



DSC Change Proposal

Change Reference Number: XRN 4687

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

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

Change Title	PSR updates for large domestic sites
Date Raised	01/06/2018
Sponsor Organisation	E.ON
Sponsor Name	Kirsty Dudley
Sponsor Contact Details	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
Xoserve Contact Name	Ellie Rogers
Xoserve Contact Details	Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com
Change Status	Proposal / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected
Section A1: Impacted Parties	
Customer Class(es)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> iGT
Section A2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change	
<p>Suppliers and Transporters have licence obligations to record and share domestic customer vulnerability. This is maintained through a Priority Service Register (PSR). This is fulfilled through the Supplier (via the Shipper) submitting this information to the CDSP to be recorded and issued to the relevant GT. This information is then filtered through to the electricity DNO who holds the overall central PSR registry.</p> <p>Vulnerability validation has always been based on AQ rather than property classification as majority of domestic customers have an AQ<73,200. There are however customers' who have an AQ >73,200. The current validation relating to Supply Meter Points with an AQ >73.200kWh are rejected and not recorded centrally.</p> <p>The rejection of this information means the Supplier has the customer vulnerability recorded, however, the Transporter nor the electricity DNO do, which also the central register does not contain all vulnerability information.</p> <p>The issue has also been raised at the SPAA Expert Group via Issues Paper 11 and a request for information has been issued to understand the impacts. To ensure that customers with an >73,200AQ are also included in the PSR which the GTs and DNOs hold a UK Link solution is required – however, at this stage the true impact is unknown because the rejection volume doesn't account for Shippers who don't send updates knowing they'll be rejected,</p> <p>In anticipation of the outcome and from an initial consideration, the following options have been proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Do nothing <i>Pros: No change required</i> <i>Cons: PSR updates would continue to be rejected and vulnerability for these sites would not be recorded centrally.</i>2. Change the validation from AQ to Market Sector Code (D / I) (vulnerable information accepted based on the MSC not AQ) <i>Pros: Validation still in place and updates can only be provided for Domestic sites as per the licence condition</i> <i>Cons: Dependent on the accuracy of the MSC, if recorded incorrectly, sites that are genuinely domestic maybe rejected</i> <i>Change in validation required</i>	



3. **Change the validation threshold from 73,200 kWh to 732,000 kWh**
Pros: Although separate processes, this will bridge the gap between the Priority Service and Priority Consumer threshold
Cons: Change in validation required

4. **Remove the validation**
(vulnerable information accepted regardless of the MSC or AQ)
Pros: All vulnerable information will be recorded centrally
Cons: Removal of validation completely which could result in vulnerable information being recorded against non-domestic sites

5. **Offline solution**
Pros: Vulnerable information submitted
Cons: Potentially only an interim solution and not as 'clean'

6. **Amend the CNF hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP**
(this will also require a change to the CNC validation to either increase the threshold (option 3) or remove the validation (option 4)).
Pros: Vulnerable information can be submitted on confirmation of a LSP and will be recorded centrally
Cons: Hierarchy change therefore would need to be a major release

Proposed Release	Feb or June 2019										
Proposed Consultation Period	10WD										
Section A3: Benefits and Justification											
Benefit Description <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>	This change will allow customer vulnerability submitted by the Suppliers via their Shipper to be recorded centrally and relayed to the relevant Distribution Network and ensuring customer safeguarding and SLC adherence										
Benefit Realisation <i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i>	As soon as the validation is changed.										
Benefit Dependencies <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>	SPAA Change 16/370A – Refining the Needs Codes Information is in scope of Release 2 due for implementation in June-18. This change in validation will support this CP.										
Section A4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations											
DSG members recommend the approval of Option 6 - Amend the CNF hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP and a change to the CNC hierarchy to remove the validation (Option 4).											
DSG Recommendation	Approve										
DSG Recommended Release	June 2019										
Section A5: DSC Consultation											
Issued	Yes										
Date(s) Issued	17/09/18										
Comms Ref(s)	2076.1 – RJ - ES										
Number of Responses	5 (3 approve, 2 reject)										
Section A6: Funding											
Funding Classes	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Shipper</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>National Grid Transmission</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distribution Network Operator and IGTs</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Distribution Network Operator</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iGT</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table>	Shipper	100%	National Grid Transmission	0%	Distribution Network Operator and IGTs	0%	Distribution Network Operator	0%	iGT	0%
Shipper	100%										
National Grid Transmission	0%										
Distribution Network Operator and IGTs	0%										
Distribution Network Operator	0%										
iGT	0%										

Service Line(s)	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration
ROM or funding details	N/A
Funding Comments	Originally, this was under service area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence. Upon reasonable challenge, we have now have now amended the listed service area 1.
Section A7: DSC Voting Outcome	
Solution Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper Approve <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission NA <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator Approve <input type="checkbox"/> iGT Approve
Meeting Date	10/10/2018
Release Date	June 2019
Overall Outcome	Shipper representatives approved solution option 6 with elements of solution option 4. The funding class was and the intention to include this change within the June 2019 release was approved.

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

Document Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
2.0	Draft	10/08/18	Xoserve	Minutes from DSG meeting on 6 th August added to Section C.
3.0	Issued in an extraordinary Change Pack	17/09/18	Xoserve	Issued in an extraordinary change pack on solution options following DSG meeting on 17/09/18.
4.0	Reps	19/09/18	Xoserve	Reps added
5.0	Rep Matrix created	02/10/18	Xoserve	Rep Matrix created and sent to the industry
6.0	Section A6 (Funding) Updated	05/10/18	Xoserve	Service Area Changed from 16 to 1.
7.0	Section F Added	12/10/18	Xoserve	Section F following approval of the solution option at ChMC on 10th October 2018
8.0	Section G added	30/11/18	Xoserve	Section G added following the distribution of the design change pack on 27th November.
9.0	Section H added	14/12/18	Xoserve	Reps to the design change pack added

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

Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion

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

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	17/09/2018
<p>DSG members recommend the approval of Option 6 - Amend the CNF hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP and a change to the CNC hierarchy to remove the validation (Option 4).</p> <p>This recommendation was put forward at the DSG meeting on 17th September.</p>	
Capture Document / Requirements	N/A
DSG Recommendation	Recommended solution option
DSG Recommended Release	June 2019

Section D: DSC Change Proposal High Level Solution Options

Section D1: Solution Options	
High Level summary options	
<p>The High Level Solution Option Impact Assessments (HLSOIA) have been provided for Options 3, 4 and 6 and are detailed within the attached presentation for the industry to review.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>XRN4687 - High Level System Solution</p> </div>	
Implementation date for this solution option	June 2019 Release
Xoserve preferred option; including rationale	Xoserve are comfortable with the DSG preferred solution option (6) as this is a long-term solution which also encompasses the changes to the CNC validation.
DSG preferred solution option; including rationale	<p>DSG preferred solution Option 6 - Amend the CNF hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP and a change to the CNC hierarchy to remove the validation (Option 4).</p> <p>The rationale was the preference for all elements of the change to be implemented at once therefore the CNF hierarchy change plus the amendment to the CNC validation. This was deemed the most logical and effective way of implementing the change rather than splitting it between a minor change to the validation followed by a major change to the CNF.</p>
Consultation close out date	1st October 2018

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

User Name	Cher Harris
User Contact Details	Cher.Harris@SSE.com
Section E1: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>OPTION 2.</p> <p>This option best fits the Licence obligation to provide PSR information for domestic properties only. The cons state that PSR updates may be rejected if the Market Sector Code (MSC) is incorrectly set to '1', however, we see that as a positive in so far as it would act as a prompt to the Shipper/Supplier to correct the MSC, which is an important data item that drives several other processes, including RPC billing. We feel that industry should be grabbing every opportunity to improve data quality, rather than switching off validation as a way of skirting around data inaccuracies.</p> <p>Furthermore, we already see widespread misuse of the PSR process, whereby Shippers send high volumes of name changes where there is no PSR condition (i.e. the update is triggered on every change of occupier), or they send condition code '99 – Check PSR info' with no explanation, rendering the update meaningless. By removing MSC/AQ validation and opening up the file to non-domestic sites, this problem will be exacerbated and make it difficult for the Transporter to handle the volumes of files and to identify the genuine PSR updates.</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Approve
Xoserve preferred solution option	Reject
DSG preferred solution option	Reject
Publication of consultation response	Publish
Section E1: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments. To provide some context, all 6 options were discussed within the DSG meetings whereby members believed that only options 3, 4 and 6 should be impact assessed.</p> <p>Option 2 was discussed, however DSG members did not believe that utilising the MSC validation was suitable at this stage as there were concerns that this could still cause the rejection of genuinely vulnerable sites.</p> <p>DSG recommended the approval of Option 6 as this sees the full solution implemented in a single release and reduces the risk of valid domestic sites receiving rejections.</p> <p>Your comments and option preference will be published and considered by the ChMC ahead of the meeting in October. The ultimate decision will be down to the Change Managers on 10th October 2018.</p>

User Name	Eleanor Laurence
User Contact Details	Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com / 07875 117771
Section E2: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>Preferred Option 6 (incorporating option 4) We see little point in having to implementations close to 3 months apart for the same topic. We are happy to save cost for al parties and see full solution implemented in a single release. We believe removing all validation is the best solution which reduces complexity of the process, reduces costs and reduces the likelihood of incorrect rejections. Having validation in this process seems unnecessary and may result in valid domestic sites receiving rejections 'incorrectly'</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Approve
Xoserve preferred solution option	Approve
DSG preferred solution option	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish
Section E2: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Your comments and option preference will be published and considered by the ChMC ahead of the meeting in October. The ultimate decision will be down to the Change Managers on 10th October 2018.</p>

User Name	Npower
User Contact Details	Gas.codes@npower.com
Section E3: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>We support Option 6</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Approve
Xoserve preferred solution option	Approve
DSG preferred solution option	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish
Section E3: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Your comments and option preference will be published and considered by the ChMC ahead of the meeting in October. The ultimate decision will be down to the Change Managers on 10th October 2018.</p>

User Name	Wales & West Utilities
User Contact Details	Richard Pomroy – Commercial Manager
Section E4: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
<p>We oppose the proposed solution of Option 6 and Option 4. We do not support Option 6 - to amend the confirmation file hierarchy to allow Priority Service Register information to be sent at confirmation of a large supply point as recommended with either Option 3 - change the validation threshold from 73,200 kWh to 732,000 kWh or Option 4 - remove the validation (vulnerable information accepted regardless of the Market Sector Code or AQ) Either of these options would mean PSR data for large non-domestic sites being sent and the PSR and its needs categories are not intended for non-domestic sites. It is worth noting that with Xoserve’s current validation of sending information if the AQ is less than or equal to 73,200kWh then we may already be getting information on non-domestic sites (there being more non-domestic sites with AQ < 73200kWh than non-domestic sites with AQ > 73,200kWh) – an issue we can address with our preferred solution below. WWU uses Market Sector Code not AQ information. On this basis our preferred solution would be Option 6 - to amend the confirmation file hierarchy to allow Priority Service Register information to be sent at confirmation of a large supply point with Option 2 - change the validation from AQ to Market Sector Code (Domestic / Industrial Commercial) (vulnerable information accepted based on the Market Sector Code not AQ) in June 2019 If this cannot be done, we propose Option 6 - to amend the confirmation file hierarchy to allow Priority Service Register information to be sent at confirmation of a large supply point with Option 4 - remove the validation (vulnerable information accepted regardless of the MSC or AQ) in June 2019 and Option 2 - change the validation from AQ to Market Sector Code (Domestic / Industrial Commercial) (vulnerable information accepted based on the MSC not AQ) to follow later but all in one change</p>	
Implementation date for this option	Approve
Xoserve preferred solution option	Reject
DSG preferred solution option	Reject
Publication of consultation response	Publish
Section E4: Xoserve’s Response to Organisations Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments. To provide some context, all 6 options were discussed within the DSG meetings whereby members believed that only options 3, 4 and 6 should be impact assessed.</p> <p>Option 2 was discussed, however DSG members did not believe that utilising the MSC validation was suitable at this stage as there were concerns that this could still cause the rejection of genuinely vulnerable sites. This is not to say that the MSC may not be considered as the validation mechanism at a future date.</p> <p>DSG recommended the approval of Option 6 as this sees the full solution implemented in a single release and reduces the risk of valid domestic sites receiving rejections.</p> <p>Your comments and option preference will be published and considered by the ChMC ahead of the meeting in October. The ultimate decision will be down to the Change Managers on 10th October 2018.</p>

User Name	SSE Energy Supply
User Contact Details	Mark Jones
Section E5: Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	
SSE agrees with the solution recommended by the DSG (Option 6).	
Implementation date for this option	Approve
Xoserve preferred solution option	Approve
DSG preferred solution option	Approve
Publication of consultation response	Publish
Section E5: Xoserve's Response to Organisations Comments	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Your comments and option preference will be published and considered by the ChMC ahead of the meeting in October. The ultimate decision will be down to the Change Managers on 10th October 2018.</p>

Section F: DSC Change Proposal: Approved Solution Option

Section F1: Solution Option for XRN4687	
<p>Shipper representatives approved solution option 6 with elements of solution option 4. The funding class was and the intention to include this change within the June 2019 release was approved.</p> <p>DSG preferred solution Option 6 - Amend the CNF hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP and a change to the CNC hierarchy to remove the validation (Option 4).</p>	
Implementation date	June 2019 Release
Approved by	Change Management Committee
Date of approval	10/10/2018

Section G Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2160.1 – SH – ES
Comm Title:	PSR Updates for Large Domestic Sites (Revised)
Comm Date:	27 th November 2018

Change Representation

Action Required:	For representation
Close Out Date:	11 th December 2018

Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4687
Change Class:	File Format Changes
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	All Shipper Users
Change Owner:	Ellie Rogers Ellie.Rogers@xoserve.com 0121 623 2611
Background and Context:	<p>Suppliers and Transporters have licence obligations to record and share domestic customer vulnerability. This is maintained through a Priority Service Register (PSR). This is fulfilled through the Supplier (via the Shipper) submitting this information to the CDSP to be recorded and issued to the relevant Transporter.</p> <p>Within central systems customer priority service validation is currently based on AQ rather than property classification as majority of domestic consumers have an AQ ≤ 73,200kWh. There are however domestic consumers who have an AQ > 73,200kWh.</p> <p>The current validation dictates that Supply Meter Points (SMP) with an AQ > 73,200kWh will have any customer priority service code updates rejected and subsequently not recorded centrally.</p> <p>This change will amend the current validation for Shippers to submit customer priority service information and allow this to be provided at confirmation of a large supply point (LSP) and via the Customer Amendments file (CNC).</p>

Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration
Non-Functional:	No impact
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW, AMT Market Flow
User:	Shipper
Documentation:	File Format – see below
Other:	NA

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
CNF	N/A	S83, S84, S66	N/A	Hierarchy
CFR	N/A	S83, S84, S72, S66	N/A	Hierarchy
TRF	N/A	S66	N/A	Hierarchy

Change Design Description

This change involves two elements in order to allow Shippers to submit and have customer priority service codes recorded on central systems.

The first element relates to the proposed amendment to the CNF hierarchy, the associated response file, the CFR and transfer of ownership file TRF

- Amendment to the CNF – Confirmation Request hierarchy to allow PSR information to be sent at confirmation of a LSP.
- The proposed change involves the S83 – End Consumer Details and the S84 – Priority Services records being added to the S38 – LSP Confirmation and S66 Contact Details records as a level 3.
By making this hierarchy change, it allows Shippers to submit priority service information at confirmation of a LSP, mirroring the process which already exists for Small Supply Point (SSP) confirmations via the S42 – SSP Confirmation.
- The occurrence and the optionality for the S83 and S84 records will mirror their current format under the S42 (SSP Confirmation) structure when added to the S38 (LSP Confirmation) structure. To confirm it will be optional for Shippers to submit priority customer information when confirming an LSP. The number of occurrences for the S66 is being increased to 6 to allow up to 5 Emergency (EMR) contacts and a Consumer (CON) contact for submitting the S83 and S84 records. The optionality of the S67 record will be amended to optional. This change in optionality will not change the existing rule which mandates the S67 record when providing the Contact type of EMR.

Please see attached the updated CNF hierarchy for review and approval:



CNF Hierarchy
V5FA.xlsx

- Amendment to the CFR – Confirmation Response hierarchy to reflect the changes made to the CNF hierarchy which allows Shippers to submit the PSR information at confirmation of an LSP.
- The proposed change adds S83 – End Consumer Details and the S84 Priority Services records to the S09 – Reject – Confirmation and S66 Contact Details records as a level 3. The S72 – Rejection Detail records have been added to both records as a level 4.
- The occurrence and optionality for the S83, S84 and S72 records reflects the ability to provide this information.
- The number of occurrences for the S66 record is also being increased to 6 to allow up to 5 Emergency (EMR) contacts and a Consumer (CON) contact to be provided in the Confirmation Response records S07, S09, S16 & S10.

Please see attached the updated CFR hierarchy for review and approval:



CFR Hierarchy
V9.1FA.xlsx

- Amendment to the TRF – Supply Meter Point Ownership Notification hierarchy to reflect the changes needed to increase the number of occurrences to 6 for the S66 record to allow up to 5 Emergency (EMR) contacts and a Consumer (CON) contact to be provided in the Transfer of Ownership record (S15).

Please see attached the updated TRF hierarchy for review and approval:



TRF Hierarchy
V10.1FA.xlsx

The second element relates to the proposed amendment of the CNC validation and the associated change required to the Shipper Rejection Codes.

- The current validation for the CNC hierarchy is based on $AQ \leq 73,200\text{kWh}$. If the AQ is $> 73,200\text{kWh}$ then the file will be rejected. This change will remove the AQ validation from the CNC – Customer Amendments hierarchy to allow Shippers to submit files for sites with an $AQ > 73,200\text{kWh}$. Please note this is a validation change only and there is no proposed change to the structure of the CNC hierarchy.
- There will be an amendment to the Shipper Rejection Codes to remove a specific rejection code which is no longer relevant due to the proposed validation change to the CNC hierarchy. Rejection Code “CNF00030 – End Consumer / Priority Services not required for a Competitive Confirmation” has been proposed for removal from the list as it is no longer applicable due the removal of the AQ validation.

Please see attached the updated Shipper Rejection Codes for review and approval:



Shipper Rejection
Codes V6FA.xlsx

For information the Change Proposal is attached:



V7 XRN4687
(1).docx

Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	N/A
------------------------------------	-----

DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	N/A – XRN4687 has previously been to DSG for development.
Any further information:	N/A

Implementation

Target Release:	28 th June 2019
Status:	For approval

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

Section H: DSC Change Proposal: Representation response

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:	N/A
Representation Publication:	Publish
Representation:	We approve the proposed solution and implementation date
Target Release Date:	June 2019
Xoserve Response	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"/> 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 rd Party Service Request <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please provide details below)
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"/> iGT Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Impact <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)	
Associated MOD Number(s)	
Perceived delivery effort	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 30 <input type="checkbox"/> 30 – 60 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 60 – 100 <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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 (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 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
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations
Number of Service Areas Impacted	<input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two to Five <input type="checkbox"/> One
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 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 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>
Business Process Impact	<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>
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 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 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	35%