




DSC Change Proposal

Change Reference Number: XRN4665

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

Change Title	Creation of new End User Categories
Date Raised	01/05/2018
Sponsor Organisation	E.ON (on behalf of DESC)
Sponsor Name	Kirsty Dudley
Sponsor Contact Details	07816 172 645
Xoserve Contact Name	Fiona Cottam
Xoserve Contact Details	
Change Status	Proposal / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected/ Implemented
Section 1: Impacted Parties	
Customer Class(es)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission (solution option 1 only) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT
Section 2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change	
<p>The Demand Estimation Sub-Committee (DESC) have the ability to review and create new End User Categories (EUCs) through the annual review they complete, without the need for a modification. Although the new EUCs are referenced within 0644 (which is still in development) the new EUCs have been approved by DESC (Nov 2018 meeting) but require this XRN to implement them.</p> <p>This links to the ROM scoped for 0644 - XRN4616 (document from 0644 meeting 01/04/2018)</p> <div><p>MOD 644 ROM Response 2018-04-30</p></div> <p>The creation of new EUC profiles bands within 01 and 02 bands rather than splitting 01 / 02 EUC bands.</p> <p>Proposed new EUC Profiles for SMPs with a Rolling AQ in the AQ range for EUC Band EUC01:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">xx:Eyy01ND assigned to Non-Prepayment Domestic Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy01PD assigned to Prepayment Domestic Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy01NI assigned to Non-Prepayment I&C" Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy01PI assigned to Prepayment I&C" Supply Meter Points <p>Proposed new EUC Profiles for SMPs with a Rolling AQ in the AQ range for EUC Band EUC02:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">xx:Eyy02ND assigned to Non-Prepayment Domestic Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy02PD assigned to Prepayment Domestic Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy02NI assigned to Non-Prepayment I&C" Supply Meter Pointsxx:Eyy02PI assigned to Prepayment I&C" Supply Meter Points <p>The current UIG issues would benefit from the introduction of the new EUCs ASAP, however, the delivery solution and complexity may differ depending on the implementation date chosen – the two options we propose are:</p> <p>Option 1 – Delivery ASAP – reduced implementation to meet 2018 gas year or a date which can be met</p>	



Option 2 – Delivery at the start of the gas year (2019)

Our preferred option is Option 1 with the new EUCs implemented at the end of Sept 2018 to coincide with the gas year. With the current issues with UIG it would be beneficial for this to be implemented with an expediated timescale which accepts a shortened implementation window (less than 6 months).

Proposed Release	Option 1 – ASAP – adhoc date Option 2 – Start of the gas year 2019
-------------------------	---

Proposed IA Period	10WD
---------------------------	-------------

Section 3: Benefits and Justification

DESC has always had the ability to create new EUCs it has not be an option progressed until now. The recent DESC discussions for modification 0644 has identified that the EUCs are hard coded so the flexibility allowed in code to create new EUCs is not within the system coding, this has stopping DESC from just implementing the new EUCs which code permits.

The benefit of making this change would be the improvements to NDM Nominations and NDM Allocations because the profiled consumption would be closer to actual consumer consumption so UIG would be less volatile resulting in reduced UIG and less Reconciliation at a later date.

These changes would be a cost effective approach, as it would impact both Nominations ahead of and on the day, making Energy purchasing less volatile for all Shippers.

Although the creation of the new EUCs would see benefits mainly for Shippers, the creation of new EUCs could also have an impact on Transporters and IGTs.

Section 4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

At DSG on Monday 18th June, Users requested additional information to be included in the options with regards to scope of the change. This is contained within this slide deck.

DSG further requested information regarding the impacts of the changes, for example the file formats impacted and the implications of a mid-year implementation. This information will be issued no later than Friday 29th June.

DSG have not yet set preferred solution option or recommended release.

DSG Recommendation	Approve / Reject / Defer
---------------------------	--------------------------

DSG Recommended Release	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY
--------------------------------	---

Section 5: DSC Consultation

Issued	Yes
---------------	------------

Date(s) Issued	11 th May 2018
-----------------------	---------------------------

Comms Ref(s)	1946.3 (responses issued in Comm ref 1961)
---------------------	--

Number of Responses	6
----------------------------	---

Section 6: Funding

Funding Classes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper 100%
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission XX%
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator XX%
	<input type="checkbox"/> iGT XX%

Service Line(s)	Service area 2: Demand Estimation: DS CS SA15 – 02
------------------------	--

ROM or funding details	
-------------------------------	--

Funding Comments	
-------------------------	--

Section 7: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
	<input type="checkbox"/> iGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain

Meeting Date	XX/XX/XXXX
---------------------	------------

Release Date	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA
---------------------	---

Overall Outcome	Approved for Release X / Rejected
------------------------	-----------------------------------

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

Consultation Responses

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Craig Nielson
User Contact	Craig.nielson@cadentgas.com 07827 929678
Representation Status	Approve
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub categorisation of EUC codes should have limited direct consequence to our price setting processes because the main interface with Xoserve for this is via the BOPRI, Sch 606 (CSEP) and GENINF (unique sites report) reports. However, given recent experiences with report stability following Nexus implementation, we required assurance that the downstream consequences of amending EUC codes on these reports have been duly considered so that we can be confident of the integrity of Formula Year AQ and SOQ data, when 'snapshot' positions are taken in early December. The risk is that data integrity issues could infect unit price calculations, resulting in incorrect volume assumptions being taken, with the potential to create revenue over / under collection issues. If implementation is sought in time for commencement of a gas year, then this should allow a sufficient window for Xoserve to provide such assurance ahead of December data extracts. • EUC codes are used in the derivation of SOQ from AQs for NDM sites. The proposals read that any changes would be implemented for the next available gas year, which is logical. This should mean that there is no within-formula-year change to chargeable SOQs, and instead, for charging / billing purposes, the change would be effective for formula year AQs and SOQs from the following 1st April. We request that Xoserve confirm that there would be no impact to current formula year billing stability as a result of this change for the avoidance of doubt. • We would like to note the following areas of indirect impact of changes to EUC codes, with associated process development timescales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gas Transportation Charge Calculator: uses EUC code information to derive SOQs from AQs, and would need 2 months for reengineering and testing ○ Economic Test Model: uses EUC code information in a similar way to the charge calculator, but is possibly more difficult to implement given the nature of the existing models, so should allow 3 months development time. This is a higher risk area, as could impact the level of customer funded connection costs. ○ GDN Domestic Bill calculation: traditionally we have used EUC code EXX01B as a proxy for the "domestic" class. The proposal will distinguish between domestic and non-domestic within EXX01B and EXX02B. Improved definition of domestic usage is clearly a positive factor, but GDNs will need to consider for the purposes of domestic bill calculations as included in our quarterly revenue reports, and referenced in our regulatory reporting.

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 implementation through a minor release but as noted in the main consultation above, would require 3 months to implement.

As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 15. The funding for this area is 50% Shipper funding, 50% DNs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?

Our view is that whilst DNs have an interest in this, Shippers are the beneficiaries so suggest funding should reflect this; 100% Shipper funded?

Target Release Date	Confirmation of release date or comments for an alternate release date
----------------------------	--

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Shanna Key
User Contact	SKey@northerngas.co.uk 07779 416 216
Representation Status	Comments
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide representation on the above noted Change Proposal. Please find below Northern Gas Network's (NGN) comments in respect of this change.</p> <p>Impact and costs:</p> <p>The amendment of EUC bands 01 and 02 to introduce new profiles within each would impact multiple files and reports which NGN receive and send, and therefore could result in changes being required to multiple systems and processes. These changes could require multiple months to develop, test and implement.</p> <p>NGN is likely to incur costs and extra workload to deliver these changes for a proposal which is of no benefit to Transporters. So as Shippers would be the beneficiary of this change, we believe this should be 100% Shipper funded.</p> <p>Implementation:</p> <p>Due to the volume of changes required to systems and processes and the development time which would be required, NGN would prefer delivery option 2 with implementation at the start of the 2019 gas year.</p>

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Eleanor Laurence
User Contact	Eleanor.Laurence@edfenergy.com / 07875 117771
Representation Status	Accept
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	This change should require minimal system amendments and given views we would support doing this outside usual major release timelines.
<p>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)</p> <p>We would require a 3 months' notice period for this change. It should therefore be practical for us to have these changes in place by end of September 2018. Usually we would not want to make changes outside standard release schedules. With regard to this change this does need to be done</p>	

on an alternate timeline and from our perspective do feel a change for next gas year is possible.	
As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 15. The funding for this area is 50% Shipper funding, 50% DNs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?	
We have no strong views on funding for this change.	
Target Release Date	Provided a decision is made with no issues to be resolved then we would support option 1 but would want date to be defined in line with our response and not as an as soon as possible date.

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Andrew Green / Louise Hellyer
User Contact	Andrew Green Andrew.green@totalgp.com 01737 275 554
Representation Status	Approve
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	We are in support of generating new EUC codes within AQ bands 1 & 2. Analysis to date shows that there is a significant difference between the consumption profiles of commercial sites and domestic sites not currently reflected in the profiles allocated. The evidence of the difference on prepayment meter has been demonstrated within Modifications. We believe that having more accurate profiles for sites will give a better view of UIG and with the proposed approach can see no issue as no degradation on profiles should occur. We believe that this would make an incremental improvement and will not resolve the wider issue in its entirety. It will be important to ensure that sample numbers are kept high to get the best profiles possible but with industry support and other Modifications in progress this should be achievable.
Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)	
Yes we would be happy that the release go into a minor release, from our side there are no issues with that. We would only expect that the CDSP is happy that the release is adequate.	
As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 15. The funding for this area is 50% Shipper funding, 50% DNs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?	
We are disappointed that the functionality is not already available in the systems but understand the situation we are in requires for the change to be paid for by all affected. We are therefore happy with the funding proposal.	
Target Release Date	Confirmation of release date or comments for an alternate release date

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Kirsty Dudley
User Contact	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
Representation Status	Approve
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	We support the implementation of this change as developed within the ROM – this has been discussed at the 0644 workgroup and is recognised as a root cause fix towards some of the UIG issues. Currently the modification is awaiting the final report and Authority decision but the creation of the new EUCs have been approved by DESC (as per their allowable remit) and these should be implemented without the need for the

	modification decision.
<p>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)</p> <p>For changes like this we would normally seek for a 6 month implementation window, however, due to the nature of the UIG issue and the fact the optimum implementation is the beginning of the gas year we would prefer for the implementation to be introduced as of the 2018 gas year rather than 2019.</p> <p>We consider this an urgent issue and are willing to expedite our internal delivery timescales to implement this ASAP to see the benefits of this solution sooner rather than later.</p> <p>As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 15. The funding for this area is 50% Shipper funding, 50% DNs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?</p> <p>We support the charging line splits.</p>	
Target Release Date	Before 2018 gas year commencement

Change Representation (to be completed by User and returned for response)	
User Name	Maitrayee Bhowmick-Jewkes
User Contact	Maitrayee.Bhowmick-Jewkes@npower.com
Representation Status	None
Representation Publication	Publish
Representation	Npower recognises the potential benefits in finessing EUC bands via mod644 and as such supports this change in a general sense. We feel the impact of having a 'split year' hasn't yet been fully explored and as such are unable to comment specifically about when the change should be delivered. Timescales to deliver this in line with the existing industry release of EUCs seem very tight, especially when balanced against the potential impact on UiG, where a rushed delivery might risk having the opposite impact than is intended.
<p>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)</p> <p>We support the delivery of this change within a minor release, if the benefits of doing so are proven and agreed via mod644. Keeping the proposed changes in line with BAU timescales for the delivery of new EUCs would avoid having a 'split' year. Also, it would be desirable for the potential (positive) impact on UiG to be felt in the market quickly. However, the impact of changes to EUCs on UiG needs to further explored via 644 workgroup and DESC, with analysis based on an extensive sample size.</p>	
<p>As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 15. The funding for this area is 50% Shipper funding, 50% DNs. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?</p> <p>Yes</p>	
Target Release Date	Confirmation of release date or comments for an alternate release date

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date	16 th July 2018 / 20 th August 2018 / 3 rd December 2018 / 17 th December 2018
----------	--

DSG Summary

16th July 2018

ES provided an updated on XRN4665 which was approved at CHMC last week. It was agreed that this change will be delivered in 2019, for the start of the gas year (October)

20th August 2018 – [click here](#) to find the presentation pack

SH presented slides 81 to 83. 4665 was discussed at ChMC on 11th July. They approved the following:

- Solution: Option 2 - New EUC with same UIG Share Factors
- Delivery: Option B - New Gas Year October 2019

SH explained that delivery will be split into 2 stages. SAP-ISU code deployment has been proposed for the June 2019 release. Delivery of new EUCs is planned for implementation in October 2019 to be used in anger.

SH presented a timeline on slide 83. He explained that the green squares are ISU Code sections, blue squares represent demand estimation work and Orange are BAU activities. In addition, the code deployment will need to be completed before the WAALP values are loaded into UK Link and only major release close enough to meet the deadline is June-19. An industry consultation period was also included in the timeline to agree the WAALP and profile data to be used in the new EUC's.

3rd December 2018

Simon Harris (SH) presented slides 62 to 67 to DSG. SH provided a background of the change: XRN4665 is looking to add new EUC profiles for bands 01B & 02B. SH went on to explain that New EUC profiles will be split based on Market Sector Code & Pre-Payment Meter Type:

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

SH presented a set of considerations for DSG on slides 63 to 65. SH explained that if there is no asset on site, then the EUC meter type would be Non-prepayment. The Meter Mechanism code would be used in the first instance to check if a meter is classed a Pre-Payment and then consider the Payment Type using the following logic....

if No Asset Present then

EUC Meter Type = Non-Prepayment (assumption on default)

elseif [Meter Mechanism] = "PP" or "CM" or "ET" or "MT" or "TH" then

EUC Meter Type = Prepayment

elseif [Meter Mechanism] = "S1" or "S2" or "NS" and [Payment Method] = "PP" then

EUC Meter Type = Prepayment

else EUC Meter Type = Non-Prepayment

SH mentioned an important consideration: sites with a Smart Meter Mechanism Code (NS, SM1, and SM2) can also be prepayment; therefore, the payment method would need to be checked for sites with a Smart Meter. SH said that roughly 50,000 sites fit this category. The payment method is populated for 1.1 million assets.

EL asked if any analysis on Meter Mechanisms returned a result which is not present on slide 64, but the site is not a Smart Meter, would the EUC meter type be prepayment. SH said yes there could be a mismatch between them, and that there is no relationship/validation carried out between Meter Mechanism code and Payment Method: a site could have a Credit Meter Mechanism Code and pre-payment payment method; hence, why we're only checking Payment Method in the case of the Meter Mechanism Code of NS, S1 and S2 with the Meter Mechanism taking priority.

SH presented the additional considerations on slides 65 and 66. SH stated that Xoserve are proposing to only apply a new EUC if the MSC/EUC Meter Type is amended in line with existing processes such as Rolling AQ process & Gas Year EUC assigning; this method was supported by DESC. DSG members

agreed with this approach.

SH said that ChMC will be asked to ratify both of the above proposals. EL asked if Option 2 (If an MSC is updated, follow this up with a read submission to trigger Rolling AQ), would have an impact on the change of supplier process. SH said not directly as the AQ calculation would be triggered as a result of the transfer read (actual or estimate).

17th December 2018

SH presented slides 75-78 stating that it was agreed at ChMC new EUC's will only change as per current system rules e.g. AQ Calc, Confirmation Start/Change, Gas Year Reassigning. However, following on from detail design the potential need for a new Rec Variance code has been identified to show where an EUC has been amended. SH went through the Back Billing on Greenfield Scenario. SH addressed all questions asked and confirmed this as an extreme case scenario and went through the scenario again and pointed out the triggers, risks and how it works.

Xoserve are proposing not to introduce a new Rec Variance Code as part of this change, due to...

- A new variance code would incur Shipper system changes
- Add additional complexity regarding the production of supporting information files
- BAU precedent exists for EUC changes as part of Gas Year
- Additional regression testing would be needed

SH then went through the current Reconciliation Variance Codes and what needs to be considerations are needed to implement this change. LW clarified that all members understood. JB said he was not really concerned considering what it impacts.

Urgent Action: DSG to consider the Greenfield Back Billing Scenario and advise if a new Rec Variance Code is needed or would the existing Variance Code (UGR – Monthly Variance) be enough?

If yes, are there any other instances where EUC Rec Variance Code would take priority over any current codes?

A separate comms went out to customers in regards to this action as we need the feedback by COP 20th December.

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	Approve / Reject / Defer
DSG Recommended Release	Release: November 2019

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Summary from meeting date 07/01/19

SH stated that this change was in the Change Pak which is due to closeout on 9th January and the below discussions points will go to the ChMC on the 9th January. SH went through slides 33-40 and explained that New EUC profiles will be split based on Market Sector Code & Pre-Payment Meter Type. SH stated that DSG need to ratify the 4 consideration found in Detailed Design to allow the project team to finalise the functional specifications and move forward into build. The 4 discussion points are as follows, 1.EUC Naming Conventions, 2.CSEP Creations/Amendments, 3.Twin Stream and 4.Telemetered.

1. EUC Naming Conventions: SH presented the naming conventions that are being proposed for the new bands, a question was raised asking if these were the same that specified in the Change Proposal, SH stated that no as due to compatibility of naming conventions and the requirement to aggregate up to bands 01 & 02 the B will be retained and included in the naming. SH asked DSG if they had any concerns over the

naming conventions, none were raised.

2. CSEP Creation/Amendments: SH went through the proposed rules for CSEP and stated that for creation and amendments the input files will still only specify EUC bands EUC01B and EUC02B so each of these values would need a default profile (one of the new EUC's band) to pull the required Load factors to calculate the MAX SOQ for the CSEP. Katy Binch (KB) inquired about the possibility of a small AQ industrial being set as domestic and take lower load factors. SH advised that this is a possibility and that but doesn't think this would have an impact but will take this away for advice from the SME's. KB stated that this will also be raised this in their Rep response to the change pack.

3. Twin Streams: SH explained that where multiple meter devices are present a rule is needed to determine the sites EUC Meter Type (Prepayment or Non-Prepayment) and that we are proposing a rule which states, if all meter devices have been identified as Prepayment then the EUC Meter Type will be set as Prepayment, if any of the Meter Devices are defined as Non-Prepayment then the Prepayment Status will be set as Non-Prepayment. SH asked DSG if they had any concerns over this proposed rule, none were raised.

4. Telemetered: For Telemetered Supply Points a Dummy device is installed on UKL with no Meter Mechanism or Payment Method to enable the EUC Meter Type to be determined. As a result we need a default rule so are proposing that for Telemetered sites the EUC Meter Type will be set as Non-Prepayment. SH asked DSG if they had any concerns over this proposed rule, none were raised.

SH asked DSG to ratify the logic and there were no objections raised apart from the clarification needed for CSEP logic. Swetta Coopamah (SC) said she has a number of questions surrounding the EUC change but will send SH an email with her questions. But SC did ask if the changes proposed have external impacts, SH specified that the code changes are internal, but we wouldn't know if their own system would need any changes and asked them to consider naming conventions for EUC's in their systems as specified within the Change Pack.

LW wanted to bring to DSG's attention costs of potential future changes in relation to EUC, if the UIG Taskforce makes any recommendations on EUC banding e.g. wanting to split future EUC's, this will incur additional charges due to the main costs being around functional & regression testing.

Action: Simon to find out more information regarding the CSEP logic and if there are any risks associated with the proposals.

Final Capture Document / Requirements - DATE	INSERT
Final Capture Document Requirements - DATE	INSERT
Final DSG Recommended Release - DATE	Release: September 19 DD/MM/YYYY

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**DSG Summary from meeting date 07/05/19**

SH stated it was agreed at ChMC that we will only re-assign the EUC value in line with current business logic. In detailed design, further clarification is thought to be beneficial for industry participants on “Confirmations as part of SPA” and what that includes (slide 64-66) and the context round them. In summary, only Greenfield confirmation will assign EUC based on the Market Sector Code received in the confirmation, Brownfield, Re-Confirmation and Shipper Transfers will not and will wait until another BAU process re-assigns the EUC (e.g. Rolling AQ Calc).

Final Capture Document / Requirements - DATE

INSERT

Final Capture Document Requirements - DATE

INSERT

Final DSG Recommended Release - DATE

Release: September 19 DD/MM/YYYY

Section D1: Solution Options

High Level summary options

Please see attached the two solution options for the implementation of XRN4665. Please respond on the following page (Section E) with your organisations preferred solution option.

At DSG on Monday 18th June, Users requested additional information to be included in the options with regards to scope of the change. This is contained within this slide deck.

DSG further requested information regarding the impacts of the changes, for example the file formats impacted and the implications of a mid-year implementation.

This information has now been included. **Please be advised version 0.3 contained incorrect cost information.** The slides are now reflective of the correct costs, which were presented to DSG on Monday 18th June.



XRN 4665 Industry
Pack v0.4 27062018.

Implementation date for this solution option	Proposed for February 2019 release; subject to discussions and prioritisation at ChMC in July
Xoserve preferred option; including rationale	N/A
DSG preferred solution option; including rationale	N/A
Consultation close out date	05/07/2018

Section E: DSC Change Proposal: Industry Response Solution Options

User Name	Richard Pomroy
User Contact Details	richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
WWU is okay for any implementation date from 1st October 2018. We are not providing comments on either the delivery option or solution option as it is a Shipper related matter.	
Implementation date for this option	Option A / Option B (please select) – No Comments
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish / Private (please select)

User Name	Lorna Lewin
User Contact Details	llew@orsted.co.uk 0207 451 1974
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
We support solution option 2 - New EUC with same UIG Share Factors. This option has less central system impacts and allows for further analysis to be done to determine whether UIG share factors should be different. This option also has minor impacts on our own internal systems with minimal costs and resource impacts.	
Implementation date for this option	Option A
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Shanna Key
User Contact Details	SKey@northerngas.co.uk 07779 416 216
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
As stated in our previous consultation response, the volume of changes required to systems and processes and the development time which would be required means that NGN would prefer delivery option 2 with implementation at the start of the 2019 gas year.	
Implementation date for this option	Option B
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Eleanor Laurence
User Contact Details	Eleanor.Laurence@edfenergy.com / 07875 117771
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
Our preferred solution option is option 2 as we are unclear as to additional benefits that might be seen under option 1. If an industry wide case can be made for option 1 additional benefits then we would be prepared to review our choice.	

Implementation date for this option	<p>Given both options have two different approaches we cannot respond to this simply.</p> <p>We can support option A if a June release date is agreed, but would not support this for a February release date. This is as option A for June has minimal change from current processes for annual update processes based on these flows..</p> <p>For option B we would support this but only for an approach with June deployment as this uses existing process for these annual updates and does not require a potential ad hoc update process.</p> <p>Cost differences for both of our preferred approaches are similar but other cases require additional costs to support those implementation approaches. Overall we feel that option B is probably easiest as this better matches current annual update process.</p>
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Total Gas & Power Ltd
User Contact Details	Andrew Green – andrew.green@totalgp.com
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>TGP's strong preference for implementation date is Option A delivery Feb 19 effective from 01st March 19. Delivery in June for implementation in August has very little benefit (2 summer months).</p> <p>According to the analysis it appears that there are 9 impacted interfaces for shippers, all in data sent to shippers. Although they are impacted I think that the majority have the change allowable in the structure therefore impact should be minimal.</p> <p>With respect to system impacts we are not clear on why Solution Option 1 has more complexity around AQ corrections and address amendments than Option 2?</p> <p>Current AUGC processes would not allow for different factors between the proposed new EUC categories therefore there would be a long lead-time before these could be utilised, if ever. This would increase complexity of UIG methodology therefore it may be more pragmatic to keep the same factors but allowing for it may future-proof the solution.</p> <p>We are happy that none of the options propose a high risk and feel that the concerns of waiting for Oct 19 would outweigh what the benefits should be of having a mid-year deployment. The demonstration of Nexus mid-year was that is fully possible.</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Option A / Option B (please select)
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish / Private (please select)

User Name	Kirsty Dudley
User Contact Details	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>We are supportive of the implementation of the split EUC bands for 01B and 02B, we are happy they will deliver the intended transparency and facilitate profiling which are linked to the sectors they have been created for.</p> <p>At DSG, a member wanted to introduce rules for smart pay as you go (PAYG) mode into this change, as the sponsor we do not support this at this stage because there is no reliable indicator for this in UK Link, and this change was not intended to fix all profiling issues. Future developments for this can be completed by DSG or DESC and could see the prepayment EUC's being morphed into Smart PAYG as smart roll out comes to an end. We appreciate the DSG discussion on this, but, the intention for this XRN was to deliver a solution for today rather than future planning for rollout conclusion. To develop this would also need MAM and Supplier engagement which is beyond the scope of what XRN4665 is trying to achieve.</p> <p>Solution wise, we support the introduction of an agile system approach so variable share factors are sensible, however, not at the expense of a swift delivery. If the solution to have variable factors can be delivered in the same timings with limited additional costs, we support that, what we don't want to do is to pay the same again to develop this in the future.</p> <p>We are disappointed that DESC approved this a number of months ago but an oversight in the governance meant the change was not raised, we sponsored XRN4665 to avoid any further delays, but, we recommend that the governance into how DESC feed changes into the ChMC process is reviewed and clearly cascaded to DESC members (especially new voting members).</p> <p>Implementation timings, we are supportive of a Feb 2019 delivery, ideally, we would have preferred this to be for the commencement of the 2018/2019 gas year but this is just not possible.</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Option A / Option B (please select)
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish

User Name	Maitrayee Bhowmick-Jewkes
User Contact Details	Maitrayee.Bhowmick-Jewkes@npower.com
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>Please note Npower prefers October 2019 as the implementation date for this change.</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Option A/Option B (please select)
Xoserve preferred solution option	NA
DSG preferred solution option	NA
Publication of consultation response	Publish

Section G Change Pack

Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2264.3 – RJ – ES (Revised version of 2184 – RJ – ES)
Comm Title:	Revised: XRN4665 Creation of New End User Categories
Comm Date:	15/03/2019

Change Representation

Action Required:	For information
Close Out Date:	N/A

Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4665
Change Class:	System Validation Change
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	All Shipper Users, National Grid Transmission, Distribution Network Operator, iGT
Change Owner:	Simon Harris simon.harris@xoserve.com 0121 623 2455
Background and Context:	<p>The Demand Estimation Sub-Committee (DESC) have approved the creation of new End User Category (EUC) profile bands within current EUC bands 01 & 02 based on additional data items (Market Sector Code & EUC Meter Type). This should help make NDM Nomination & Allocations more accurate, by being closer to actual consumer consumption and therefore should result in less volatile UIG.</p> <p>MOD0644 was originally raised to amend UNC code to facilitate the new EUC profile bands however, after discussions at Distribution Workgroup, it was agreed that DESC already had the authority to recommend the creation of new EUCs as part of their annual review, without the need for a UNC Modification. As a result of this agreement MOD0644 was formally withdrawn.</p> <p>This change has been raised to make the necessary code and process changes to UK Link suite of systems and this change pack is being produced during detailed design.</p> <p>Within this document we have outlined the code changes needed within UKL and the logic behind how the new EUC's will be assigned for context and transparency. If you feel there are impacts to your systems that are missing that you wish to highlight please do so by</p>

	responding using the Change Representation section of this document within the consultation window.
--	---

Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	SPA, RGMA, Reads/Settlement, Invoicing, DES, Portal
Non-Functional:	None yet identified
Application:	SAP ISU
User:	All Shipper Users, Distribution Network Operator, iGT
Documentation:	None
Other:	None

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

Change Design Description

Overview of Change

This change is looking to create new EUC profiles (at supply meter point level) within EUC Bands 01 & 02 to replace the existing “bucket” profile, the new EUC’s will be effective from 01.10.2019. Current EUC bands assigned to Supply Meter Points are based on Supply Meterpoint Annual Quantity (AQ), Local Distribution Zone (LDZ), Gas Year and Winter Consumption WAR (for 03-08 only) these new EUC profiles will be assigned to Supply Meter Points using additional criteria.

This additional criteria has been defined as, **Market Sector Code** (if a site is Domestic or Industrial) and **EUC Meter Type** (a derived value based on data stored within the *Meter Mechanism* and *Payment Method* of an installed device to determine it as either Prepayment or Non-Prepayment).

High Level Solution

The new EUC profiles will replace the existing “bucket” profiles for EUC01 & EUC02 effective from 01.10.2019 and are looking to be split based on 2 additional data items, the Market Sector Code & EUC Meter Type (Prepayment or Non-Prepayment).

The proposed naming conventions for the new EUC profiles conform to current file formats, are in line with the precedent set by WAR band EUCs and are outlined below, along with example values.

Current EUC: LDZ:EYY01B (e.g. EA:E1901B)

New EUCs:

LDZ:EYY01BND - Non-Prepayment/Domestic (e.g. EA:E1901BND)

LDZ:EYY01BPD - Prepayment/Domestic (e.g. EA:E1901BPD)

LDZ:EYY01BNI - Non-Prepayment I&C (e.g. EA:E1901BNI)
LDZ:EYY01BPI - Prepayment I&C (e.g. EA:E1901BPI)

Current EUC: LDZ:EYY02B (e.g. EA:E1902B)

New EUCs:

LDZ:EYY02BND - Non-Prepayment Domestic (e.g. EA:E1902BND)
LDZ:EYY02BPD - Prepayment Domestic (e.g. EA:E1902BPD)
LDZ:EYY02BNI - Non-Prepayment I&C (e.g. EA:E1902BNI)
LDZ:EYY02BPI - Prepayment I&C (e.g. EA:E1902BPI)

Note: The naming convention above is indicative and subject to change, approval of the EUC naming convention will be discussed at DSG on the 7th January 2019 and ChMC on the 9th January 2019.

The EUC assigning code (used by a number of processes to determine which EUC needs to be applied) is being amended to include Market Sector Code and EUC Meter Type (Meter Mechanism Code & Meter Payment Method) in the determination of which EUC to assign to a Supply Meter Point where it falls into EUC Band 01 or 02. EUC codes 03 to 09 are not affected by this change.

Visibility of new EUC profile bands prior to 01.10.2019

The first issuing of the new EUC profiles (including the End User Category numbers) will be provided to Shippers via the "Annual Notification of EUC Definitions" (.EUC) file / T67 record issued in August-19 in line with BAU process of notifying industry participants of the new EUC definitions.

The End User Category numbers associated with the new EUC profiles will also be sent out on the "AQ WC Notifications" (.NRL) file within records S91, T04 & T50 and the "AQ Notification" (.NNL) files within the A92 record, in late September-19 as part of the September Supply Meterpoint AQ process for AQ's becoming effective on 01.10.2019.

New EUC profiles will also be sent out to Shippers in the "Supply Meter Point Ownership Notification file" (.TRF) within the S15 record prior to the 01.10.2019 but only if the Confirmation Effective Date is on or after the 01.10.2019.

Detailed Solution/Scenarios

Market Sector Code

The EUC assigning code within UKL will need to determine if a Supply Meter Point is Domestic or Industrial & Commercial. To do this, the system will use the Market Sector Code (MSC) which has 2 allowable values, [D] for Domestic and [I] for Industrial & Commercial. There will be no changes to the allowable values for this data item and no changes are being made to the way the Market Sector Code is currently updated as part of this change.

It is however, advised that for EUC's to be assigned as accurately as possible post implementation, the Market Sector Code is reviewed by all Shipper parties and cleansed where appropriate. This can be done via the Market Sector Amendment Request (.MSI) file, as part of a confirmation (SPA) change or RGMA flow (.ONJOB/.ONUPD) update.

EUC Meter Type

The EUC assigning code within UKL will need to determine if a Supply Meter Point has a Prepayment Meter installed. To do this, a check will be carried out on the installed device Meter Mechanism Code and (in case of a SMART device) Meter Payment Method. The logic to be applied to determine this was approved at ChMC on the 12.12.2018 and is as outlined below...

```
if No Asset Present then
    EUC Meter Type = Non-Prepayment
elseif [Meter Mechanism] = "PP" or "CM" or "ET" or "MT" or "TH" then
    EUC Meter Type = Prepayment
elseif [Meter Mechanism] = "S1" or "S2" or "NS" and [Payment Method] = "PP" then
    EUC Meter Type = Prepayment
else EUC Meter Type = Non-Prepayment
```

Please note that the **EUC Meter Type** will not be a standing data item stored in UKL, just a logical name for the purpose of determining if a Supply Meter Point is Prepayment or Non-Prepayment based on Meter Mechanism and Meter Payment Method.

It is advised that, for EUC's to be assigned as accurately as possible post implementation, the Meter Mechanism and Meter Payment Type are reviewed by all Shipper parties and cleansed where appropriate. Changes to these data items can be made via RGMA flows (JOB or UPD) files.

UIG Share Factor

As per agreement at ChMC on the 11.07.2018, there will be no change in the UIG share factor for EUC bands 01 & 02. All sites within the new EUC profiles will have the UIG share Factor applied for the calculation of Unidentified Gas dependent on Class & EUC Band. This is due to the complexities surrounding having different UIG share factors and the subsequent impacts on Gemini, leading to the Gas Year 2019 implementation date being at risk.

Business Processes

As per agreement in ChMC on the 12.12.2018 it was decided that EUC's will only be re-assigned, in the case of Market Sector Code, Meter Mechanism Code and/or Meter Payment Method changes, during BAU activities that would currently see the EUC amended. It was agreed that we would not re-assign the EUC's straight away when changes to the data items are carried out, this is due to the potential complex code changes to UKL/Gemini and regression testing needed to facilitate this. The BAU processes that currently re-assign the EUC are listed below for reference...

- Supply Meterpoint AQ Calculation
- AQ Correction
- Confirmations as part of SPA
- Address Amendment (where LDZ/Exit Zone are changed)
- LDZ/Exit Zone change
- Site Takeovers process
- WAR Band Update

- Annual EUC updates (Gas Year)
- CSEP amendment via CAI file, i.e. address change and LDZ/Exit Zone change

Due to the above agreed approach, there will be some instances where a current EUC will not be reflective of current Market Sector Code, Meter Mechanism or Meter Payment Method, until such a point as one of the above specified processes triggers a EUC re-assignment. For clarity, if Market Sector Code is being updated as part of a Confirmation/Re-Confirmation then the new EUC will be assigned in line with these updates so will take affect from D (D being Confirmation Start Date).

Gemini

High level impact assessment stated that there would be no impact to Gemini as part of this change however Gemini would feature extensively in our regression testing to ensure the new EUC's load and successfully flow to downstream processes. Detailed design has now completed for Gemini aspects of this change and we can confirm that no functional changes are required to Gemini and no external impacts to existing processes as a result of this change.

Reconciliation Variance Code

As per agreement in DSC Delivery Sub Group (DSG) on the 17.12.2018 and following a small representation period, it was agreed that any changes to EUC's does not require a new Reconciliation Variance Code to highlight where an EUC has been amended due to BAU processes taking priority. Reconciliation Variances will continue as-is using existing codes and could occur mid-month (i.e. address change, LDZ, EZ change, site take over etc) or 1st of the month (Gas Year and AQ calculation etc). If a new EUC Reconciliation Variance Code was introduced then this would only be seen in very rare circumstances and DSG agreed that one would not add value and agreed that there will always be a monthly variance on the effective date. It was also noted that the End User Category Numbers will be clearly visible within the below Supporting Information Files so the current Reconciliation Variance Codes have been deemed sufficient.

- Amendment - "Amendment Invoice Supporting Information" file (.AML - K92)
- Amendment - "Core Amendments Invoice Supporting Information" file (.ASP - K88, K90, K91 & K93)
- Capacity - "Core Capacity Invoice Supporting Information" file (.ZCS - K81)
- Capacity - "Core Capacity Individual SMP Supporting Information" file (.CZI - K43 & K47)
- Commodity - "Core Commodity Invoice Supporting Information" file (.COM - K79)
- Commodity - "Core Commodity Individual SMP Supporting Information" file (.COI - K43 & K44)

CSEP

For CSEP creations/amendments, the EUC's specified in the inbound "IGT/CSO CSEP Creation Request" (CIC) file, within the C80 (EUC Details) Record and the "IGT/CSO CSEP Amendment Request" (.CAI) file, within the C80 (EUC Details) Record will not change for bands 01 & 02 (EUC01B/EUC02B). However, to derive the max SOQ value at grid level (for creation, amendment and annual SOQ calculation) the system pulls aggregated Load factors that are maintained for each EUC profile. As a result, we are proposing that we do not keep and maintain the EUC01B & EUC02B bands (as we are replacing them with the new EUC

profile bands), but instead assign a default EUC profile band in which to pull the required Load factors as per the below logic...

- EUC01B - system should refer to domestic, non-prepayment EUC (LDZ:EYY01BND) load factors for calculating the Max SOQ
- EUC02B - system should refer to industrial, non-prepayment EUC (LDZ:EYY02BNI) load factors for calculating the Max SOQ

Approval of the above rule for handling CSEP sites will be discussed at DSG on the 7th January 2019 and ChMC on the 9th January 2019.

Additional Information

Historical Data

Due to the AQ process using the current EUC to pick up the required Annual Load Profiles (ALPs) and Daily Adjustment Factors (DAFs) within the optimum/sub-optimum period, historical values would be needed for the new EUC profiles. As part of this change, we will be loading historical ALP & DAF information into UKL for the new EUC's, however the new EUC description/numbers will still only be assigned to Supply Meter Points from 01.10.2019, no backdating of EUC's will occur.

Twin Stream

Twin Stream Supply Meter Points, where multiple Meter Devices are present, would need additional rules to determine the EUC Meter Type (where they fall into EUC Band 01 or 02), the proposed rule for this is as follows...

If all meter devices are defined as Prepayment (using the logic specified above) then the EUC Meter Type will be set as Prepayment, if any of the Meter Devices are defined as Non-Prepayment (using the logic specified above) then the Prepayment Status will be set as Non-Prepayment.

Approval of the above rule for Twin Stream sites will be discussed at DSG on the 7th January 2019 and ChMC on the 9th January 2019.

Telemetered

Telemetered Supply Points on UKL are set up with dummy devices and as a result an additional rule will be needed to determine the EUC Meter Type (where they fall into EUC Band 01 or 02), the proposed rule for this is as follows...

For Telemetered Supply Points where a Dummy device is installed the EUC Meter Type will be set as Non-Prepayment.

Approval of the above rule for Telemetered sites will be discussed at DSG on the 7th January 2019 and ChMC on the 9th January 2019.

Additional Considerations

As mentioned above, consideration is needed into potential cleansing activities to standing data items that would feed into the EUC assigning process. Market Sector Code, Meter Mechanism Code & Meter Payment Method.

Please note that as part of the solution for this change and agreement to limit the impacts on Gemini, changes to UKL (SAP ISU) are only covering EUC Bands 01 & 02 (EUC bands 03-09 are out of scope). If future requirements dictate the need for additional EUCs within EUC AQ Bands 03-09 or even new EUC AQ Bands then similar code changes will be needed plus potential impacts to Gemini. If flexibility was to be introduced for out of scope EUC bands as part of this change then there would be a high risk of not meeting the agreed delivery timescales. Work to look into how UKL Suite of systems can be configured to build in flexibility relating to all EUC's is underway but will not be covered in this change.

Implementation Approach

The design specification was approved at the extraordinary Change Management Committee on 21st January 2019. Xoserve can now confirm the implementation dates. There are two implementation dates:

- Part A on 3rd August 2019 to make new End User Category (EUC) bands allowable in SAP ISU to share new EUC bands with the industry via the T67 file
- Part B on 31st August 2019 (with a contingency date of 7th September 2019 if required) to implement all code changes to processes affected by new EUC bands

The above implementation approach will be ratified within the Implementation Plan at the Change Management Committee on 10th April 2019.

Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	- MOD0644 - Improvements to nomination and reconciliation through the introduction of new EUC bands and improvements for the ALP and DAF - XRN4616 - ROM relating to MOD0644
------------------------------------	---

DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	N/A - XRN4665 has previously been to DSG for development and design rule ratification.
Any further information:	N/A

Implementation

Target Release:	Part A – 3 rd August 2019 Part B – 31 st August 2019
Status:	Approved

Section H Representation Response

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	ESP Utilities Group	
	Name:	Katy Binch	
	Email:	katy.binch@espug.com	
	Telephone:	01372587550	
Representation Status:	Qualified Support Support (see comments below)		
Representation Publication:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private
Representation Comments:	<p>In its current form, ESP does not support this change.</p> <p>Regarding the CSEP changes we believe that further thinking is required to evidence how the solution can accurately map eight EUC combinations to the two default EUCs proposed within the C80 record.</p> <p>In the current CIC and CAI files, the EUC split is by AQ only. However the proposed solution would advise IGTs to allocate low usage industrial properties to the EUC02 banding e.g. corner shops, and high usage domestic properties to the EUC01 banding e.g. Large houses with outbuildings fed from a single supply. We do not believe this would better enable Xoserve to derive the max SOQ value at grid level.</p> <p>ESP agrees with the principle of the change, and if the above is resolved then we would support the progression of the change into UK Link.</p>		
Confirm Target Release Date?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	ESP requires 6 months for system changes. This would require a change to our CSEP creation and amendments files, and also downstream processes such as the bulk confirmation process (EUC is mandated in the PSA file).
Xoserve Response to Organisation's Comments	<p>Thank you for your representation comments.</p> <p>Regarding the CSEP logic outlined in the Change Pack, this has been proposed to limit the impacts on the creation/amendment process. Current logic for EUC's are split per AQ only however, EUC band 01 has a domestic profile for allocation and EUC band 02 has an industrial profile for allocation to be used in the load factors that feed the MAX SOQ calculation, so the proposed rule to default EUC 01 to domestic/non-prepayment and EUC 02 to industrial/non-prepayment will in effect be leaving the process for CSEPS creation/amendments to be 'as is'.</p>		

	As a result of the conversations between Xoserve and Katy Binch on 14 th January 2019, the status of this response has changed from 'Qualified Support' to 'Support'.
--	--

Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON		
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley		
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com		
	Telephone:	07816 172 645		
Representation Status:				
Representation Publication:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	
Representation Comments:	<p>We support the introduction of the new EUCs which have been approved by DESC for October 2019.</p> <p>We are however concerned that the scope of the delivery has increased from that originally proposed by us. The ability to amend EUCs is something DESC could already do, but, due to Nexus system design has been hard coded which has caused a far more detailed solution to be deployed.</p> <p>Although we understand why the scope has increased to the degree it has, it has not been a smooth road to develop this change, we therefore request that the CDSP ensures that as part of the 'capture process' it asks standard questions to understand the implications of changes so that extraordinary change packs are not needed.</p>			
Confirm Target Release Date?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	If [No] please specify alternative	
Xoserve Response to Organisation's Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments; we do appreciate that this is a complex change.</p> <p>We are not increasing the scope; we are ensuring the new EUC code logic is successfully applied for particular sites while taking into consideration the mitigation of impacts to downstream processes.</p> <p>We continuously review the effectiveness of the Capture process, and we are very interested in your feedback.</p> <p>It is also important to note that this was one of the first Changes to go through the Capture process.</p>			

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

Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	npower		
	Name:	Amie Charalambous		
	Email:	Gas.Codes@npower.com		
	Telephone:	07917271763		
Representation Status:	Support			
Representation Publication:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	
Representation Comments:				
Confirm Target Release Date?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	If [No] please specify alternative	
Xoserve Response to Organisation's Comments	Thank you for your comments.			

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	<input type="checkbox"/> CMA Order <input type="checkbox"/> EU Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> BEIS <input type="checkbox"/> SPAA Change Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please provide details below)	<input type="checkbox"/> MOD / Ofgem <input type="checkbox"/> License Condition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ChMC endorsed Change Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> Additional or 3 rd Party Service Request
Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact <input type="checkbox"/> Network Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)		
Associated MOD Number(s)		
Perceived delivery effort	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 30 <input type="checkbox"/> 60 – 100 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 – 60 <input type="checkbox"/> 100+ days	
Does the project involve the processing of personal data? <i>'Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' – includes MPRNS.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (If yes please answer the next question) <input type="checkbox"/> 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:	<input type="checkbox"/> New technology <input type="checkbox"/> Mass data <input type="checkbox"/> Fundamental changes to Xoserve business <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please provide details below)	
	<i>(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.</i>	
Change Beneficiary <i>How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Participants <input type="checkbox"/> All industry UK Gas Market participants <input type="checkbox"/> One Market Group	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Group <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Only <input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant	
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	Service Area 15: Demand Estimation	
Number of Service Areas Impacted	<input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> One <input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two to Five	
Change Improvement Scale? <i>How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low	
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Safety of Supply at risk <input type="checkbox"/> Customer(s) incurring financial loss <input type="checkbox"/> Customer Switching at risk		
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer System Changes Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Testing Likely Required <input type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required		
Known Impact to Systems / Processes		
Primary Application impacted	<input type="checkbox"/> BW <input type="checkbox"/> AMT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ISU <input type="checkbox"/> EFT <input type="checkbox"/> CMS <input type="checkbox"/> IX	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Gemini <input type="checkbox"/> Birst <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>
Business Process Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> AQ <input type="checkbox"/> SPA <input type="checkbox"/> RGMA <input type="checkbox"/> Reads <input type="checkbox"/> Portal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invoicing <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>
Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <i>(please provide details below)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> No
Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Xoserve impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact
Workaround currently in operation?	
Is there a Workaround in operation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes who is accountable for the workaround?	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve <input type="checkbox"/> External Customer <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <i>(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <i>(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> High <i>(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)</i>
Change Prioritisation Score	44%