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:	XRN5180		
Change Title:	Inner Tolerance Validation for replacement reads and read insertions		
Date Raised:	19/05/2020		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Xoserve	
	Name:	Chandni Khanna	
	Email:	Chandni.khanna@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2097	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	James Barlow	
	Email:	James.barlow@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2802	
	Business Owner:		
Change Status:	☐ Proposal	☐ With DSG	☐ Out for Review
	☐ Voting	☒ Approved	☐ Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	☒ Shipper	☐ Distribution Network Operator
	☐ NG Transmission	☐ IGT
	☐ All	☐ Other <Please provide details here>
Justification for Customer Class(es) selection	Please use this field to explain how the parties you've selected will be impacted	

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Problem Statement:	There have been 58k replacement reads rejected as they fall between two existing reads, have failed the inner tolerance check (ITC) for one consumption period and the override flag has been populated.

Change Description:	In the shipper read files, there is a provision for an override flag to be provided where the consumption fails the inner tolerance checks. When a read is replaced (and there is a previous and subsequent read present for the replaced read) or a read is inserted between 2 reads, the replaced/inserted read is validated against the previous and subsequent reads and energy tolerances are performed both ways for both periods. There can be instances where only one of the 2 periods fail the inner tolerance and hence would need the override flag, while the other does not. In such cases, the read will always be rejected due to the consumption failing inner tolerance checks for one of the 2 periods. The read validation logic needs to be amended such that if either of the 2 periods need an override flag and one has been provided, the read should be accepted. There would also be changes to UNCVR (UNC Validation Rules) document to update the respective rules on inner tolerances for such instances.	
Proposed Release:	Release: Minor Release	
Proposed Consultation Period:	☐ 10 Working Days	☐ 15 Working Days
	☐ 20 Working Days	☐ Other [Specify Here]

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	To reduce read rejections for replacement reads and reads inserted between 2 reads, thereby impacting read performance, AQ accuracy and UIG. It will also reduce effort on the shipper, and Xoserve, part to raise and process tickets to investigate the rejections
	What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?
Benefit Realisation:	
	When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?
Benefit Dependencies:	
	Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change, this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the projects has not got direct control of.

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 5: Metered volume and quantity		
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor/ Unclear/ None		
If None please give justification			
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix			
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor/ Unclear/ None		
If None please give justification			
Funding Classes:	Customer Classes/ Funding	Delivery of Change	On-going Budget Amendment
	☒ Shipper	100 %	XX %
	☐ National Grid Transmission	XX %	XX %
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	XX %	XX %
	☐ IGT	XX %	XX %
	☐ Other <please specify>	XX %	XX %
ROM or funding details:			
Funding Comments:			

A7: ChMC Recommendation – Initial Review

Change Status:	☒ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSC Consultation Issue:	☐ Yes	☒ No	

A8: ChMC Recommendation – Solution Review

Change Status:	☒ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
Industry Consultation:	☒ 14 Working Days	☐ 15 Working Days	
	☐ 20 Working Days	☐ Other [Specify Here]	
DSC Consultation Issue:	☒ Yes	☐ No	
Date Issued:	14/12/2020		

Comms Ref(s):	2741.5 - RT - JR	
Number of Responses:	2 approval responses	
Solution Voting:	☒ Shipper	Approve
	☐ National Grid Transmission	Please select.
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	Please select.
	☐ IGT	Please select.
Meeting Date:	13/01/2021	
Release Date:	Release: Adhoc – proposed March/April 2021	

A8: ChMC Recommendation – Detailed Design

Change Status:	☒ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
Industry Consultation:	☒ 10 Working Days	☐ 15 Working Days	
	☐ 20 Working Days	☐ Other [Specify Here]	
DSC Consultation Issue:	☒ Yes	☐ No	
Date Issued:	12/04/2021		
Comms Ref(s):	2808.4 - MT – PO		
Number of Responses:	1 approval		
Solution Voting:	☒ Shipper	Approve	
	☐ National Grid Transmission	Please select.	
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	Please select.	
	☐ IGT	Please select.	
Meeting Date:	05/05/2021		
Release Date:	Release: November 21		

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
DSG Summary:	This change was raised and previously presented at DSG in November 2019. After additional analysis was found it out of scope of a defect as business rules to support the process were not documented so this change has been raised to address this. JB explained that this issue occurs where either replacing or inserting a read where a subsequent Valid Actual read exists and an overrise flag is required. Due to the consumption between the previous read and the replaced/inserted read as well as between the replaced/inserted read and the subsequent read is validated if an override flag is required for only one of the periods that read is always rejected. JB stated that with analysis, circa 58k reads replacement reads have been rejected in this scenario. – Inserted reads were not included and, therefore, the actual volume of impacted is likely to be higher **Recommended Solution:** The recommended solution is to accept the override flag as correct where at least one of the periods requires it. ○ If backward period requires O/R but forward period does not or ○ If backward period does not require O/R but forward period does JB stated that this option was previously recommended by DSG. Option 2 – additional override flag • Add a second override flag to account for the forward period - This would be a change and as such require additional funding - File format changes would be required to all read files and, potentially, new rejection codes and, therefore, require a major release - It is believed that cost/effort would far outweigh the benefits given the volume Option 3 – Change current validation logic • Do not perform Inner Tolerance Check on Forward Period. Outer tolerance check would persist - This would be a change and as such require additional funding - The option would remove a level of validation - Provides a similar result to Option 1 however at an additional cost Option 4 – Do nothing • These reads will continue to fail and leave the shipper with no route to amend in order to pass

	JB asked DSG if they support the recommended solution. EL asked if this is being re-raised as a change. JB explained that this was initially a defect and has now been raised as a change. PO added that this was raised as a change to progress with customers approval due to the defect team clarifying this cannot be resolved as a defect and would be needed to be raised as a change. PO explained that the recommended option has been selected as this is the lowest impact to systems and processes of customers. EL supported the recommended option. HB support recommend option		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	14/12/2020		
DSG Summary:	JB presented this agenda item. JB stated there is one solution options available for this Change. **Solution Option: Accept replaced or inserted read where the inner tolerance check fails in at least one direction and override flag is provided.** There is no change to market breaker tolerance validations, RGMA flow read validations, Must Read or RD1 file validations. JB stated this has been presented previously to DSG. Furthermore, the impacted system would be SAP ISU involving changes to multiple read processes. This solution has an overall impact of medium and is recommended for a Major Release type. This solution has a high level cost estimate of 70K-150K GBP. System impact assessment shows there are impacts to SAP ISU and AMT. The AMT impacts are low and are due to the required regression testing, no changes are expected. JB stated there is a CSS code conflict with this solution. This is being investigated to understand the impacts to the CSS code and how this will be mitigated.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	26/04/2021		
DSG Summary:	MN presented this agenda item. MN provided and overview for this Change. When reads are inserted or replaced between two actual reads energy tolerances are applied to both periods (backwards as well as forwards). When one of these periods fail the inner tolerance check an override flag is required however if the other period does not require the override flag the read cannot be accepted even when an override flag is provided. The diagram view for this process can be viewed in the slide deck (slide 39). This change will update the read validation logic to accept the read (provided all other validations have passed); • When only the backwards period requires an override flag and the override flag has been provided • When only the forwards periods required an override flag and the override flag has been provided **XRN5180 – For Awareness** There are no changes to the following read validation logic when; • Both periods require an override flag and the override flag has been provided. The read will continue to be accepted (provided all other validations have passed) • None of the periods require an override flag and the override flag has been provided. The read will continue to be rejected with MRE01030 (Override tolerance passed and override flag provided) • At least one of the periods require an override flag and the override flag has not been provided. The read will continue to be rejected with MRE01029 (Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided) **Resubmitting Reads** Following implementation, you may resubmit any reads previously rejected due to the issue but you will need to take into consideration any other validations i.e. submission read window for an inserted read.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

Solution Option Summary:	**Overview** XRN5180 “Inner Tolerance Validation for replacement reads and read insertions” seeks to provide a solution to the existing read validation rules that will allow reads, either replaced or inserted, in between other valid reads, to be accepted where the inner tolerance check (ITC) fails in at least one direction. The Change Proposal can be found here **Change/Solution Overview** When a read is replaced, and there is a previous and subsequent read present for the replaced read, or a read is inserted between two reads, the replaced/inserted read is validated against the previous and subsequent reads and energy tolerances are performed for the respective periods i.e. backwards as well as forwards. Currently, if one of the two periods fails the ITC and, therefore, requires the override flag, and this has been provided, the read will be rejected as the other validation period does not require the override flag (MRE01030 - Override tolerance passed and override flag provided). This is because the system will use the provided (in this case ‘Y’) override flag in both backwards & forwards validation checks causing an error. Should the System User then resubmit the meter read with the override flag not populated, they would receive the opposite rejection code (MRE01029 - Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided). Again, because the system will use the provided (in this case blank) override flag in both backwards & forwards validation checks causing another error. This results in it being impossible for the provided read to be accepted through the normal file submission processes, where both validation checks require different override flag values in order to be acceptable. The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) document for this change is now available and can be found here for your review. The provided HLSO shows that Xoserve have impact assessed one solution option only to deliver the requirements of XRN5180, as agreed by DSG members. (To view the minutes of this session please click here.) **Solution Option 1:** This solution is looking to amend multiple read validation processes to utilise the provided Override flag, where the read received is in

	between two existing reads, if either, or both, consumption/validation periods require it i.e. a. If the past period requires the Override flag but forward period does not b. If the forward period requires the Override flag but the past period does not c. If both periods require the Override flag Where neither period requires the Override flag and it is supplied then the read will be rejected in line with existing validation rules. The changes will be made to the following read processes: • Class 1 read validation (DLC file) • Class 2 read validation (UDR file) • Class 3 read validation (UBR file) • Class 4 read validation (UMR file) • Site visit read validation (SFN file) • Online read entry screen (UK Link SAP ISU Screen internal to Xoserve) • Proxy validations for Site Visit reads submitted via DN Portal for Class 1(DMSP) & Class 2 (Shipper) Supply Meter Points • AQI file validation for the U01 record **Discounted Solution Options:** Solution options have been presented to the DSG members on multiple occasions and the solution defined above was agreed as the most appropriate ahead of the HLSO being generated. For customers awareness, the solution options discounted by DSG members were: a) A new, additional, override flag, to be referenced for the forward period This solution would have resulted in changes to the file formats which would have meant a size of change disproportionate to the number of incidents b) Remove ITC for forward period This would have removed a level of validation deemed as required by industry stakeholders and removed consistency within the read validation processes **Option Summary** Option 1 utilises the existing file formats and industry process to meet the requirement of this change to correctly validate the submitted read. In addition, the option to “Do Nothing” is available however, as per the change overview, should this option be supported then the reads in the scenario outlined within this change pack will continue to be rejected.
Implementation Date Solution Options:	The solution option will require delivery within a Major Release, aiming for November 2021, subject to ChMC approval.

Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)	Xoserve's preferred solution is option 1 as this will ensure Valid Meter Reads in the defined scenario are accepted and used to feed downstream processes with minimal impact to Shippers.
DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	The solution options were discussed at the July DSG meeting (minutes can be viewed here) at which option 1 was presented as preferred. The DSG view supported this based on the perceived low impact to customer systems and processes.
Consultation closeout:	05/01/2021

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

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Approve	
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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE Energy Supply Ltd
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We agree that the proposed solution to utilise the existing file formats and industry processes to amend read validation processes to use the Override flag will help prevent rejections.	

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:	XRN5180 Inner Tolerance Validation for replacement reads and read insertions
Solution Details:	Option 1 - Accept replaced or inserted read where the inner tolerance check fails in at least one direction and override flag is provided SAP ISU: Code changes for override flag validation in below programs: Code Change to Class 1 read interface validation (DLC file) Code Change to Class 2 read interface validation (UDR file) Code Change to Class 3 read interface validation (UBR file) Code Change to Class 4 read interface validation (UMR file) Code Change to site visit read interface validation (SFN file) Code changes to Online read entry screen (SAP Internal Screen) Code changes to proxy validations for Site visit reads via DN Portal for Class 1(DMSP) & 2 (Shipper) Code changes to AQI file validation for U01 record.
Implementation Date:	TBC
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	13/01/2021

Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2808.4 - MT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN5180 Inner Tolerance Validation for replacement reads and read insertions - Detailed Design Change Pack
Comm Date:	12/04/2021

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For representation
Close Out Date:	26/04/2021

G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN5180
Change Class:	Functional System
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Shipper Class A; Shipper Class B; Shipper Class C
Change Owner:	James Barlow james.barlow@xoserve.com
Background and Context:	When a read is replaced, and there is a previous and subsequent actual read, or an estimated read treated as such, present for the replaced read, or a read is inserted between two actual reads, the replaced/inserted read is validated against the previous and subsequent reads and energy tolerances are performed for the respective periods i.e. backwards as well as forwards. Currently, if only one of the two periods fails the inner tolerance check (ITC) and, therefore, requires the override flag, and this has been provided, the read will be rejected (MRE01030 - Override tolerance passed and override flag provided) as the other validation period does not require the override flag. This is because the system will use the provided (in this case 'Y') override flag in both backwards and forwards validation checks resulting in the rejection. 

	Should the Shipper submit the meter read with the override flag not populated, then the read would again be rejected (MRE01029 - Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided). As per the first scenario, this is due to the system utilising the provided (in this case blank) override flag in both backwards and forwards validation checks.  The current logic results in it being impossible for the provided read to be accepted through the normal file submission processes, where both validation checks require a different override flag value in order to be deemed valid.

G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Meter Read Processing (UK Link)
Non-Functional:	None
Application:	SAP ISU
User(s):	Shippers
Documentation:	None
Other:	None

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
None	None	None	None	None

G5: Change Design Description

Within the initial Change Pack consultation, a single solution option was proposed as a result of discussions with Design Sub-Group (DSG) members, and all representations were in support of this solution which is defined below. This was ratified by Change Managers at the Change Management Committee (ChMC) meeting in January 2021.

The change will amend read validation logic within UK Link to allow the acceptance of a valid read in the case where the read is replacing an existing read, or the read is inserted, between two existing actual reads (or an estimated read treated as such), and only one of the two periods fails the inner tolerance check (ITC), therefore requiring the override flag, and the override flag has been provided. The three scenarios in context are:

- If the backward period requires the Override flag but the forward period does not
- If the forward period requires the Override flag but the backward period does not

- If both periods require the Override flag

For the avoidance of doubt, in scenario c the Override flag is already handled correctly and, therefore, is not impacted by this change. Equally, where neither period requires the Override flag and it is supplied then the read will be rejected in line with existing validation rules.

For clarity, the below table represents the possible outcomes of the Override flag validation, following the ITC, where there is a previous and subsequent actual read present. The rows in green highlight the new outcomes of the scenarios defined above that will occur as a result of this change:

Backwards Read volume fails ITC	Forwards Read volume fails ITC	Override Flag Provided	Override Flag Validation	Rejection Code
Yes	Yes	Yes	Pass	N/A
Yes	**No**	**Yes**	**Pass**	**N/A**
No	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Pass**	**N/A**
No	No	Yes	Fail	MRE01030
Yes	Yes	No	Fail	MRE01029
Yes	No	No	Fail	MRE01029
No	Yes	No	Fail	MRE01029

Rejection Code	Rejection Reason
MRE01030	Override tolerance passed and override flag provided
MRE01029	Reading breached the upper Inner tolerance value and no override flag provided

The change will apply to all reads which are validated using the ITC against previous and subsequent reads. This includes:

- Class 1 read validation (DLC file)
- Class 2 read validation (UDR file)
- Class 3 read validation (UBR file)
- Class 4 read validation (UMR file)
- Site Visit reads submitted via DN Portal for Class 1(DMSP) & Class 2 (Shipper) Supply Meter Points
- Must Reads received via CMS

It should be noted that in the solution change pack it stated that the following items were also considered to be impacted. However, following further review, and in line with the detail provided, no changes are required:

- Screen internal to Xoserve - No change is required as it has been found that these screens already perform inline with the intended outcome of this change
- Site visit read validation (SFN file) – During analysis it has been found that the current validation for SFN reads does not consider a forward read. This is to be investigated independently to this change and any update to the functionality will include alignment to this design

- AQI file validation for the U01 record – An AQ correction, through the AQI file, will be rejected where a subsequent read is present. Therefore, the functionality in scope of this change is not applicable to the AQ correction process

Following implementation of the change system users may resubmit any reads previously rejected due to the issue defined within the background of this change pack but should take into consideration any other validations i.e. submission read window for an inserted read. No reads will be automatically reprocessed, as part of the change, by the CDSP.

G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	None

G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	26th April 2021
Any further information:	To discuss any comments provided from the Detailed Design Change Pack representations

G8: Implementation

Target Release:	November 2021
Status:	Approved

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

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power	
	Name:	Helen Bevan	
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com	
	Telephone:	01416145517	
Representation Status:	Approve		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Confirm Target Release Date?	Approve	«h1_userDataAlternative»	

H1: Xoserve' s Response

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

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

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1.0	With DSG	04/08/2020	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 27th July 2020
2.0	With DSG	22/12/2020	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 14th December 2020
3.0	For Approval	12/01/2021	Rachel Taggart	Solution review Change Pack and responses added
4.0	Approved	20/01/2021	Rachel Taggart	Updated with outcome from ChMC on 13th January 2021
5.0	Approval	05/05/2021	Megan Troth	Updated with Section G Detail Design Change Pack (Issued in April 2021)
6.0	With DSG	05/05/2021	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 26th April 2021
7.0	Approved	14/05/2021	Rachel Taggart	Updated with the design outcome from ChMC on 12/05/2021

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 3rd Party Service Request ☒ Other *(please provide details below)*
Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered	☒Shipper Impact ☐iGT Impact ☐Network Impact ☒Xoserve Impact ☐National Grid Transmission Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)	
Associated MOD Number(s)	
Perceived delivery effort	☐ 0 – 30 ☐ 30 – 60 ☒ 60 – 100 ☐ 100+ days
Does the project involve the processing of personal data? *'Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' – includes MPRNS.*	☐ Yes *(If yes please answer the next question)* ☒ No
A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the delivery of the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:	☐ New technology ☐ Vulnerable customer data ☐ Theft of Gas ☐ Mass data ☐ Xoserve employee data ☐ Fundamental changes to Xoserve business ☐ Other *(please provide details below)* *(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (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 *How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?*	☒ Multiple Market Participants ☐ Multiple Market Group ☐ All industry UK Gas Market participants ☐ Xoserve Only ☐ One Market Group ☐ One Market Participant
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	Service Area 5: Metered Volume and Metered Quantity
Number of Service Areas Impacted	☐ All ☐ Five to Twenty ☐ Two to Five ☒ One
Change Improvement Scale? *How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?*	☐ High ☒ Medium ☒ Low
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?	
☐ Safety of Supply at risk ☐Customer(s) incurring financial loss ☐ Customer Switching at risk	
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?	
☐ Customer System Changes Required ☐ Customer Testing Likely Required ☐ Customer Training Required	
Known Impact to Systems / Processes	
Primary Application impacted	☐BW ☒ ISU ☐ CMS

	☐ 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)* ☒ 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 currently in operation?	
Is there a Workaround in operation?	☒ Yes ☐ No
If yes who is accountable for the workaround?	☒ Xoserve ☐ External Customer ☐ Both Xoserve and External Customer
What is the Frequency of the workaround?	Ad hoc due to volumes
What is the lifespan for the workaround?	Enduring however does not meet volume
What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround?	
What is the Complexity of the workaround?	☐ Low *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)* ☒ Medium *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)* ☐ High *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)*
Change Prioritisation Score	**13%**