s) who would be impacted	□Xoserve Impact □National Grid Transmission Impact				
if the change is not delivered	VDNACCE				
Associated Change reference Number(s)	XRN4665				
Associated MOD Number(s)	MOD0711				
Perceived delivery effort	$\Box 0 - 30 \qquad \Box 30 - 60$				
-	⊠ 60 – 100 □ 100+ days				
Does the project involve the	□ Yes (If yes please answer the next question)				
processing of personal data?	\boxtimes No				
'Any information relating to an identifiable					
person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an					
identifier' – includes MPRNS.					
A Data Protection Impact	□ New technology □ Vulnerable customer data □ Theft of Gas				
Assessment (DPIA) will be	Mass data Xoserve employee data				
required if the delivery of the	□ Fundamental changes to Xoserve business				
change involves the processing of personal data in any of the	Other (please provide details below)				
following scenarios:					
Tonowing Sociarios.	(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Kevin-Eltoft-Prest) to complete the DPIA. Kevin-Eltoft-Prest. Information can be				
	found: https://xoserve.sharepoint.com/dept/tech/infosec/Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx				
Change Beneficiary	Multiple Market Participants				
How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the	□ All industry UK Gas Market participants □ Xoserve Only				
change?	One Market Group One Market Participant				
Primary Impacted DSC Service	Service Area 15: Demand Estimation				
Area					
Number of Service Areas	□ All □ Five to Twenty □ Two to Five				
Impacted					
Change Improvement Scale?	🗆 High 🛛 Medium 🗆 Low				
How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?					
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?					
	Customer(s) incurring financial loss				
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?					
□ Customer System Changes Required □ Customer Testing Likely Required □ Customer Training Required					
Known Impact to Systems / Processes					



□ AMT □ EFT □ IX □ Gemini □ Birst ○ Other (please provide details below) Business Process Impact □ AQ □ SPA □ RGMA □ Reads □ 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) Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. ○ No Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. ○ No If yes who is accountable for the workaround in operation? ○ No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? ○ No What is the Frequency of the workaround? ○ No What is the Ifespan for the workaround? □ Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very litte risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? □ Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very litte risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? □ Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, trac drame error in determining outcome)	Primary Application impacted	⊠BW	⊠ ISU		
Business Process Impact AQ SPA RGMA Reads Portal Invoicing Other (please provide details below) Yes (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) Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact Workaround currently in operation? Shipper impact National Grid Transmission Impact Is there a Workaround in operation? No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? No What is the Frequency of the workaround? Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the lifespan for the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)		🗆 AMT	🗆 EFT		
Business Process Impact AQ SPA RGMA Reads Portal Invoicing Other (please provide details below) Invoicing Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? Yes (please provide details below) Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact iGT impact Is there a Workaround in operation? Ship Yes No No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? No Soserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Irfespan 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) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) 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)		🛛 Gemini	□ Birst	Other (please)	provide details below)
Image: Control of the service of t					,
Other (please provide details below) Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? Shipper impact Impact of the external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? Impact of the external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? Impact of the external services and/or systems as a result of delivered. Impact of the external services and/or systems as a result of delivered. Impact of the external customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Impact of the external currently in operation? Is there a Workaround in operation? Is there a Workaround in operation? If yes who is accountable for the workaround? What is the Frequency of the workaround? What is the Iffespan for the workaround? What is the Iffespan for the workaround? What is the Complexity of the workaround? What is the Complexity of the workaround? What is the Complexity of the workaround? Impact workaround?	Business Process Impact	□AQ		PA 🛛 🗆 RGM	1A
Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? Yes (please provide details below) Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. No Workaround currently in operation? Shipper impact National Grid Transmission Impact Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve Soserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Frequency of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Hedium (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) High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)		□Reads		ortal 🛛 🖾 Invo	icing
external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change? No Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact iGT impact Workaround currently in operation? Shipper impact National Grid Transmission Impact Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes Workaround? No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve What is the Frequency of the workaround? Soth Xoserve and External Customer What is the lifespan for the workaround? External Customer What is the lifespan for 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)		Other (please)	provide details belo	w)	-
as a result of delivery of this change? ⊠ No Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact iGT impact Shipper impact National Grid Transmission Impact Xoserve impact National Grid Transmission Impact Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes What is the Frequency of the workaround? Xoserve Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the lifespan for the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) modeling (moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)		□ Yes (please pr	rovide details below)	
change? No Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact iGT impact Xoserve impact National Grid Transmission Impact workaround in operation? Yes No No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve What is the Frequency of the workaround? Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Iffespan for the workaround? Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Infespan for the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) 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)					
Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Shipper impact Network impact iGT impact Xoserve impact National Grid Transmission Impact Workaround currently in operation? Yes Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Frequency of 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)					
who would be impacted if the change is not delivered. Xoserve impact National Grid Transmission Impact Is there a Workaround in operation? Yes operation? No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve Both Xoserve and 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? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)					
Workaround currently in operation? Is there a Workaround in operation? operation? If yes who is accountable for the workaround? If yes who is accountable for the workaround? What is the Frequency of the workaround? What is the lifespan for 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? What is the Complexity of the workaround? High (complicate 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)					
Is there a Workaround in operation? □ Yes If yes who is accountable for the workaround? □ Xoserve □ External Customer □ Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Frequency of the workaround? □ Some Xoserve and External Customer What is the lifespan for the workaround? □ Yes What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround? □ Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) 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)		· · ·			
operation? No If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Frequency of the workaround? What is the lifespan for the workaround? What is the lifespan for the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)					
If yes who is accountable for the workaround? Xoserve Both Xoserve and External Customer Both Xoserve and External Customer What is the Frequency of the workaround? What is the lifespan for the workaround? What is the lifespan for the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Low (easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error) What is the Complexity of the workaround? Hedium (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)					
workaround? 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? I 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) 					
Image: 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? Image: Workaround? Image: Workaround? Image: What is the Complexity of the workaround? Image: Workaround? I					
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? What is the Complexity of the workaround? High (complicate 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)					
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? What is the Complexity of the workaround? Image: Head of the workaround? <tr< th=""><th>What is the Frequency of the</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr<>	What is the Frequency of the				
workaround? What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround? What is the Complexity of the workaround? Description Description Description Description What is the Complexity of the workaround? Description Description Description Description Description Description What is the Complexity of the workaround? Description Description Description Wedium (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)					
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)	workaround?				
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)					
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) 	•				
workaround? Medium (moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome) High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)			petitive quick task	very little risk of human	error)
human error in determining outcome) High (complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)					
human error in determining outcome)		human error in determining outcome)			
Change Prioritisation Score 9%	Change Prioritisation Score		rmining outcome)		

Document Control

Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
1	Draft	27/04/18	Anesu Chivenga	
1.1	approved	27/12/19	Pooja Patel	Updates have been made to the DPIA information