



# DSC Change Proposal

Change Reference Number: XRN 4691/4692/4693/4694

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour ■

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour ■

<b>Change Title</b>	CSEPs IGT and GT File Formats
<b>Date Raised</b>	29/03/2018
<b>Sponsor Organisation</b>	Wales & West Utilities
<b>Sponsor Name</b>	Richard Pomroy
<b>Sponsor Contact Details</b>	<a href="mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk">Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk</a> 07812 973337
<b>Xoserve Contact Name</b>	Paul Orsler
<b>Xoserve Contact Details</b>	<a href="mailto:Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com">Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com</a>
<b>Change Status</b>	Proposal / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected / <b>Deferred</b>
<b>Section A1: Impacted Parties</b>	
<b>Customer Class(es)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT
<b>Section A2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change</b>	
<b>XRN4691 Requirements</b>	
1. New Fields added to the CGI file	
a. Nested CSEP Indicator When analysing the data contained within the CGI file, whether the CSEP is a Parent or a Nest is relevant, but the indicator is not currently included in the CGI file.	
b. Parent CSEP ID Include the Parent CSEP ID for Nested CSEPs to aid analysis.	
c. CSEP Hierarchy Level – NEW Data Item Cadent have submitted Change XRN4354 to reintroduce the Nested CSEP Hierarchy Report, including this in the CGI will aid the analysis of the data. CSEP Hierarchy Level describes all CSEP IDs contained within the CSEP Hierarchy.	
d. CSEP Level – NEW Data Item Number associated to the total count of CSEPs within the CSEP Hierarchy.	
e. CSEP Connection Max AQ (provided by GT) The current CGI format is that it does not include the CSEP Connection Max AQ supplied by the GT, only the figure provided by the iGT. Where CSEP Connection MAX AQ is not provided by the GT this field will be optional to ensure file continues to be issued to relevant parties.	
f. Connection Date – as provided by the GT within the DCI file Currently there is no way to determine if the CSEP is taking gas or not, and the CGI files are often generated when the MPRNs are created and linked to the CSEP ID by the iGT. This means that a CGI may show a CSEPs are breaching when no gas is flowing. Including the Connection Date will help iGTs and GTs identify, which CSEPs are live and which are not. – Where a GT Connection Date doesn't exist (i.e. DCI file hasn't been provided) this field will be optional to ensure the file continues to be issued to relevant parties.	



The possibility of basing the CGI file on actual Meter Readings has been discussed in the iGT/GT Meetings, but it was ruled as too complex. However, using actual meter reads to give a true reflection of the gas being taken would be preferential to using potential figures.

## 2. Increase Breach Figure from 85% to 101%

Having the breach figure at 85% in practice means, that all completed CSEPs that have an AQ between 85%-100% (which they should do), generate a CGI file every time the AQ is recalculated on receipt of meter readings. By raising the breach figure to 101%, attention will be focused on those CSEPs that are actually breaching the contracted CSEP Connection Max AQ.

### **XRN4692 Requirements**

#### 1. Reduce the number of "Triggers" in the CIN File

- a. The current process looks for any inconsistencies across all of the fields in the DCI (GT file) and the CIC/CAI (iGT Files). For example, if the IGT names the site "CSEP off High Street" and the GT names it "CSEP at High Street", even if all other data items match, a CIN file would still be produced and sent to both parties. In practice this means that a CIN file is generated every time XoServe receive an update to the CSEP record.
- b. Suggested CIN File Process: change the validation process, so that only inconsistencies in crucial data items lead to the creation of a CIN. This will reduce the number of files received by the IGTs and GTs and minimise the likelihood of significant inconsistencies being overlooked.

#### Critical Data Items:

"CSEP Post Town", "CSEP Postcode Outcode", "Number of ISEPs", "LDZ Identifier", "CSEP Exit Zone Identifier", "CSEP Connection Max AQ", "CSEP Connection Max SHQ", "Condition 16 Max AQ", "Condition 16 Max SHQ" (new field, included in the "CSEP Creation Process" change form), "Nested CSEP Indicator", "Directly Connected CSEP ID", "Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number", "IGT Short Code", "CSEP Status" (new field, below")

Currently the GTs do not raise Nested CSEPs with XoServe which means that they do not appear in the CIN files. Making the "Nested CSEP Indicator", "Directly Connected CSEP ID", "Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number" critical data items will not change this as there will be nothing for the iGT file to match to. However, by making these critical items now, they are available if we wish to change the process so that GTs do submit Nested CSEPs.

#### 2. Add the CSEP Status Field

- a. Current CIN File: the current CIN file does not include a field for the Status. However, the status is submitted to XoServe on all files, DCI (GT file), is created in Xoserve systems following a CSEP Creation, and can be updated by IGTs following a CSEP Amendment.  
– to confirm, CIC file doesn't include CSEP Status – CSEP status is created as RQ following successful CSEP Creation, and can be amended (to either RQ, CA or DE) following successful CSEP Amendment request.

- b. Suggested CIN File: the CSEP Status is a critical data item, and should therefore be included in the CIN file format and validated to ensure that any inconsistency is highlighted.

#### **XRN4693 Requirements**

1. Condition 16 Max AQ and Condition 16 Max SHQ
  - a. Create New Field in all listed IGT and GT Files: "Condition 16 Max SHQ" (currently only "Condition 16 Max AQ" exists in CIC/CIR/CAI/CAO/DCI/DCO/CIN/CCN/CCN file formats)
  - b. Validate this New Field in all listed IGT and GT Files: Where a "Condition 16 Max SHQ" is given it must match the "CSEP Connection Max SHQ".
  - c. Validate Existing Field in all listed IGT and GT Files: Where a "Condition 16 Max AQ" is given it must match the "CSEP Connection Max AQ".
2. IGT System Max SHQ
  - a. Create New Field in the CIC, CIR, CAI, CAO, CCN and CUN Files: "IGT System Max SHQ" (currently only "IGT System Max AQ" exists in file formats)
  - b. Validate New Field in all listed IGT and GT Files: The "IGT System Max SHQ" must be equal to or less than the "CSEP Connection Max SHQ".
3. IGT System Max AQ
  - a. Add Field to the CCN and CUN Files: "IGT System Max AQ" (currently only included in IGT file formats and is not sent to the GT)
  - b. Validate Existing Field in all listed IGT and GT Files: The "IGT System Max AQ" must be equal to or less than the "CSEP Connection Max AQ". – To confirm, this logic already exists in UK Link Systems

#### **4. CSEP Status Field – Allowable Values**

Include Allowable Values of 'LI' (Live) within the CSEP Status field within the DCI and DCO file formats. This value should be used to compare to the CSEP Status as created and maintained by Xoserve following the creation and amendment of CSEP details.

#### **XRN4694 Requirements**

Create new data validations for the following fields, to be built in to the XoServe Data System. If the data submitted does not meet these requirements, the file would reject and the file owner would need to correct the item and resend the file. Files Affected are as follows: CIC, CIR, CAI, CAO, DCI, DCO, CIN, CCN, CUN – this includes files which will be indirectly affected (in the form of regression impacts where new validation rules are being applied). The purpose of outlining these files is to ensure the full scope of CSEP Creation and Amendment processes are understood when assessing viable solutions and taking these into a detailed design phase.

1. GT Reference Number – Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
  - a. "Default", "TBC" and "Unknown" are not valid GT Reference Numbers – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files.
  - b. Cancelled GT Reference Numbers must not be used. – The requirement is to ensure any CSEPs recorded in Xoserve system with a Status of 'CA' – cancelled – will not be permitted to reuse associated GT Reference Numbers for CSEPs at a 'Cancelled' status.
2. CSEP Connection Max AQ – Validation rules applied to CIC and CAI files

- a. Must be Equal to or Greater than the IGT System Max AQ – rule already exists
  - b. Must be Equal to or Greater than the Sum of the EUC AQs – rule already exists
  - c. Must be Equal to the Condition 16 Max AQ (where applicable) – rule already exists
  - d. Must be Greater than 1 – rule already exists
3. CSEP Connection Max SHQ – New Validation rule to be applied to CIC and CAI files
    - a. Must be Equal to or Greater than the IGT System Max SHQ – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
    - b. Must be Equal to or Greater than the Sum of the EUC AQs – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
    - c. Must be Equal to the Condition 16 Max SHQ (where applicable) – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
    - d. Must be Greater than 1 – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
  4. IGT System Max AQ - Validation rules applied to CIC and CAI files
    - a. Must be Equal to or Less than the CSEP Connection Max AQ – rule already exists
    - b. Must be Greater than 1 – rule already exists
  5. IGT System Max SHQ – New data item introduced as part of XRN4693
    - a. Must be Equal to or Less than the CSEP Connection Max SHQ- New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
    - b. Must be Greater than 1 – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
  6. Condition 16 Max AQ – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
    - a. Must be Equal to the CSEP Connection Max AQ – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
  7. Condition 16 Max SHQ ( – new Data Item introduced as part of XRN4693
    - a. Must be Equal to the CSEP Connection Max SHQ – New Validation rule applied to CIC and CAI files
  8. Connection Date – Change Validation rule in DCI file
    - a. Make Connection Date ‘Optional’ within the DCI file
  9. CSEP Emergency Cover Date – Change Validation rule in DCI file
    - a. Make CSEP Emergency Cover Date ‘Optional within the DCI file

<b>Proposed Release</b>	<b>June 2019</b>
<b>Proposed Consultation Period</b>	<b>5WD</b>
<b>Section A3: Benefits and Justification</b>	
<b>Benefit Description</b> <i>What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?</i> <i>What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?</i>	<p>The purpose of introducing all of these Validations is to improve data quality. By rejecting invalid data before the file is processed, the relevant party must make a correction in order to proceed.</p> <p>For example, if an IGT tried to create a CSEP using “Default” as the GT Reference Number, the CIC file would reject and they would have to confirm that there is a valid GT project and get the relevant reference number before they could proceed and get a CSEP ID.</p>
<b>Benefit Realisation</b> <i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i>	<p>Benefits of these changes are expected to be realised incrementally as CSEP data quality improves.</p>

<b>Benefit Dependencies</b> <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>	N/A
<b>Section A4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations</b>	
DSG members recognised that these changes are prescriptive and are solely related to the CSEP Creation and Amendment processes. As such, single solution options have been provided.	
<b>DSG Recommendation</b>	Approve
<b>DSG Recommended Release</b>	June 2019
<b>Section A5: DSC Consultation</b>	
<b>Issued</b>	Yes
<b>Date(s) Issued</b>	2082 – RJ – PO issued on 26/09/2018
<b>Comms Ref(s)</b>	1972.2 – RH – ES / 2082 – RJ – PO
<b>Number of Responses</b>	2 received – Both in support (1972.2) 2 received – one recommended a deferral, the other was an approval
<b>Section A6: Funding</b>	
<b>Funding Classes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper XX% <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission XX% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator TBC% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT TBC%
<b>Service Line(s)</b>	DSC Service Area 10; Connected System Exit Points ASGT-CS SA10-01
<b>ROM or funding details</b>	
<b>Funding Comments</b>	Funding breakdown to be determined between IGT and GT Customer Classes.
<b>Section A7: DSC Voting Outcome</b>	
<b>Solution Voting</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper NA <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission NA <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator Defer <input type="checkbox"/> iGT Defer
<b>Meeting Date</b>	10/10/2018 / 07/11/2018
<b>Release Date</b>	TBC
<b>Overall Outcome</b>	<p>Defer to next ChMC, and will therefore become a candidate for the November 2019 Release; meetings to be arranged between Katy Binch and Richard Pomroy to discuss the funding arrangements.</p> <p>Update from ChMC meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2018, the issues with funding still exist, and discussions are ongoing. This was deferred to the December ChMC meeting to correlate with the approval of the November 2019 Release scope</p> <p>Update from ChMC meeting on 12th December 2018: this change was deferred again due to the same reason. This change is no longer a candidate for the November 2019 Release, and will be implemented in 2020.</p> <p>Update from ChMC meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2019: Richard Pomroy said that a data cleanse may be required for this change, and will have some news for ChMC in April 2019</p>




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

## Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	06/08/2018 / 01/10/2018
DSG Summary	
<b>06/08/2018</b> Change Proposal presented at DSG for information.	
<b>01/10/2018</b> Paul Orsler (PO) provided a verbal update to DSG. PO mentioned that an extraordinary change pack, to acquire review comments on the high level solution option impact assessment results for these changes, was issued to the industry on 26th September. PO provided an overview of the impact assessment results to DSG.	
Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	Approve
DSG Recommended Release	Release: June 2019

### Discussions

## Section D: DSC Change Proposal High Level Solution Options

<b>Section D1: Solution Options</b>	
<b>High Level summary options</b>	
<p>The High Level Solution Option Impact Assessments (HLSOIA) are detailed within the attached presentation for the industry to review.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>XRN4691_4694 - HLSOIA.pptx</p> </div>	
<b>Implementation date for this solution option</b>	June 2019 Release
<b>Xoserve preferred option; including rationale</b>	Xoserve are comfortable with the identified solution option and will look to work with those impacted parties to define the detailed design.
<b>DSG preferred solution option; including rationale</b>	GTs and IGTs have bilaterally indicated their preference of the changes being proposed. This has since been ratified by DSG.
<b>Consultation close out date</b>	<b>3rd October 2018</b>

## Section E: DSC Change Proposal: Industry Response Solution Options Review

<b>User Name</b>	Katy Binch
<b>User Contact Details</b>	<a href="mailto:katy.binch@espug.com">katy.binch@espug.com</a>
<b>Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.</b>	
<p>ESP do not believe that the estimated costs are justified by the proposed benefits. We have also considered the internal costs we will incur in regards to system changes, and as a result we seek further clarification of the funding class prior to being able to state a preferred solution.</p>	
<b>Implementation date for this option</b>	Defer
<b>Xoserve preferred solution option</b>	Defer
<b>DSG preferred solution option</b>	Defer
<b>Publication of consultation response</b>	Publish
<b>Section E1: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments</b>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Change Proposal's XRN4691-4694 will be taken to DSC Change Management Committee on Wednesday 10th October. We will be seeking approval from the Committee for changes to progress into a Release and for clarification on the allocation of CDSP charges attributed to these changes, as detailed in the High Level Solution Option Impact Assessment.</p>

<b>User Name</b>	Alison Davies
<b>User Contact Details</b>	<a href="mailto:Alison.Davies@wwutilities.co.uk">Alison.Davies@wwutilities.co.uk</a>
<b>Section E2: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.</b>	
<p>WWU accepts the proposed solution outlined by DSG.</p> <p>We have considered any potential impact of "NEXUS Phase 2" and whether it would be better to include these changes in the development of the future system. However, as discussions for Phase 2 are in the very early stages and all of the proposed changes would still be applicable, we wish to proceed with this change proposal.</p> <p>GTs are having to put a lot of man hours into identifying the mistakes in the CSEP data and trying to get the IGTs to make the necessary corrections, and there is no guarantee that the data will be updated. These changes will reduce the amount of time that staff are having to spend on this, as well as improving the overall data quality.</p> <p>The "Directly Connected CSEP ID" and "Directly Connected GT Reference Number" have been included in the "Crucial Data Items" in the CIN validation. These are really a "like to have" item, as currently the DNs do not provide Nest data to XoServe and therefore there will be no corresponding CSEP record for the IGT</p>	



data to match to. However, WWU are able to provide Nest data and with the other validations being introduced, we are more likely to start using this option.

<b>Implementation date for this option</b>	Approve
<b>Xoserve preferred solution option</b>	Approve
<b>DSG preferred solution option</b>	Approve
<b>Publication of consultation response</b>	Publish
<b>Section E2: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments</b>	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.

<b>Change Driver Type</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> CMA Order <input type="checkbox"/> MOD / Ofgem <input type="checkbox"/> EU Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> License Condition <input type="checkbox"/> BEIS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ChMC endorsed Change Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> SPAA Change Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> Additional or 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Service Request <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>
<b>Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network Impact <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Impact <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact
<b>Associated Change reference Number(s)</b>	
<b>Associated MOD Number(s)</b>	



<b>Perceived delivery effort</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 30 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 – 60 <input type="checkbox"/> 60 – 100 <input type="checkbox"/> 100+ days
<b>Does the project involve the processing of personal data?</b> <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 <i>(If yes please answer the next question)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>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:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> New technology <input type="checkbox"/> Vulnerable customer data <input type="checkbox"/> Theft of Gas <input type="checkbox"/> Mass data <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve employee data <input type="checkbox"/> Fundamental changes to Xoserve business <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>  <i>(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.</i>
<b>Change Beneficiary</b> <i>How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Participants <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Group <input type="checkbox"/> All industry UK Gas Market participants <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Only <input type="checkbox"/> One Market Group <input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant
<b>Primary Impacted DSC Service Area</b>	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations
<b>Number of Service Areas Impacted</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two to Five <input type="checkbox"/> One
<b>Change Improvement Scale?</b> <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
<b>Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Safety of Supply at risk <input type="checkbox"/> Customer(s) incurring financial loss <input type="checkbox"/> Customer Switching at risk	
<b>Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer System Changes Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Testing Likely Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required	
<b>Known Impact to Systems / Processes</b>	
<b>Primary Application impacted</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> BW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ISU <input type="checkbox"/> CMS <input type="checkbox"/> AMT <input type="checkbox"/> EFT <input type="checkbox"/> IX <input type="checkbox"/> Gemini <input type="checkbox"/> Birst <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>
<b>Business Process Impact</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> AQ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPA <input type="checkbox"/> RGMA <input type="checkbox"/> Reads <input type="checkbox"/> Portal <input type="checkbox"/> Invoicing <input type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please provide details below)</i>
<b>Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <i>(please provide details below)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT impact <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve impact <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact
<b>Workaround currently in operation?</b>	
<b>Is there a Workaround in operation?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If yes who is accountable for the workaround?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve <input type="checkbox"/> External Customer <input type="checkbox"/> Both Xoserve and External Customer
<b>What is the Frequency of the workaround?</b>	
<b>What is the lifespan for the workaround?</b>	
<b>What is the number of resource</b>	

<b>effort hours required to service workaround?</b>	
<b>What is the Complexity of the workaround?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Low</b> ( <i>easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Medium</b> ( <i>moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>High</b> ( <i>complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome</i> )
<b>Change Prioritisation Score</b>	32%

### Document Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
1.0	Draft	27/04/18	Anesu Chivenga	
2.0	Change in progress	17/08/18	Xoserve	Document to go to DSG following ChMC on 8th August
3.0	Issued in an extraordinary Change Pack	26/09/18	Xoserve	Issued in an extraordinary change pack on solution options following DSG meeting on 17/09/18.
4.0	Representation Matrix	04/10/18	Xoserve	Issued in a representation matrix on 04/10/18
5.0	DSG Notes Added	05/10/18	Xoserve	DSG notes added from meeting on 01/10/201* (Section C)
6.0	ChMC Notes Added	12/10/18	Xoserve	ChMC notes added from meeting on 10/10/18 to section A8
7.0	ChMC Notes Added	09/11/18	Xoserve	ChMC notes added from meeting on 07/11/18 to section A8
8.0	ChMC Notes Added	14/12/18	Xoserve	ChMC notes added from meeting on 12/12/18 to section A8.
9.0	ChMC Notes Added	11/01/19	Xoserve	ChMC notes added from meeting on 09/01/19 to section A8.

### Template Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
2.0	Approved	01/05/18	Emma Smith	Layout and cosmetic changes made following internal review