

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 ■

General Details

Change Reference:	XRN 6079		
Change Title:	UNC 0926S Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems		
Date Raised:	23/04/2026		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Cadent	
	Name:	Andy Clasper	
	Email:	andy.clasper@cadentgas.com	
	Telephone:	07884113385	
	Name:	Kathryn Adeseye	
	Email:	kathryn.adeseye3@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2351	
	Business Owner:		
Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected

Impacted Parties

Change Reference:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input type="checkbox"/> All	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other National Gas Transmission

Justification for Customer Class(es) selection:	<p>Shippers are highly impacted as it is their UNC obligation to ensure emergency contact details for Large Firm Supply Points & Interruptible Supply Points are accurate.</p> <p>Distribution Networks and National Gas Transmission rely on the provision of this data to respond swiftly in the event of an emergency so are also impacted parties.</p> <p>IGTs and IGT Supply Points are also in scope of the change.</p>
---	---

Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Problem Statement:	<p><u>Extract from UNC0926S:</u> <i>“ UNC TPD Q: 2.3 outlines that emergency contact details are mandatory for all ‘Large Firm Supply Points’... Although UNC confirms that emergency contact details are mandatory for Supply Points with an AQ $\geq 732,000$kWhs, the high-level criteria and treatment associated with providing, recording and maintaining emergency contact details is not stipulated.</i></p> <p><i>This Modification seeks to provide this clarity, particularly around treatment of non-mandated emergency contact details where the AQ threshold is not met.</i></p> <p><i>The CDSP also maintains a record of User emergency contact details for Interruptible Supply Points. This Modification is also seeking to amalgamate UNC TPD Q 2.3 and 2.4 to reflect that there is no differentiation between the treatment of Large Firm Supply Point & Interruptible Supply Point contacts.”</i></p>
Change Description:	<p>This Change Proposal has been raised to deliver the Central System changes required as set out within UNC 0926S.</p>

This modification outlines the criteria for how all emergency contact data (EMR data) must be recorded and maintained in Central Systems. It covers the following:

- 1) The Supply Point criteria where EMR data is mandatory and is permitted to be maintained in Central Systems.
- 2) The treatment of non-mandated EMR data* and the circumstances in which it may be held by Central Systems, including, but not limited to, the mechanism by which non-mandated EMR data shall be deleted from Central Systems after a contiguous 12-month period of not meeting the criteria.
(*EMR data is mandatory for Supply Points when the AQ is $\geq 732,000\text{kWh}$ OR The Supply Point is an Interruptible Supply Point).
- 3) No differentiation between the treatment of EMR data regardless of Supply Point type. I.e. Large Firm Supply Point & Interruptible Supply Point EMR data is to be maintained consistently. I.e. maximum number of contacts which can be submitted is 5.
- 4) Confirmation that EMR data can be submitted for any Larger Supply Point* with the understanding that the owning Shipper expects and warrants that the Supply Point will soon meet the criteria for mandatory EMR data in the near future.
(*Larger Supply Points have an AQ $> 73,200\text{kWhs}$).
- 5) Confirmation that the Shipper warrants, prior to submission to Central Systems, that they have permission from the end consumer to share EMR data with Central Systems as per the parameters outlined in UNC post 0926S implementation.
- 6) Mandatory EMR data that has not been updated for > 36 months will trigger a notification to the Shipper requesting that they review the EMR details held in Central Systems. If the Shipper updates EMR post this

<p>notification, then the clock of >36 months will restart. If an update is not received, Central Systems will retain the emergency contact details against the Supply Point and the original effective date shall be maintained.</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing rules around when a Carry Over Flag is applied are to continue. • NTS Supply Points, CSEPs and IGT Supply Points are included in this change. <p>Implementation is expected to occur from UNC0926S implementation effective date. No transitional rules are anticipated.</p>		
Proposed Release:	TBC	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [specify here]

Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	<p>This DSC Change Proposal outlines the parameters by which EMR data is to be maintained in Central Systems. It also determines under what circumstances emergency contact details provided for Larger Supply Points, which are neither Large Firm Supply Points or Interruptible Supply Points, can be recorded and retained by Central Systems. It also ensures no differentiation between the treatment of EMR data for Large Firm Supply Point & Interruptible Supply Points.</p> <p><i>What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?</i></p>	
Benefit Realisation:	<p>As soon as the change is implemented. No transitional rules are anticipated.</p> <p><i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i></p>	

Benefit Dependencies:	Shipper submission of EMR data in accordance with the parameters outlined in UNC post 0926S implementation.
	<i>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.</i>

Service Lines and Funding

Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing:	<p>From an initial consideration of the DSC Service Line impact, the Service Area which these processes currently come under is: Service Area 3: Manage Updates to Customer Portfolio</p> <p>This service area is currently 90% Shipper funded and 10% funded by the Distribution Networks as per the DSC Budget and Charging Methodology.</p> <p>Whether a change to the Service Line is required as a result of this Change Proposal is currently unknown. This will be determined during the later stages of the project and taken through the appropriate DSC Change and Contract Management governance process as necessary.</p> <p>The proposer's initial view is that a funding split as per Service Area 3 is appropriate. However, as IGTs and NGT are also impacted parties, further discussion at DSC ChMc on this split may be beneficial.</p> <p>Final funding split to be confirmed as part of the DSC Change governance process.</p>
Level of Impact:	TBC
If None please give justification:	N/A
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix:	TBC – to be considered as part of the change assessment
Level of Impact:	TBC



If None please give justification:	N/A		
Funding Classes:	Customer Classes/ Funding	Delivery of Change	On-going Budget Amendment
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	90 %	[x] %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Gas Transmission	0 %	[x] %
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	10 %	[x] %
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	0 %	[x] %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [please specify]	0 %	[x] %
ROM or funding details:	<p>A Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) assessment is in the process of being completed.</p> <p>Once available, the ROM Response will be published on Joint Office's UNC 0926S governance page found here.</p>		
Funding Comments:	<p>The proposer's initial view is that a funding split as per Service Area 3 is appropriate. However, as IGTs and NGT are also impacted parties, further discussion at DSC ChMc on this split may be beneficial.</p>		

Please send the completed forms to: pmo@xoserve.com

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
Version 1.0	DRAFT	13.04.26	Kathryn Adeseye	
Version 1.0	LIVE	23.04.26	Kathryn Adeseye	