

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:	XRN4850		
Change Title:	Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters		
Date Raised:	30/01/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities	
	Name:	Richard Pomroy	
	Email:	Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk	
	Telephone:	07812 973337	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Ellie Rogers	
	Email:	Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2138	
Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	<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"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Change Description:	<p>This change has two elements and ultimately aims to improve communications with end consumers during planned and unplanned gas supply disruptions.</p> <p>The first element involves the implementation of a process by which customer contact details will be provided to the CDSP by Suppliers. The process will be developed by a SPAA working group set up to progress SPAA SCP 443 – Notification of customer contact telephone numbers to Transporters.</p> <p>The process of getting the customer contact details could involve Shippers and be via the IX within a UK Link file format(s). Please note, other solutions are also possible.</p>
---------------------	---

The second element of the change involves the provision of a web portal to allow GDNs and IGTs to send messages to selected customers.

A ROM response for the initial change (XRN4555) raised in March 2018 gave the following change impact:

Change Impact:

Initial assessment of whether the service change is / would have:

- This is a restricted class change.
- This not a priority service change
- This would have an adverse impact on customers

Change Costs (implementation):

The solution will cost at least **£150k**, but probably not more than **£250k** to develop.

The funding split is to be determined by the Change Management Committee.

Change Costs (on-going):

The solution will cost at least **£8k**, but probably not more than **£15k** to support per annum.

The above ongoing cost includes the telecom cost to send the messages.

Timescales:

The strategy adopted for Post Nexus change is a Release strategy (changes grouped and implemented together at a set date) and it is expected that this change would form part of a Major Release.

Assumptions:

- Each SMS and email message would be tailored to each GDN.

Risks:

- Not all Suppliers have IX
- Not all telephone numbers will accept a SMS message

This ROM response was based on the initial Change Request (XRN4555) and therefore does not capture all of the latest requirements but it provides an indication of the change impact.

Web Portal requirements

Two levels of functionality “Broadcast” and “Extract”

There will be five uses cases:

1. Unplanned interruptions including purge and relights;
2. Planned interruptions including reinstatement of ground (e.g. mains replacement);
3. Gas Safety Regulation (GSR) cut-offs;
4. Appointments for Multiple Occupancy Buildings (e.g. riser replacement), and;
5. Guaranteed Standards of Performance compensation payments.

Broadcast facility

1. Ability for Transporters to request that SMS messages and emails to be sent to customer contact details for each MPRN in the selection criteria.
2. Transporter will submit text of message to be sent
3. Requests will not be processed without a use case
4. For use cases 1 and 5 GDNs will be able to send messages to IGT customers where the IGT has authorized that GDN for that use case. This authorization to be held in a permissions matrix in the portal
5. MPRNs to be selectable by postcode including outcode only and outcode and parts of incode, by road name and within that by number range for example 1 to 30 either all numbers or odds and evens separately.
6. Customer contact details will not be visible to Transporter at any time
7. Customers will be able to request "STOP", this will stop messages for a particular incident but customers will be told to contact their Supplier if they want to remove their details entirely

Extract facility

1. Transporters will be able to down load customer contact details for a single MPRN for use in special circumstances.
2. Requests will not be processed without a use case
3. Facility will be restricted to particular users in a Transporter
4. For use cases 1 and 5 GDNs will be able to send messages to IGT customers where the IGT has authorized that GDN for that use case. This authorization to be held in a permissions matrix in the portal
5. Customers will be able to request "STOP", this will stop messages for a particular incident but customers will be told to contact their Supplier if they want to remove their details entirely

Reporting facility

1. Facility to run reports on number of times portal used by:
 - a. Type of use (Broadcast or Extract)
 - b. Date range
 - c. Transporter submitting request
 - d. Use Case

Communications

Current view of the SCP443 SPAA workgroup is that the IX is utilized in a similar way to the PSR data being sent from Suppliers to CDSP by means of the Shippers

Data items to be sent

- MPRN;
- Up to four email addresses;
- Up to four telephone numbers;
- Customer Name;
- Contact Name;
- Contact telephone number;
- Contact email address;
- Mailing Address, and;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred contact method. <p>Xoserve to scope out options for communicating this data by means of IX</p> <p>Note as the SPAA schedule will not be mandatory on I&C TRAS Suppliers and I&C only Suppliers are not required to be parties to SPAA the Xoserve solution should not require Shippers to make changes if they are not required to transfer the data.</p>
Proposed Release:	Release June 2020
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days <input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days This is being raised as a place holder and is dependent on SPAA CP 443. This change will be further developed as the 443 solution is developed. A consultation is appropriate when the high level design for the solution has been developed. The portal could go out for consultation earlier but it seems sensible to keep both parts of the change together. <input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	<p>These changes will mirror those put in place in electricity following the storms in 2013. They will allow gas distribution businesses to proactively communicate information relating to the disruption of customer's gas supplies.</p> <p>Distribution businesses will only use this information to contact the customer concerning disruptive events impacting that customer's connection to the network. The portal will work by GDNs/ IGTs informing the CDSP of the message to be communicated and the MPRNs to which it should be sent. This means that GDNs/ IGTs do not directly access the customer contact details except in very limited cases thereby minimising the risk of data breaches. See SPAA CP 443 for further details.</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:	Ongoing during any planned or unplanned interruption
	<p><i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i></p>
Benefit Dependencies:	<p>This is dependent on SPAA CP 443 being developed and implemented and Suppliers passing customer information to the CDSP.</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

Final DSG Recommendation:	<i>Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.</i>		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: June 2020		

A6: Funding

Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	XX %
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator and IGT	100 %
Service Line(s)	DSC Service Area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence New Service Lines Required	
ROM or funding details:		
Funding Comments:	<p>04/03/2019- Originally, the DSC Service Area assigned to this change was DSC Service Area 13: Emergency Contact Information, which is 100% by the DNs. However, the reps within the February Initial Review Change Pack asked for the funding arrangements to be split between DNs and IGTs as this service would be used by the latter, and therefore the service area is now DSC Service Area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence. This was agreed at ChMC on 10th April 2019.</p> <p>28/03/2019 - Xoserve is also reviewing the Service Description Table to assess if there is any impact to the service lines.</p> <p>11/07/2019 – Potentially two new service lines are required; one for the receipt of consumer contact details from Shippers, the second for the provision of said data to the DNOs and IGTs upon request.</p>	

A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13th February 2019 / 13th March 2019 / 10th April 2019

Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve (10/04/2019)	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer (13/02/2019)
Industry Consultation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days		<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days		<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]
Expected date of receipt for	1 st March 2019		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	15/02/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2234.2 – RJ – ES	
Number of Responses:	7 (5 approvals, 2 deferrals)	
Comments	13/03/2019 - ChMC were content for this change to proceed to DSG for solution development, but wanted the change to return to April's ChMC meeting for approval of the funding arrangements. There was some discussion as to whether the IGTs would support the funding arrangements specified in section A6 of the Change Proposal.	
responses (to Xoserve)		



DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (initial review)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	12/07/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2234.2 - RJ - ES (initial review) / 2378.7 – RT – PO (solution review)	
Number of Responses:	7 reps: 4 approvals and 3 deferrals 4 Reps: 2 approvals, 1 Approve date and defer option and 1 defer date and approve option (solution review)	
Date Issued:	18/11/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2489.14 - RT – PO (detail design)	
Number of Responses:	4 Reps: three approvals and one reject	
Date Issued:	14/04/2020	
Comms Ref(s):	2566.6 – MT - JR (detail design updated)	
Number of Responses:	3 Reps: three approvals responses	

A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Approve
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	N/A
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Approve
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	N/A
Meeting Date:	07/08/2019	
Meeting Date:	13/05/2020 – Updated Detailed Design	
Release Date:	June 2020 – 26 th June 2020	
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
	June 2020	

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

Section B: Change Proposal Initial Review

B1: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Northern Gas Networks
	Name:	Shanna Key
	Email:	Skey@northerngas.co.uk
	Telephone:	07779 416 216

B1: ChMC Industry Consultation

XRN4850 – Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response		
At this initial stage, we have not identified any material risks to NGN from this change proposal; however, we are aware that use of the new request portal will be limited to “particular users in a Transporter”, meaning we will need to internally identify who is best to receive this access and responsibility and develop a new procedure for the processing of requests, selection of MPRNs for contact and running of any reports. This is likely to require user training.		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
We agree that the ability to communicate with consumers during relevant gas events will be beneficial to the industry as it could improve industry/consumer relationships and help reduce complaints due to lack of information.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)		
As this proposal is only in the initial stages and the extent of any procedure development and training required is unknown, we are unable to comment on the eligibility of this change to be implemented via a minor release or what lead time would be required.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
Yes, we agree that this change should be 100% DN funded as we are the main beneficiaries of the change and are the parties wishing to improve communication with consumers during relevant gas events.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

B2 User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales and West Utilities
	Name:	Richard Pomroy
	Email:	Richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk
	Telephone:	029 2027 8552 or 07812 973337

B2: ChMC Industry Consultation

XRN4850 – Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response		
We think that the process proposed minimises the risks. The key feature is the portal, the data will be held securely by Xoserve and networks will not download the data to their own Systems.		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
We think that the proposal will help improve communications between networks and Customers benefiting the whole industry.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)		
We do not think that this would be appropriate for a minor release. Although WWU will not have to make system changes, some Shippers and Xoserve will need to make system Changes. The SPAA change is not mandatory on I&C only Shippers so the functional Changes should not require Shippers that are not impacted to make system changes.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
No. This will benefit both DNs and IGTs and therefore the cost should be shared between DNS and IGTs pro-rated by MPRN count.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

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

B3: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
	Telephone:	07816 172 645

B3: ChMC Industry Consultation

<p>1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response</p>
<p>The proposed change could pose a cost and material risk through these initial identified areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GDPR – sharing customers’ information would need to be in controlled & secure manner. Using file exchanges e.g. via the IX gateway could remove this risk. 2. The development of a mechanism to share the data from Supplier > Shipper > CDSP > Transporter would have a cost associated and depending on the approach could has costs associated – we would require detailed specs to cost this further.
<p>2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.</p>
<p>We recognise the Transporter benefits, as well as potentially those of the customers’, however, we are concerned that the solution could end up costing more to deliver overall. We have participated in the SPAA workgroup for this and the joint MRA/SPAA Secure Communications Work Group (SCWG), and are assessing the possible overlap in the deliverables and solutions. We are currently unsure if what the SCWG is developing could also extend to this solution reducing what could be significant industry development and costs.</p> <p>We recognise that the charging of the CDSP costs has been suggested as 100% DN, however there might be significant industry costs to deliver this as each Supplier and Shipper develop their systems to deliver the solution.</p> <p>We would ask that the Transporters and the CDSP discuss with the Secretariat which is hosting the SCWG and the SPAA to assess if the solution could be utilised as an option to deliver this solution as wel. We appreciate that the SCWG solution is itself still under development but we would prefer to have deliverables which integrate into existing or a single solution where possible.</p>
<p>3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)</p>
<p>We not support a minor release, this would introduce a new process so would have to be a major release with a minimum of 6 months’ lead time.</p>
<p>4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?</p>

Yes, we support with the funding principles but it would need recognising that Shippers and Suppliers would also have their own development costs to deliver this.			
Change Proposal in principle:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private

Please send the completed forms to: uklink@xserve.com

B4: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875 117771

B4: ChMC Industry Consultation

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response
No
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.
I cannot see a large direct benefit apart from possible small reduction of calls for such emergency issues
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)
<p>We would need a 6 months period given the need for system development.</p> <p>We would however like to add:</p> <p>We have no fundamental issue with the principal of the change, however as per discussions at SPAA SCP 443 working group, until we get more information on GDPR and what is in or out of scope, we cannot fully support this solution.</p> <p>We would however be more comfortable if the change proposal introduces a regulatory requirement to share this information as this would give increased reassurance around the GDPR aspect.</p> <p>We would however recommend the use of an existing flow (e.g. CNC) where possible and an existing means of communication i.e. IX if this were to develop further. We would however looking at use of special characters in IX flows e.g. @ signs in email addresses to ensure that these can be supported as electricity market found these issues when looking at a similar change.</p> <p>There is still quite a lot of development and unsupported assumptions that need review before we can fully support this change</p>
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?
N/A

Change Proposal in principle:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private

Please send the completed forms to: uklink@xserve.com

B5: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	npower
	Name:	Amie Charalambous
	Email:	Gas.Codes@npower.com
	Telephone:	07917271763

B5: ChMC Industry Consultation

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response		
Yes, whilst we are supportive of this change in principle and believe the data should be mandated, This information is already provided to the CDSP via the CNC file. This could be used by the CDSP to develop their portal		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
Neutral		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)		
Six month implementation lead time required		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
yes		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

B6: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Southern Electric Gas Limited, SSE Energy Supply Limited
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738

B6: ChMC Industry Consultation

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response		
This change will require shippers to provide data in a new flow via IX. This will result in material costs for our business to develop a solution and processes to meet this requirement. It is not yet possible to quantify these costs until more information about the proposed change is provided. In principle we approve the intention of the change, however we believe an alternative solution should be sought to minimise the impact on Shippers. We are aware of work being done under the Secure Communications Working Group (SCWG), and that there may be other solutions identified in that forum.		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
The change as proposed will benefit Transporters; however the new requirements will impact Shippers. Alternative solutions should be considered to minimise the impact on Shippers.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)		
We do not support implementation within a minor release. We request implementation within a major release, with a minimum of 6 months lead time ahead of implementation. We suggest a UNC modification may also be required if an obligation is required to be placed on Shippers under the UNC.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
Yes.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

B7: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Centrica
	Name:	Kate Mulvany
	Email:	kate.mulvany@centrica.com
	Telephone:	07789 572 420

B7: ChMC Industry Consultation

1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market? Please can you provide the rationale for your response		
<p>The proposal is helpful, but the inherent risks of expanding the availability of personal customer data cannot be underestimated. So long as all parties are comfortable with their legal obligations, and newer concepts like the right to be forgotten are considered, the a revised solution should deliver the necessary protections.</p> <p>We cannot support the change in its current format due to concerns about data protection, but anticipate being able to support a revised proposal that includes tighter controls.</p>		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
If delivered with due care to data protection laws, the change could deliver benefits to the end user (the customer).		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how much lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of four months, minimum of six months)		
Depending on the complexity of the solution ultimately agreed upon, we would require a minimum of 6 months' notice.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
Yes		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	17/06/2019
DSG Summary:	<p>SH presented this agenda item. SH stated that for this change, the solution options vary slightly. This allows DN's to trigger off notifications for example to end consumers that work or update etc. will be conducted at certain times.</p> <p>Both solution options are the same, the only difference is the information being transferred from the Shippers is from either an existing record type or a new record type.</p> <p>SH stated during the MOD discussions, there was discussion about potentially using API's as a solution, although SAP ISU can do most of the work necessary.</p> <p>SH stated one thing to point out that the costings shown in the HLSO's do not include the SMS server costings. The costings are for Only Solution up to that point.</p> <p>SH suggested from DSG the options available in regards to HLSO are what need to be focussed on as the CDSP would like to scope this for June 2020. SH explained a recommendation from DSG would be needed in regards to the HLSO option as using a new record type or old record type. This is due to it needing to go to ChMC in July for approval.</p> <p>EL asked if discussion of this had occurred at an earlier DSG. SH replied that these options have not been discussed as yet. EL asked is there any way of getting a better understanding of the detail involved in regards to this solution. PO responded to EL that the detail has been mentioned and discussed within SPAA workgroup. EL suggested could this be Change Packed with all the low level and high level detail. SH responded by stating that this Change would need a DSG recommendation beforehand and then to go to ChMC to be Change Packed in July. PO suggested what is also required is ChMC to agree this change within a scope. SH stated that he does understand the understanding is needed regarding the definitive detail of the data items and solution. Therefore, SH suggested that at DSG meeting 1st July, further detail of the option can be explained and discussed then.</p> <p>ACTION: Add XRN4850 to DSG on 1st July so DSG members get a view, discuss and agree on the recommended option.</p> <p>SH confirmed the only difference in the options is the way that notifications from Shippers are provided to the CDSP; a new record or using an old record to amalgamate the data.</p> <p>SC asked a question on why Shippers wouldn't want to use the existing record currently stored. PO answered that this is different in regards to how customer contact details are captured, the contact details for an emergency contact for example it's not a large load site or a vulnerable site, it's strictly end consumer details. PO stated that the question is for Shippers to confirm whether it is easier for Shippers to have new constructed record that distinguished new contact details or a solution that tried to</p>

	<p>amalgamate the data using an existing record. PO stated a recommendation will be needed by DSG for the next ChMC to go for scope approval. This is to also include giving clarity to customers next DSG meeting with detail to consider and move forward with a recommended option. This change is the driver for the SPA change, therefore urgency on pushing forward for approval of release scope.</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 X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	01/07/2019
DSG Summary:	<p>ER stated that there are 2 functionalities that would involve the CDSP to hold end consumer information at the request of transporters. E.g. the CDSP on behalf of transporters would send those notifications to end consumers. ER stated that this change is linked to the SPAA Change 443. ER stated that both high level solution options for this change were presented to DSG last meeting. The difference between to two options would be how the CDSP receives the end consumer details from Suppliers via Shippers. Option 1 involves using an existing record type and modifying that to make sure all details required are included. Option 2 involved a new record to be created within the confirmation files. ER stated that she believed there was some discussion and questions from DSG last meeting 17th June 2019 that were raised as ER was away on annual leave and Simon Harris had presented this agenda item. ER also asked if DSG would like to express any further questions. It was highlighted that the cost and efforts within the HLSO presented on the 17th June did not include the SMS service provider costs. ER confirmed that the relevant teams internally were looking at options for this in order to provide the high level cost.</p> <p>PO added that the key point last meeting was that the creation of a new record would be a cleaner option. PO stated that the existing contact record would need to change quite significantly to allow Shippers to direct their data through that route. Therefore the new record might suit to be better. IB added that Npower's preference would be better to use the existing record type due to the significant changes needing to be made for a new record types. PO stated that the CDSP's preference for the options is agnostic as it's the industries decision as there are benefits and cons for both. ER stated that the cost is not particularly different but the creation of a new record type would be slightly higher in cost. Furthermore ER added that this is still proposed in scope for June 2020 release at the moment. ER asked DSG for a preference. PO asked SC what her preference was in regards to the option. SC replied that at the moment this question couldn't be answered and would need time. PO stated that due to there being no preference PO suggested that ChMC would need to provide</p>

	approval for this to go ahead into Change Pack for industry responses to define and steer to a preferred solution option.		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	15/07/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Ellie Rogers (ER) provided a brief overview regarding this change. ER stated there are two options for this change and as discussed before they both relate to how the Shippers notify the CDSP of the end consumer details. The first option involves using the existing S66 and S82 files to submit the details and the second option involves using a new record type for the notification.</p> <p>ER added that the main update regarding this change is around the SMS service provider. ER highlighted that an indication of the high level costs and efforts had been published in the Solution Change Pack which was issued 10th July. It was confirmed that there was an additional slide in the Change Pack which provides details in a table regarding the set up costs for SMS service provider, the price per notification and the ongoing cost. ER added that this is just an example of what the costs could be and once this change is approved at ChMC meeting the CDSP's procurement team will then look at attaining a service provider and the firm costs will be known. ER encouraged Users to provide responses in the Change Pack regarding the change in general and the specifically the solution options for submitting the end consumer details. ER encouraged any User who had questions about this change to get in touch via email, call or submitting an official response.</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 X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	05/08/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Ellie Rogers (ER) presented this agenda item. ER stated that this change went out for solution review in July's Change Pack and multiple responses were provided by the industry. ER bought this change back to DSG to ask if there are any further questions to raise or flag before going to ChMC 07/08/19 or are they happy to go ahead with what the solution representation that has been provided. James Rigby (JR) asked ER if the intention at ChMC was to obtain approval of solution, ER confirmed this is the case so that they can be approved and scoped into June 2020 Release. ER stated that from the responses received, the preference was for solution option 1 (utilising an existing record). Other representations received requested more detail on how the solution would work. ER stated that this will be provided in the detailed design.</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 X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	18/11/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>PO highlighted to DSG that this change is going in the November detailed design change pack, and DSG members are encouraged to review this and feed in any representations on this.</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 X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

<p>Solution Option Summary:</p>	<p>The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be found here</p> <p>The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified two viable options to deliver the requirements of the change. The only difference between the two options is around the method in which the Shipper sends the End Consumer details to the CDSP.</p> <p>Option 1 seeks to utilise existing records (S66 and S82) to submit the End Consumer details to the CDSP. Please note, these records will need to be enhanced to ensure all required information can be sent by the Shipper to the CDSP.</p> <p>Option 2 seeks to create a new record within the CNF and CNC for Shippers to submit End Consumer details specifically for the purpose of this change. Amendments to the existing records (S66 and S82) will be out of scope of this change and the intention will be a new record is created.</p> <p>Please note, these are the only differences between the two options. All other functionality to deliver the change such as the trigger for GDNs and IGTs to request the service and the method for the notifications being sent or extracted are exactly the same.</p> <p>As per HLSO slide 9, the costs provided within slide 3 and 6 are related to the CDSP system costs only which are required to deliver this change. This is not inclusive of the SMS Service Provider efforts which will be required to send the messages to the End Consumers.</p> <p>As this change has not been approved by Change Managers yet, we are not in the position to have an SMS Service Provider secured therefore we do not have firm costs for this element of the change. However, we have investigated options in terms of Service Providers and have provided an indication of the high level costs associated.</p> <p>Please note, this is not a firm cost for this element of the change, it is just an indication. If approval is received from Change Managers, we will seek to procure a Service Provider and the delivery and ongoing costs will be fed back through ChMC.</p> <p>The Change Proposal can be found in the Change Proposal Library</p>
---------------------------------	---

<p>Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>Xoserve do not have a preferred option for this change. We are comfortable delivering either and will progress with whichever option is preferred and more suitable for Shippers.</p> <p>To provide some extra detail, it has been discussed that a new record could be a 'cleaner' option as it explicitly details exactly what is required and for this purpose. However, it has been highlighted that enhancing the existing record could avoid duplication of data items already provided within existing records.</p> <p>As you can see from the HLSO, the cost difference between the two options is minimal (option 1 being slightly cheaper), therefore it is up to Shipper to decide which is their preferred mechanism.</p>
<p>DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>No preference has been provided by DSG representatives at this stage. This HLSO is on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting on Monday 15 July 2019.</p>
<p>Consultation closeout:</p>	<p>26/07/2019</p>

<p>Impact on Service Line(s) and funding (A6) for each Solution Option:</p>	<p>It is anticipated that at least one new Service Line will be required as part of this change. This is to cover the receipt of End Consumer information from Shippers for this purpose and to issue out the notifications or make the information available at the request of the DNOs or IGTs.</p> <p>This may be split into two Service Lines one for the receipt and second for the ongoing messages but this is to be determined at a later date.</p> <p>The new Service Line(s) will go under DSC Service Area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence</p>
---	---

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.	We are unable to specify our preferred option without further detail around proposed hierarchies and record structure. Without this it is not possible to fully impact assess changes.			
Implementation Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	

E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation and support for the proposed implementation date. Regarding your request for more information relating to file format/hierarchy changes, the provided solution options are high level only for the purpose of obtaining impact and costs of each. Following ChMC approval of a specific solution option, detailed design will follow, with DSG input on the potential file format/hierarchies (new or existing).
---	--

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Northern Gas Networks		
	Name:	Helen Chandler		
	Email:	HChandler@Northernngas.co.uk		
	Telephone:	07580704123		
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>NGN has no comments regarding the method for Shippers to send End Consumer details to the CDSP.</p> <p>We support the introduction of a new Web Portal for GTs/IGTs to communicate with End Consumers; however, we would like more details regarding the funding for the SMS Service Provider once they become available.</p>			
Implementation Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	

Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private

E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Regarding your request for more information on the SMS Service Provider costings, we will fulfil this as soon as we can. If approved at ChMC to progress with the change, procurement of a SMS Service Provider will commence along with detailed design, at this point we would have more information in this regard to provide.
---	--

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	npower ltd		
	Name:	Richard Vernon		
	Email:	richard.vernon@npower.com		
	Telephone:	07825608088		
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We support using existing records but at this stage there is not enough detail as to what data needs to be included in what records and therefore fuller assessment will need to wait until the next round.</p> <p>We encourage this to happen relatively quickly in order to meet the target of June 2020 and having the appropriate 6 month lead time.</p>			
Implementation Date:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	

E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation and support for a preferred solution option. Regarding your query around providing 6 month lead time, this change is in scope for June-2020 and if approved at ChMC, detailed design will commence where the file format hierarches will be (with help from DSG) scoped and finalised accordingly. Formal file format notifications to the industry will be sent to ensure adherence to the 6 month standard timeframe.
---	---

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE		
	Name:	Mark Jones		
	Email:	mark.jones@sse.		
	Telephone:	07810858716		
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	SSE is in favour of Option 1 as it is a simpler option to implement. Option 2 is looking to create a new record which will involve more IT development.			
Implementation Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	

E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your comments.
---	------------------------------

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities		
	Name:	Claire Edwards«e1_name»		
	Email:	Claire.edwards@wwutilities.co.uk		
	Telephone:	02920 278629/ 07879848477		
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	No preference. WWU acknowledge and accept that the SMS usage costs are approximate and support them being applied on a usage basis for each GT			
Implementation Date:	June 2020			
Xoserve preferred solution option:	N/A			
DSG preferred solution option:	N/A			

Publication of consultation response:	Publish
---------------------------------------	---------

E2: Xserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your comments.
---	------------------------------

Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4850
Solution Details:	Receive End Consumer data using existing record type
Implementation Date:	26/06/2020
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	07/08/2019

Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2489.14 - RT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN4850- Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters
Comm Date:	18/11/2019

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For representation
Close Out Date:	02/12/2019

G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4850
Change Class:	Functional System and File Format Changes
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Shippers Users Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) Independent Gas Transporter (IGTs)
Change Owner:	Ellie Rogers Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com +44 1212 292 185
Background and Context:	<p>Link to CP</p> <p>Transporters (DNOs and IGTs) under the Supply Point Administration Agreement (SPAA), Schedule 42 – Transfer of Customer Data, are authorised to use agreed Customer Contact Data to proactively communicate information to Customer’s relating to their gas supplies.</p> <p>XRN4850 delivers the mechanism for Transporters to communicate with Customers for this purpose. There are two proposed functions to allow Transporters to communicate with Customers. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ‘Broadcast’ function <i>This allows Transporters to instruct the CDSP to send a communication (email or SMS) to a defined set of Customers. The Customers can be defined by address.</i> 2. ‘Extract’ function <i>This allows Transporters to access Customer details on a single MPRN basis via the UK Link Portal to communicate to the selected Customer.</i>

	<p>Transporters are authorised to use Customer Contact Data as defined in SPAA Schedule 42, in the event of any of the following 5 Use Cases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unplanned Interruptions 2. Planned interruptions 3. Gas Safety Regs Cut-off 4. Contact for Multiple Occupancy Building 5. Payment of Guaranteed Standard of Performance Payment <p>For further details on the 5 Use Cases and the obligations set out in Schedule 42, please see the link to the SPAA website and the SPAA Change Proposal 443: https://www.spaa.co.uk/change/provision-of-customer-contact-data-to-transporters/</p> <p>Change Proposal XRN4850 was raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this SPAA Change Proposal and the link to this XRN can be found below: https://www.xoserve.com/change/change-proposals/xrn-4850-notification-of-customer-contact-details-to-transporters/</p>
--	---

G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration
Non-Functional:	A migration plan should be considered ahead of implementation
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW, SAP PO, AMT, UK link Portal
User(s):	DNO, IGT, Shipper
Documentation:	File formats and Rejection Codes – see below
Other:	NA

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy, Format or Record Agreed
CNF	NA	NA	Occurrence	Hierarchy
CFR	NA	NA	Occurrence	Hierarchy
TRF	NA	NA	Occurrence	Hierarchy
C37	NA	NA	REQUESTED_END_DATE description change	Record
CNF, CFR, TRF, CNC, CNR	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and new associated fields	Record
CSS, CRS, TRS	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and new associated fields	Record

G5: Change Design Description

XRN4850 has 3 main elements which are receiving the Customer contact details from Suppliers via the Shippers, the 'broadcast' functionality and the 'extract' functionality. Below provides the details of each of these elements and the proposed changes / associated impacts.

Receiving Customer contact details for 'broadcast' and 'extract (*Information for Shipper Users*):

This change requires Customer contact details to be provided to the CDSP by Suppliers via their Shipper for the details to be used by Transporters for the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality as detailed within the 'Background and Context' section.

Customer contact details for the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality can be provided by the Supplier via their Shipper during Confirmation (CNF hierarchy – Confirmation Request) or Customer Amendment (CNC hierarchy– Customer Amendment).

A new Contact Type will be created within the S66 – Contact Details record for Suppliers (via their Shippers) to provide the Customer contact details to be used as part of the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality. This new Contact Type will be 'BRO'.

The proposed amendments to the S66 – Contact Details record, the CNF hierarchy, the associated response file – CFR – Confirmation Response hierarchy and the Transfer of Ownership hierarchy – TRF are detailed below:

- Amendment to the S66 – Contact Details record to allow Customer contact details to be provided for 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality.
- The following new fields will be added to S66 record within CNF – Confirmation Request hierarchy, CNC – Customer Amendment hierarchy, CFR – Confirmation Response hierarchy, CNR – Customer Amendment Response hierarchy and TRF – Supply Meter Point Ownership Notification hierarchy.

1. Customer Name
2. Contact Name
3. Contact Telephone Number
4. Contact Email address.
5. Customer Email 1
6. Customer Email 2
7. Customer Email 3
8. Customer Email 4
9. Customer Telephone 1
10. Customer Telephone 2
11. Customer Telephone 3
12. Customer Telephone 4
13. Customer Mailing Address
14. Preferred contact Method

Please see below link to the updated S66 record for review and approval:

<https://www.xserve.com/media/7629/s66-contact-details-v3fa.pdf>

1. When a Shipper provides the Customer contact details using Contact Type 'BRO' within the CNF hierarchy, the Customer Name must be provided and at least one Email or Telephone number (this can be a Customer Email or Telephone or the Contact Email or Telephone).

1. If this information is not provided when using the 'BRO' Contact Type, the CNF will be rejected, and the corresponding CFR will be sent.
2. A new Rejection Code is being proposed for this scenario - 'CTT00047' – 'Broadcast Email or Telephone not provided'

The updated Shipper Rejection Codes are attached later in the Change Pack for review and approval.

2. Please note Shippers can send Contact Type 'BRO' along with existing Contact Types EMR and CON during Confirmation (within the CNF hierarchy) for Large Supply Points (S38 – LSP Confirmation hierarchy). Contact Type 'BRO' and 'CON' can be sent by Shippers for Small Supply Points (S42 – SSP Confirmation hierarchy).
3. To accommodate and allow the addition of the new Contact Type 'BRO', the occurrences of the S66 record are being increased:
 1. Within the CNF for the S38 – LSP Confirmation hierarchy, the S66 occurrences has increased from 6 to 7
 2. Within the CNF for the S42 – SSP Confirmation hierarchy, the S66 occurrences has increased from 1 to 2.
 3. Within the TRF the number of S66 occurrences has been increase from 6 to 7.

The occurrences within the corresponding outbound hierarchy (CFR) will also be amended to accommodate this change.

Please note within SPAA Schedule 42, Suppliers are only obligated to provide Customer Contact Data for customers with an annual consumption of up to 1,464,000kWh. The CDSP will accept 'BRO' Contact Type details within the S38 – LSP Confirmation but would not expect this Contact Type to be used for sites with an AQ above 1,463,000kWh.

Please see the links to the updated CNF, CFR and TRF hierarchies for review and approval:

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7627/cnf-hierarchy-v6fa.pdf>

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7637/cfr-hierarchy-v10fa.pdf>

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7634/trf-hierarchy-v11fa.pdf>

4. Although the S66 record occurrences have been increased to allow the addition of the 'BRO' Contact Type, we are not expecting more than 1 'BRO' Contact Type to be provided per Supply Meter Point.
5. To prevent more than 1 'BRO' and CON Contact Type being provided for a Supply Meter Point, a new rule will be applied to the CNF hierarchy.
 1. The system will not accept 2 CON or 2 'BRO' Contact Types to be sent at the same time.
Please note, the existing rules for the EMR Contact Type will remain unchanged (up to 5 EMR Contact Types can be provided)
 2. If multiple CON or 'BRO' Contact Types are provided the CNF will reject and the corresponding CFR will be sent.
 3. A new Rejection Code is being proposed for this scenario – 'CTT00048' – 'Number of Contact Types provided exceed the permissible limit'

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

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7632/shared-supply-meter-point-transfer-of-owner-template-trs-file-formats-v3fa.pdf>

1. The S66 record is also present within the CSS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Request Template, CRS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Response Template and TRS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Transfer of Ownership Notification Template. These templates will also be updated to reflect the new S66 record. Please note that Shippers will not be able to send the new Contact Type 'BRO' within the CSS template. The update is purely to ensure there is consistency across the S66 record. To confirm there are no proposed changes for SSMP sites.
2. Please note if a Shipper submits Contact Type 'BRO' within the Shared Supply Meter Point Templates, this will result in a rejection. Rejection Code CTT00023 – 'Invalid Contact Type' will be sent.

Please see the links below to the updated CSS, CRS, TRS template for review and approval:

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7631/shared-supply-meter-point-confirmation-response-template-crs-v3fa.pdf>

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7632/shared-supply-meter-point-transfer-of-owner-template-trs-file-formats-v3fa.pdf>

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7630/shared-supply-meter-point-confirmation-file-template-css-v2fa.pdf>

Please note that the CRS and TRS have also been updated with proposed amendments as part of another change in scope of June 2020 (XRN4871B). The changes to the CRS and TRS within XRN4871B and XRN4850 will be treated independently (therefore the proposed amendments for XRN4871B are not present within the attached CRS and TRS files). Once the outcome of the changes are known, the proposed amendments will be amalgamated into one version for each file ready to be set live.

The following section details the proposed logic and associated changes for utilising the 'BRO' Contact Type within the CNC – Customer Amendments hierarchy.

1. Currently within the CNC hierarchy, Shippers can only update Contact Type CON. This change proposes that the Shippers can also submit the CNC to update Contact Type 'BRO'.
1. CNC hierarchy is proposed for Shippers to be able to use to add, amend or delete Customer details provided under Contact Type 'BRO'.
1. To add or amend 'BRO' Contact Type data using the CNC hierarchy, Contact Type 'BRO' within the S66 record should be submitted and include the relevant Customer data. Please note, there should only be 1 'BRO' Contact Type submitted for a Supply Meter Point. If a 'BRO' Contact Type is submitted, any existing data held in UK Link for this Contact Type for that specific Supply Meter Point will be replaced with the data within the latest 'BRO' Contact Type. This will not remove or amend any existing data we hold under Contact Type CON.
2. To only remove 'BRO' Contact Type data (leaving the CON Contact Type data), Shippers can submit the CNC hierarchy and the S66 record with Contact Type

'BRO' with the relevant data fields blank. This will remove the 'BRO' Contact Type details from UK Link. Please note, removing 'BRO' Contact Type data this way will not impact the CON Contact Type data (including Priority Service Register data) we hold on UK Link.

Please note, where the Shipper sends an S66 record with Contact Type 'BRO' and all the associated fields blank within the CNC hierarchy, this **will not** be rejected. This is because sending blank data for Contact Type 'BRO' within the CNC is the how Shippers can instruct the CDSP to end date and remove 'BRO' Contact Type data held on UK Link systems.

Please be aware that the 'BRO' Contact Type details will be end dated and removed from UK Link in the following scenarios:

- The C37 – Customer End Date Request record functionality will be enhanced to remove 'BRO' Contact Type data as well as End Consumer and Customer data. This means when a Shipper submit the C37 record within the CNC hierarchy, all End Consumer, Customer and 'BRO' data held will be end dated and removed from UK Link. A description update is being proposed for the C37 record to confirm that 'BRO' Contact Type data will also be end dated and removed.

Please see attached a link to the updated C37 for review and approval:

<https://www.xserve.com/media/7620/c37-customer-end-date-request.pdf>

- When the S66 record is submitted within the CNC hierarchy for Contact Type 'BRO' and the associated fields are blank, any existing data held for 'BRO' will be end dated and removed.
- When the GEA – Generic Organisation Entity Amendment hierarchy is submitted by the Shipper and there is a change of Supplier, all 'BRO' Contact Type data held will be end dated and removed from UK Link.
- When the CNF hierarchy is submitted by the Shipper and there is a Shipper Transfer or Reconfirmation (change of Shipper and or Supplier), all 'BRO' Contact Type data will be end dated and removed.

For the avoidance of doubt, there are **no** proposed amendments to the current Transporter portfolio files to include the detail submitted within Contact Type 'BRO'.

*To confirm, the associated Transporter portfolio files are as follows:
IDL, IQL, EDL, EQL and EWS*

'Broadcast' and 'extract' functionality (Information for Transporters):

The CDSP will receive and store the Customer contact details provided under Contact Type 'BRO'. Transporters will be able to request that a broadcast notification is sent to specific Customers or extract a single MPRN Customer contact details in the event of any of the 5 Use Cases provided. This is a proposed new service that the CDSP will provide to Transporters and will enable them to communicate with Customers when certain situations arise.

Please note that the requesting Transporter will see **no** Customer details provided under the 'BRO' Contact Type when requesting for a 'broadcast' notification to be issued by the CDSP.

Transporters will only see Customer details held under Contact Type 'BRO' upon an 'extract' request. Please note, the 'extract' request will be on an individual Supply Meter Point basis and Transporters **will not** be able to view multiple Customer details held under 'BRO' utilising this functionality.

Please see below the details for 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality:

1. Xoserve UK Link Portal page will be enhanced for Transporters to include the broadcast and extract services.
2. Please note that only Transporter Authorised Users/Super Users will be able to access and utilise the broadcast and extract functionality. Each Transporter will be expected to provide a list of users who should have the authority to access and utilise the broadcast or extract functionality (or both). This authorisation will be held in a permissions matrix within the UK Link Portal. A user who is not authorised to utilise the 'broadcast' or 'extract' functionality will not be able to gain access.
3. There will be 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality on the sidebar of the menu within UK Link Portal for Transporters
4. For a Transporter to trigger a 'broadcast' request, the following information is required.
 1. Date for communication to be broadcast (mandatory)
 2. Broadcast Reason – *must select one of the 5 Use Cases from a dropdown (mandatory)*
 3. Delivery Option – *must select one of three options - email, SMS or both (mandatory)*
 4. Message text - *SMS text has a limitation of 150 characters including spaces and Email text has a limitation of 500 characters including spaces. Please note, when the broadcast request is accepted, the message populated by Transporters will be issued to the specified Customers (mandatory to provide SMS and Email text if the request is to broadcast to both)*
 5. Upload file – *a file which must contain a valid Principal Street and full Post Code to send the broadcast notification to*
 6. Exit Zone – *please note if Exit Zone is chosen then upload file option will be disabled for this request. For example, EM1*

Please note Transporters can provide either an upload file (5) or an Exit Zone (6). Only one can be provided within a 'broadcast' request
7. Links – *The messages should ensure that any links are conveyed as such within the message content to enable the recipient of a message to easily access this (optional)*

Please see attached a link to the screenshot of the proposed 'broadcast' request screen:

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7617/broadcast-screenshot.jpg>

1. If the 'broadcast' request passes the required validations it will be sent to the SMS Service provider to issue the SMS and Emails.
Please note if there are any validation failures, the broadcast notification will be suspended, and email will be sent to the requesting Transporter User.
2. When a broadcast request is proposed for a specific date in the future, the request will be stored and delivered on the required date.
3. For 'extract' functionality, Authorised Users can search for a site by MPRN or based on address provided (Principal Street, Post Code). 1 of the 5 Use Cases must be provided for the details to be provided.

Please see attached a link to the screenshot for the 'extract' functionality screen:

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7628/extract-screenshot.jpg>

4. The Customer contact data held under 'BRO' Contact Type will be visible to the Authorised User following the search and can be download within CSV format.

Please note, Transporters will only be able to request a broadcast notification or extract Customer contact details for sites within their portfolio or where they have explicit permission to contact sites outside their portfolio

Reporting 'broadcast' notifications

A summary report will be available which will have the number notifications broadcasted against the requestor (Transporter) and the Use Case for issuing the notification. This is an ad-hoc report which can be requested by Transporters.

The following fields will be available within the report:

1. Broadcasted notification requested by
2. Number of Customer broadcast notifications requested for
3. Use Case for broadcast
4. Number of hits by each broadcast reason for a date range

Reporting 'extract' information.

A report will be available which detail where the Customer contact details have been viewed.

The following high-level fields will be available in the report:

1. Broadcast contact details viewed by
2. Date and time of viewing
3. Number of hits by Transporter
4. Use Case for extract

G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	SPAA Change Proposal 443 - Provision of customer contact data to Transporters
------------------------------------	---

G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	Click here to enter a date.
Any further information:	XRN4850 has previously been developed and discussed at DSG with a proposed recommended solution provided.

G8: Implementation

Target Release:	June 2020 Release
Status:	For approval

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

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	NGN	
	Name:	Helen Chandler	
	Email:	HChandler@northerngas.co.uk	
	Telephone:	07580704123	
Representation Status:	Support		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	<p>NGN is supportive of the proposed request screens and detailed design of the functions for the new Customer Contacts portal. We have no comments regarding the changes to Shipper records, file hierarchies, rejection codes or templates. We would still like to request more details regarding costs for the SMS Service Provider once they become available.</p>		
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»	

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. In terms of the SMS Service Provider costs, we will as requested provide more details when they are available.		
---	---	--	--

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities	
	Name:	Claire Edwards	

	Email:	Claire.Edwards@wwutilities.co.uk
	Telephone:	02920278629
Representation Status:	Customer Experience Manager	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	<p>Under the section 'Broadcast' and 'extract' functionality (Information for Transporters) - it says:-</p> <p>“Transporters will only see Customer details held under Contact Type 'BRO' upon an 'extract' request. Please note, the 'extract' request will be on an individual Supply Meter Point basis and Transporters will not be able to view multiple Customer details held under 'BRO' utilising this functionality”</p> <p>The highlighted sentence is slightly ambiguous We agree that the extract function will only allow details relating of one MPRN to be extracted but we need to be able to see all the customer contact data for that one MPRN..</p> <p>Also</p> <p>4 Message text - SMS text has a limitation of 150 characters including spaces and Email text has a limitation of 500 characters including spaces. Please note, when the broadcast request is accepted, the message populated by Transporters will be issued to the specified Customers (mandatory to provide SMS and Email text if the request is to broadcast to both) –</p> <p>Can the message be easily copied and pasted if the text is to be the same for both? It is however good to have the option to send more information by email if required.</p> <p>With regards to the next point: -</p> <p>1. Upload file – a file which must contain a valid Principal Street and full Post Code to send the broadcast notification to</p> <p>We need to be able to search of part post codes in the broadcast function e.g. in a supply loss incident, we could need to send messages to all customers with a CF23 *** post code</p> <p>With point 6 – what is meant by “exit zone” below and how and why will this option then be disabled?</p> <p>6 Exit Zone – please note if Exit Zone is chosen then upload file option will be disabled for this request. For example, EM1</p> <p>Finally, there is no mention of reports for successful and unsuccessful delivery of texts/emails to each email/phone number. There is also no mention in here that the message will go to all</p>	

	available numbers and email addresses where there is more than one for an address.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	June 2020 release

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>"Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. You are correct regarding the 'extract' request only being on an individual SMP basis. If the request passes validation, the Transporter will get visibility of the contact details for that particular SMP.</p> <p>In terms of the message text being used for the SMS and email, the wording for both can be copied into the relevant screen to request the broadcast notification.</p> <p>For the Upload file, as currently drafted, we expected the full Post Code to be provided but we will feed this back to the design team regarding whether part Post Code searches can be accommodated.</p> <p>An Exit Zone is a general code representing a geographical area where a SMP is located e.g. WM1 = West Midlands 1. Transporters can either provide Principle Street and Post Codes to issue the broadcast notification to or select a whole Exit Zone. If Exit Zone is selected for that broadcast request, a specific Post Code and Principle Street cannot also be selected. If Exit Zone is unlikely to be used by Transporters due to the volume, this can be removed as a function.</p> <p>With regards to successful or unsuccessful delivery, this will need to be made available to Transporters. "</p>
---	--

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd
	Name:	Alison Price
	Email:	alison.price@npower.com
	Telephone:	07557202065
Representation Status:	Large Shipper	
Representation Publication:	Publish	

Representation Comments:	No comments	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

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

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Representation Status:	Reject	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	As per our previous response and phone conversation we Xoserve - we stand by the belief that this proposed solution is over-engineered and all that was needed was a broadcast flag - which could be used if contact type of CON. If set this would then mandate addition data. This would have mitigated the need to have made so many changes to existing records and duplication of data items being sent	
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	see comments

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. We appreciate your views regarding the solution. As this change was driven from the SPAA Change Proposal 443, the data items that Suppliers can send to the CDSP via their Shipper to be utilised in the broadcast and extract functionality were set out within the SPAA Schedule. Currently we do not hold the required data items as set out under SPAA CP443 therefore it would not be possible to utilise just a flag. We will ensure we feed your views into ChMC for a final decision.	
---	--	--

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

Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2566.6 – MT - JR
Comm Title:	XRN4850 - Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters
Comm Date:	14/04/2020

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For Representation
Close Out Date:	28/04/2020

G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4850
Change Class:	Functional System and File Format Changes
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Shippers Users Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) Independent Gas Transporter (IGTs)
Change Owner:	Ellie Rogers Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com +44 1212 292 185
Background and Context:	<p>Revised Change Pack following Industry Representation</p> <p><i>Original Change Pack was issued on 18th November 2019 (Comm Ref – 2489.14 – RT - PO)</i></p> <p><i>An updated Change Pack was then issued on 16th March 2020 (Comm Ref – 2552.2 – JLR – JR)</i></p> <p>XRN4850 delivers the mechanism for Transporters to communicate with Customers for agreed Use Cases. Change Proposal XRN4850 was raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this SPAA Change Proposal and the link to this XRN can be found below:</p> <p>https://www.xoserve.com/change/change-proposals/xrn-4850-notification-of-customer-contact-details-to-transporters/</p> <p>This Revised Change Pack is based on comments received during Industry Consultation which requested clarity on where the 'BRO' Contact Type within the S66 record can be used and where data items for this Contact Type should be provided.</p> <p>For reference, please see below the details of the previous Change Packs issued for XRN4850:</p>

	<p>The detailed design Change Pack for XRN4850 was issued in November 2019 and approved at the December Change Management Committee meeting. This included the file formats and hierarchies which are proposed to be changed as part of the delivery for this XRN. For reference please see the link to this Change Pack below (Communication reference 2489.14):</p> <p>https://www.xserve.com/change/change-packs/2489-rt-po-change-pack-november-2019/</p> <p>An updated Change Pack was issued in March 2020 to include the Interconnector file formats which were absent (RCI file format – Interconnector Confirmation Request File and TNI file format - Interconnector Transfer of Ownership File) to reflect the amended S66 record. This was a consistency update to ensure only one version of the S66 record. To confirm, this updated Change Pack only detailed the description update within the S66. For reference please see the link to this Change Pack below (Communication reference 2552.2 – JLR – JR):</p> <p>https://www.xserve.com/change/change-packs/2552-jlr-jr-change-pack-march-2020/</p>
--	--

G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration
Non-Functional:	A migration plan should be considered ahead of implementation
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW, SAP PO, AMT, UK link Portal
User(s):	DNO, IGT, Shipper
Documentation:	File formats – see below
Other:	NA

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy, Format or Record Agreed
CNF, CFR, TRF, CNC, CNR	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and new associated fields	Record
CSS, CRS, TRS	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and new associated fields	Record
TNI RCI	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and	Record

			new associated fields	
EMC CTR	Multiple	S66	Added Contact Type 'BRO' and new associated fields	Record

G5: Change Design Description

This change requires Customer contact details to be provided to the CDSP by Suppliers via their Shipper for the details to be used by Transporters for the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality.

Customer contact details for the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality can be provided by the Supplier via their Shipper during Confirmation (CNF hierarchy – Confirmation Request) or Customer Amendment (CNC hierarchy– Customer Amendment).

Please note, the changes in the occurrences of the S66 within the CNF, the response hierarchy CFR and the TRF to accommodate the addition of the new Contact Type are detailed within the original Change Pack and are published within the UK Link Manual SharePoint under Approved – Awaiting Implementation June folder.

A new Contact Type will be created within the S66 – Contact Details record for Suppliers (via their Shippers) to provide the Customer contact details to be used as part of the 'broadcast' and 'extract' functionality. This new Contact Type will be 'BRO'.

As detailed above and within the original Change Pack, Shippers can provide contact details within the CNF or the CNC.

To confirm the following data items are mandatory where the Contact Type BRO is provided to **add details** held for broadcast or extract within the CNF and CNC hierarchy:

- BR_CUSTOMER_NAME
- BR_CONTACT TEL_NUMBER
(if BR_CONTACT EMAIL_ADDRESS or at least one Customer Email or Customer Telephone is not provided)
- BR_CONTACT EMAIL_ADDRESS
(if BR_CONTACT TEL_NUMBER or at least one Customer Email or Customer Telephone is not provided)

This information is mandatory as the CDSP must hold at least piece of contact information to be stored and utilised within the 'broadcast' or 'extract' services requested by Transporters. If the mandatory data items are not provided within the S66 when using the 'BRO' Contact Type within the CNF hierarchy, Shippers will receive Rejection Code 'CTT00047'.

In terms of the CNC, the S66 record with the BRO Contact Type can be submitted to also delete the contact details held against the site.

If the S66 record is being submitted with BRO Contact Type within the CNC to **remove details**, only the Contact Type BRO must be provided, and all other data items should be blank. The following clarification has been added to the description of the relevant S66 record data fields to confirm this:

*We would expect this field to be null where you are seeking to **remove details** held under BRO Contact Type within the CNC hierarchy.*

The S66 has been updated to reflect these **description changes only** to clarify where data items are required and where they should be left blank. Please see the link to the updated S66 later within the Change Pack.

The S66 record has been confirmed to be present within the following hierarchies and file formats which require updating as part of this change:

1. CNF hierarchy – Confirmation Request (*hierarchy change approved*)
 2. CFR hierarchy – Confirmation Response (*hierarchy change approved*)
 3. TRF hierarchy – Supply Meter Point Ownership Notification File (*hierarchy change approved*)
 4. CNC hierarchy– Customer Amendment (*no hierarchy change required*)
 5. CSS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Request Template
 6. CRS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Response Template
 7. TRS file format – Shared Supply Meter Point Transfer of Ownership Notification Template.
1. RCI file format – Interconnector Confirmation Request File
 2. TNI file format - Interconnector Transfer of Ownership File

The S66 record is also present within EMC hierarchy – Emergency and Interruptible Contact Amendments File and the response, CTR – Emergency Contact Amendment Response. It was detailed within the previous Change Pack that the BRO Contact cannot be utilised within the EMC hierarchy S66 record and for the EMR contact updates this should be done via the EMC file.

Please note that Shippers will not be able to send the new Contact Type 'BRO' within the CSS template, the RCI file format or the EMC hierarchy. The update is purely to ensure there is consistency across the S66 record.

For the avoidance of doubt, no proposed changes to the EMC or CTR hierarchies are being made, they are noted for reference only as the S66 record is present as a distinct record within the hierarchies.

To confirm, if a Shipper submits Contact Type 'BRO' within the Shared Supply Meter Point Templates (CSS), the Interconnector file formats (RCI) or the EMC hierarchy, this will result in a rejection. Existing Rejection Code CTT00023 – 'Invalid Contact Type' will be sent.

Currently the S66 record confirms that the BRO Contact should not be used within the Shared Supply Meter Point templates and the Interconnector files. As per above, we are also proposing a **description change only** to confirm that the BRO Contact Type should not be used within the EMC hierarchy either.

Please see the links below to the updated S66 records which reflects the description changes to clarify the data items conditionality and where the BRO Contact Type should not be utilised for review and approval:

- [S66 CONTACT DETAILS V3.2 FA](#)
- [Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Request Template \(CSS\) V2.2FA](#)
- [Shared Supply Meter Point Confirmation Response Template \(CRS\) V3.2FA](#)
- [Shared Supply Meter Point Transfer of Ownership Notification Template \(TRS\) V3.2FA](#)

- [Interconnector Confirmation Request File \(RCI\) V3.1FA](#)
- [Interconnector Transfer of Ownership File \(TNI\) V3.1FA](#)

G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	SPAA Change Proposal 443 - Provision of customer contact data to Transporters
------------------------------------	---

G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	Click here to enter a date.
Any further information:	XRN4850 has previously been developed and discussed at DSG with a proposed recommended solution provided.

G8: Implementation

Target Release:	June 2020 Release
Status:	For approval

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

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF	
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence	
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com	
	Telephone:	07875117771	
Representation Status:	Approve		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	None		
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»	

H1: Xoserve' s Response

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

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	NGN	
	Name:	Helen Chandler	
	Email:	HChandler@northerngas.co.uk	

	Telephone:	07580704123
Representation Status:	N/A	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	Whilst NGN is supportive of this proposal, we have no comments regarding the 'BRO' contact type and the S66 record as these relate to Shippers only.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

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

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities
	Name:	Richard Pomroy
	Email:	richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk
	Telephone:	07812973337
Representation Status:	Publish	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	We are content that the file flows contain the required information but have no comment on the detailed design.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

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

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

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 Details

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 type="checkbox"/> ChMC endorsed Change Proposal	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPAA Change Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional / 3rd Party Service Request	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Customer group(s) impacted if the change is not delivered:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network
	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input type="checkbox"/> NTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Associated Change Ref Number(s):	XRN4555 (ROM)	Associated MOD Number(s):	SPAA SCP 443
Perceived delivery effort (days):	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-30		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30-60
	<input type="checkbox"/> 60-100		<input type="checkbox"/> 100+
Does the change involve the processing of personal data?	'Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' - includes MPRNS.		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (if selected please answer the next question)		<input type="checkbox"/> No
A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Technology		<input type="checkbox"/> Theft of Gas
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mass Data		<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Employee Data
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vulnerable Customer Data		<input type="checkbox"/> Fundamental changes to Xoserve
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other		<If [Other] please provide details here>
	(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact the Information Security team (Kevin Eltoft-Prest) to complete the DPIA.		
Change Beneficiary: <i>How many market participant or segments stand to benefit this change?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Participants		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Group
	<input type="checkbox"/> All 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 16: Provision of Supply Point Information Services and Other Services Required to be Provided Under Condition of the GT Licence		

Number of Service Areas Impacted:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One	<input type="checkbox"/> Two to Five	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty	<input type="checkbox"/> All	
Improvement Scale?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input type="checkbox"/> Low
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety of Supply at risk		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer(s) incurring financial loss		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer Switching at risk		
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer System Changes Required		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Testing Likely Required		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required		
Primary Application impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> BW	<input type="checkbox"/> ISU	<input type="checkbox"/> CMS
	<input type="checkbox"/> AMT	<input type="checkbox"/> EFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gemini	<input type="checkbox"/> Birst	<input type="checkbox"/> API
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Business Process Impacted:	<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	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Shippers/Networks System changes required to provide additional contact information	
	<input type="checkbox"/> No		

Workaround Details

Workaround in operation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If [No] please do <u>not</u> continue completing the [Workaround Details] section	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
Who is accountable for the workaround?	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve	<input type="checkbox"/> External Customer	<input type="checkbox"/> Both
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>	

Prioritisation Score

Change Prioritisation Score:	33%
------------------------------	-----

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	For Approval	30/01/2019	Xoserve	CP Raised
2	Out for Initial Review	14/02/2019	Xoserve	Sent out for an initial review following ChMC on 13 th February Richard Pomroy has made minor amendments within section A3 of the CP
3	Out for Initial Review	15/02/2019	Xoserve	Appendix added
4	Out for Initial Review	04/03/2019	Xoserve	Reps added following initial review
5	With DSG	15/03/2019	Xoserve	Updated with outcome from the ChMC meeting on 13 th March 2019
6	With DSG	28/03/2019	Xoserve	Funding comments updated
7	With DSG	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Updated with outcome from ChMC on 10 th April 2019
8	With DSG	26/06/2019	Xoserve	Updated with DSG discussions from meeting 17 th June 2019
9	With DSG	01/07/2019	Xoserve	Updated with DSG discussions from meeting 1 st July 2019
10	Out for review	12/07/2019	Xoserve	Updated service lines, and added section D for solution review change pack
11	Out for review	23/07/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with DSG discussions from meeting 15 th July 2019
12	Voting	06/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with reps from July's Change Pack
13	Approved	12/08/2019	Xoserve	Updated with approved solution option and release from ChMC on 7 th August 2019
14	With DSG	15/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 5 th August 2019
15	With DSG	26/11/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 18 th November 2019

16	Voting	10/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Change Pack and Reqs added from November Change Pack
17	Approved	15/05/2020	Chan Singh	Updated with the outcome from ChMC 13 th May