

DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured
 Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

A1: General Details

Change Reference:	XRN4923		
Change Title:	AQ Calculation for RGMA (ONUPD) Estimate Reads		
Date Raised:	24/07/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Xoserve	
	Name:	Karen Marklew	
	Email:	Karen.j.Marklew@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:		
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Simon Harris	
	Email:	Simon.harris@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2642	
	Business Owner:	Sat Kalsi	
Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

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

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Problem Statement:	When an RGMA ONUPD is submitted with no read record (DATASET_GROUP_READG), UK Link will generate an estimated read. This estimated read is then used in the Reconciliation process, but is not currently used to trigger the AQ calculation. There has always been the expectation from Shippers that if we use any Read for Reconciliation then the same read should also be used for AQ calculation. The calculation of the revised AQ may change, as the optimum period utilised to determine consumption
--------------------	--

	<p>will alter base on the meter reading date which triggered the AQ calculation. As estimated transfer reading and class change readings trigger the AQ calculation, including the RGMA processes will bring consistency to all processes. Note defect 471</p> <p>Link to UKLink Defect 471.</p>	
Change Description:	<p>This change will Amend UKL to utilise estimated readings generated from RGMA ONUPD transactions for AQ calculations</p> <p>When an RGMA ONUPD is submitted with no read record (DATASET_GROUP_READG), UK Link will generate an estimated read. This estimated read is then used in the Reconciliation process, but is not currently used to trigger the AQ calculation. There has always been the expectation from Shippers that if we use any Read for Reconciliation then the same read should also be used for AQ calculation. The calculation of the revised AQ may change, as the optimum period utilised to determine consumption will alter base on the meter reading date which triggered the AQ calculation. As estimated transfer reading and class change readings trigger the AQ calculation, including the RGMA processes will bring consistency to all processes. Note defect 471</p> <p>This change needs to be aligned to be in place for the formula year annual quantity snap shot taken on 1st December 2019 therefore the change needs to be implemented to ensure that the AQ and SOQs have been calculated ready for the next Formula Year snapshot which is taken on 1st December 2019.</p>	
Proposed Release:	Release: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY	
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]

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	<p>The benefit of the change will be that the Supply Meter Points will have an AQ calculation if no cyclical read is loaded but an ONUPD is submitted improving accuracy of AQ's and also bringing consistent to the read and AQ process.</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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Immediately upon delivery</p> <p><i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i></p>
Benefit Dependencies:	<p>Not aware of any dependencies</p> <p><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></p>

A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations – Removed

(see Section C for DSG recommendations)

A6: Service Lines and Funding

Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing	Service Area 6: Annual Quantity / DM Supply Point and Offtake Rate Reviews		
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor / Unclear/ None		
If None please give justification			
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix	No impact on UK Link Manual or Data Permissions matrix		
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor/ Unclear/ None		
If None please give justification	Configuration within SAP ISU – No additional data to be passed externally as part of this change.		
Funding Classes :	Customer Classes/ Funding	Delivery of Change	On-going Budget Amendment
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	100 %	100 %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	XX %	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	XX %	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <please specify>	XX %	XX %
ROM or funding details:	N/A		
Funding Comments:	As per service area.		

A7: ChMC Recommendation

Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Industry Consultation:	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 15 Working Days	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	18/11/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2489.9 - RT - PO	

Number of Responses:	4 Reqs: two approved, one deferred and one rejected response.
----------------------	---

A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Deferred	
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	Please select.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Please select.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	Please select.	
Meeting Date:	11/12/2019		
Release Date:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA		
Overall Outcome:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If [Yes] please specify <Release>

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

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

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

DSG Date:	16/09/2019
DSG Summary:	<p>This Change has been raised by Xoserve representatives. PO stated the impacted parties noted in the Change Proposal are Shippers.</p> <p>Furthermore PO read through the problem statement explaining there is a known issue where Xoserve is generating an estimated read for reconciliation purposes, via RGMA but not using that same read for AQ purposes. PO explained that this links to UKLink Defect 471.</p> <p>In addition, the benefit realisation will be immediate upon delivery. PO flagged the service lines and funding, Section A6 has not been populated.</p> <p>Action: Ensure section A6 (Service Lines and Funding) are populated.</p> <p>Sally Hardman asked a question regarding AQ. If an estimated read will be used to calculate the AQ billing. PO explained that where Xoserve estimate reads for transfers, they are reconciled off. In this case where there is UPD the estimates are being generated but not used for AQ. SH explained that if Xoserve is using estimated reads the AQ annually will impact on their charging for the following year and billing further down the line for Shippers. Flagging there is an impact for GT's as well as Shippers. IB noted that Xoserve recently introduced the LIS read, and asked whether Xoserve be considered towards the AQ calculation and estimated readings.</p>

	<p>Action: Xserve to review whether any other forms of estimated reads may exist that are not included within the AQ calculation process. If so these should also be considered as part of this change.</p> <p>Prioritisation score is 34% This Change was ratified by DSG</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	18/11/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>SH Presented HLSO slides. This change was presented at to the last DSG as an overview to highlight there is one solution for this and seek a recommendation that this be sent for HLSO. Solution presented to DSG as per slides. SH highlighted that this is a very low impacting change with the HLSO going out in the November change pack, and attendees are encouraged to look at this in greater detail and provide (where appropriate) representations. SH stated that this will then go to ChMC in December where the reps will be discussed along with delivery timescales and seek approval to progress into delivery. General support from DSG to help feed ChMC decision. N power supports this change, however Sean Cooper asked question previously.</p> <p>ACTION - By allowing estimated readings to feed AQ, do we know I this will not have an inadvertent impact on the AQ calculation?</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	27/04/2020
DSG Summary:	<p>SH presented this agenda item. SH provided a brief background on this Change.</p> <p>XRN4923 was raised to look at the possibility of using estimated RGMA readings within the rolling AQ process. This scope includes UPD updates where no reads are provided, resulting in the CDSP having to estimate readings. Currently the CDSP estimated transfer readings feed AQ calculation processes. SH stated that the aim of this change is to align the approach and include estimated RGMA readings within the AQ calculation process.</p> <p>SH stated that the solution change pack was issued out in November 2019 (2489.9 - RT - PO)</p> <p>There were 4 reps received for this change pack, this involved 2 approval changes, 1 reject and 1 defer.</p> <p>ChMC in December 2019 requested for this change to come back to DSG for a steer and further development and to ratify the logic that was outlined in the representations received.</p> <p>SH stated that the only two viable options were to either progress then change or to withdraw the change.</p> <p>SH added that the risks raised around the RGMA readings not being able to be replaced was a main point to why there was hesitancy to progress this change.</p> <p>SH asked DSG to provide view or discussion around this.</p> <p>EL stated that her organisations view has not changed from the representation that was submitted. EL stated that they can't massively see the benefit other than more AQs being calculated. EL added that if the process was using an estimated read, it would be reporting an AQ calculation that was old, therefore making it inaccurate.</p> <p>IB stated that they still support this Change and that their view is still the same as the representation that was submitted by his organisation.</p> <p>PO asked HB if their view has changed from the submitted representation that was given. HB confirmed that the view has not changed and that her organisation is not in support of this Change.</p> <p>SH raised a point that estimated RGMAs cannot be replaced and that the only difference with the estimated transfer reads that do feed the AQ process is that they can be replaced, triggering a subsequent new AQ Calculation.</p> <p>SH stated that once the reps had been received, the risks raised have been discussed and noted the items that could be potential risks.</p> <p>DW stated in light of the recent news, he would recommend that this Change be deferred until further risk analysis has been done. DW stated that he neither supports nor defers the change but would like to see the impacts of where the RGMA can now be replaced.</p> <p>PO asked LL for her view on the risks mentioned from an INC perspective.</p>

	<p>LL stated that from what she has heard today, her organisation would support a deferral as this Change is something that has not been fully discussed within her organisation.</p> <p>PO Majority did not support progressing this change, this change will need to go to ChMC to either defer the change or withdraw the change to raise it at a later date.</p>			
<p>Capture Document / Requirements:</p>	<p><Insert where appropriate></p>			
<p>DSG Recommendation:</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="485 533 790 600"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approve </td> <td data-bbox="790 533 1094 600"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reject </td> <td data-bbox="1094 533 1396 600"> <input type="checkbox"/> Defer </td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer		
<p>DSG Recommended Release:</p>	<p>Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY</p>			

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

<p>Solution Option Summary:</p>	<p>Link to CP</p> <p>Current Process</p> <p>When an RGMA (ONUPD) file is submitted by a Registered Shipper that contains no readings within the DATASET_GROUP_READG record, and it is successfully processed within UK Link, the CDSP will generate Estimated Readings. These CDSP generated Estimated Reads are subsequently used in the Reconciliation process, however, unlike their Class Change & Shipper Transfer/Re-Confirmation equivalents, are not used to trigger (or be used in) the Rolling AQ calculation process.</p> <p>Requirement Overview</p> <p>Where the CDSP has estimated readings following a successful Shipper submitted ONUPD, these readings should then go onto trigger a Rolling AQ process.</p> <p>Where a subsequent reading is submitted by a Shipper on a Supply Meter Point, this will also trigger a Rolling AQ as per existing process. If the Estimated Readings (from the ONUPD) is within the Optimum/Sub-Optimum period, these should be considered within the AQ calculation.</p> <p>High Level Solution Option</p> <p>Attached link for the HLSO for XRN4923:</p> <p>https://www.xoserve.com/media/7589/xrn4923-high-level-solution-option-assessment-v20.pdf</p> <p>As discussed at DSG, there is only one solution option being considered as part of this change, an amendment to the existing Rolling AQ process.</p>
<p>Implementation Date for this Solution Option:</p>	<p>Minor Release</p>
<p>Xoserve preferred option:</p>	<p>Option 1 (Only solution option available)</p>

(including rationale)	
DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	Option 1 (Only solution option available), however DSG agreed with this approach
Consultation closeout:	02/12/2019

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd
	Name:	Alison Price
	Email:	alison.price@npower.com
	Telephone:	07557202065
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Only 1 solution available	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve's Response

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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We do not support option 1 if UPD flows sent as part of a Change of Shipper/Supplier event are not treated differently (wait to estimate any read until after end of window for a Supplier to provide a customer or other opening read that could be validated and used in preference to a possible inaccurate estimate).</p> <p>We also do not see the benefits this will bring as estimated read will</p>	

	be generated using AQ and last read and so will not benefit the rolling AQ process
Implementation Date:	Reject
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Reject
DSG preferred solution option:	Reject
Publication of consultation response:	N/A

E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>Thank you for your representation. Regarding your additional query, in the scenario where a UPD is provided as part of a Change of Shipper event, and the UPD is submitted before the CDSP estimates the Transfer Reading, the CDSP will firstly fulfil the Estimated Transfer Read early before estimating the UPD readings (if no actuals are provided), if actual readings are provided by the Shipper within the UPD file then these will either be used to assist the estimation of the Transfer Reading or the RGMA Read will be used as the Transfer Reading (depending when the UPD is submitted). Shipper Transfer Readings currently triggers a Rolling AQ calculation, so the fulfilment of the UPD estimates in these scenarios would not add additional AQ calcs. The main reason/benefits for the proposal was to align processes (as other CDSP estimates such as Shipper Transfer/Re-Confirmation reads feed the AQ process) and an attempt to trigger additional Rolling AQ calculations that could make the AQ more accurate if a number of months have passed since the last Rolling AQ.</p>
---	--

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
	Telephone:	07816172645
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We support the estimate read approach outlined. Should any suggestions be made by others during this representation we believe they should be reviewed for suitability without impacting the implementation date.	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	

DSG preferred solution option:	Approve
Publication of consultation response:	N/A

E2: Xserve' s Response

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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power
	Name:	Helen Bevan
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	01416145517
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Could you confirm how the read estimation is calculated ,my understanding is that it is currently calculated using the current AQ, meaning the new AQ will likely to be similar or the same. Can you please clarify what the benefit of the change is?	
Implementation Date:	Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Regarding your additional query, you are correct in that the CDSP non-daily metered read estimation process will utilise the AQ value in it's calculation. Therefore the AQ, in theory, could be similar/the same as the previous AQ value if no additional changes have been made to the Supply Meter Point. However, this may not always be the case as the Rolling AQ process uses readings within an 'optimum' rolling period, and some reads used in the last rolling AQ processes may not form part of the new calculation, they may have dropped off, leading to a revised AQ value. The main reason for the proposal was to align processes (as other CDSP estimates such as Shipper Transfer/Re-Confirmation reads feed the AQ process) and an attempt to trigger additional Rolling AQ calculations.
---	---

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
V1	With DSG	24/07/2019	Xoserve	
V2	With DSG	24/09/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 16 th September 2019.
V3	With DSG	26/11/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 18 th November 2019.
V4	Voting	10/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Solution Review Change Pack and Reqs added from November Change Pack
V5	With DSG	13/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Updated with ChMC outcome from the meeting on 11 th December
V6	With DSG	05/05/2020	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 27 th April 2020

Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Superseded	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018
4.0	Superseded	07/09/2018	Emma Smith	Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1
5.0	Superseded	10/12/2018	Heather Spensley	Template moved to new Word template as part of Corporate Identity changes.
6.0	Approved	12/12/2018	Simon Harris	Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12 th December 2018.
6.1	In Draft	26/03/2019	Richard Johnson/ Alison Cross	The following minor changes were made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of an All 'Impacted Parties' option in A2 - Justification section added to section A2 - Change Description replaced with Problem Statement in section A3 - Remove 'X' in Release information (sections A3, A5, A7, C1 and G8) - Updated Service Line and UK Link impacts and funding section (A6) to include further detail

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amended questions 3 and 4 in section B - Added Service Line/UK link Assessment in section D - Removed Section A5
6.2	For approval	14/05/2019	Alison Cross	Following review at DSC Governance review group re-added Change Description text box
7.0	Approved	13/06/2019	Richard Johnson	DSC Governance Review Group changes to the template approved at Change Management Committee on 12 th June 2019
8.0	With DSG	03/10/2019	Xoserve	CP has been updated in section A6 (Service lines and funding)

Appendix 1

Change Prioritisation Variables 33%

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 <i>(please provide details below)</i>
Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper Impact <input type="checkbox"/> iGT Impact <input type="checkbox"/> Network Impact <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Impact <input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)	4923
Associated MOD Number(s)	
Perceived delivery effort	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 – 30 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 – 60 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <i>(If yes please answer the next question)</i> <input checked="" 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"/> 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>
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 type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Group <input type="checkbox"/> All industry UK Gas Market participants <input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Only <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One Market Group <input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	Service Area 6: Annual Quantity / DM Supply Point and Offtake Rate Reviews
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> AQ <input type="checkbox"/> SPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RGMA <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <i>(please provide details below)</i> <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Network impact <input type="checkbox"/> iGT impact <input 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	33%

Document Control

Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
1	Draft	27/04/18	Anesu Chivenga	