

# 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:	XRN 4860		
Change Title:	Projection of National UiG from Allocation through to reconciliation (Code Cut Off Date)		
Date Raised:	05/02/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Npower	
	Name:	James Rigby	
	Email:	<a href="mailto:james.rigby@npower.com">james.rigby@npower.com</a>	
	Telephone:	07557 198020	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Emma Smith	
	Email:	<a href="mailto:emma.smith@xoserve.com">emma.smith@xoserve.com</a>	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2194	
Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn

## A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>

## A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Change Description:	<p><b><u>Background</u></b></p> <p>Since Nexus implementation there has been a significant cumulative delta between energy that is referred to as 'permanent' UiG, and the energy referred to as 'temporary' UiG. Temporary UiG (thought to be caused by a mixture of profiling and data inaccuracies / inefficient data performance issues) is energy that is originally allocated to shippers based on their expected share of throughput in any given Local Distribution Zone and their customer portfolio mix, as per annual weighting factors set by the Allocation Of Unidentified Gas Expert (AGUE). Temporary UiG is adjusted (down or up from initial</p>
---------------------	--

allocation) as a result of meter point reconciliation across the market.

It is understood that temporary UiG volume will, over time, crystallise into permanent UiG, when any given consumption month moves beyond its respective reconciliation close-out (D + 12 months in the case of UiG reconciliation and Line In The Sand for MPRN reconciliation).

### **Trends**

Cumulative post-Nexus levels of temporary UiG have remained higher than expected since Nexus go-live, despite 18 months of meter point reconciliation having now occurred. The trend between June 2017 and the end of gas year 2017/18 was that reconciliation reduced levels of UiG initially allocated to shippers based on their portfolio mix (Class / EUC). However, this reduction was not at a pace sufficient enough to reach any recognised industry quantification of permanent UiG.

Since the start of Gas Year 2018/19 when newly 'uplifted' Annual Load Profiles / Daily Adjustment Factors came into effect for EUC 01B and 02B, the pattern has changed, with allocated UiG being much more moderate and subsequent reconciliation increasing the initial UiG volume. It is not yet clear to what extent this increase will accumulate.

### **Suggested Approach**

There is currently no independent view as to when levels of temporary UiG will reach permanency. This change request seeks to procure a budget (ideally from existing / remaining UiG Task Force funds) for CDSP subject matter experts to analyse the available industry data to provide a central national 'forecast' for UiG reconciliation.

This should initially focus on the trends (allocation / reconciliation) to date, to report how the national cumulative level of temporary UiG (for each consumption month / LDZ level) will change over the coming [18 months], with the output being reported both as a % (of national throughput) and KWh value.

This initial analysis should work on the basis of as-is industry patterns, including shipper read performance and be 'updatable' on a monthly basis as these conditions change.

The analysis might also include how CDSP recommendations (both existing and future) are expected to impact the veracity of amendment to allocated UiG levels.

It is proposed that progress and output from this analysis should be communicated with the appropriate UNC Committees (DESC/ PAC).

### **Terminology**

With reference to the above:

Temporary UiG – refers to UiG at the point of allocation

	Permanent UiG – refers to UiG after reconciliation has taken place and/or code cut off date	
Proposed Release:	Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<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]

#### A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	A central / indicative forecast of national temporary UiG will enable shippers to understand how their initial UiG allocation might evolve under the current market conditions of the day.
	<i>What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?</i>
Benefit Realisation:	Following analysis
	<i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i>
Benefit Dependencies:	
	<i>Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change, this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the projects has not got direct control of.</i>

#### 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 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		

#### A6: Funding

Funding Classes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	100 %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <please specify>	XX %
Service Line(s)	Service Area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC	
ROM or funding details:		
Funding Comments:	28/03/2019 – The DSC Service Lines may need to be reviewed for	

	this change.
--	--------------

### A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019 / 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 / 10<sup>th</sup> 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 type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days		<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	15/03/2019		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	15/02/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2234.5 – RJ - ES	
Number of Responses:	6 responses received – 5 approved the change in principle, the other was a deferral.	
Comments	13/03/2019 - Change to be presented for approval to proceed to DSG in April.	

### A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Please select.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	Please select.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Please select.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	Please select.	
Meeting Date:	Click here to enter a date.		
Release Date:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA		
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If [Yes] please specify <Release>

Please send the completed forms to: [box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com](mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com)

# Section B: Change Proposal Initial Review

To be removed if no consultation is required; or alternatively collated post consultation

## B1: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Orsted
	Name:	Lorna Lewin
	Email:	lolew@orsted.co.uk
	Telephone:	0207 451 1974

## B1: 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

*Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds?*

*If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)*

We do not support this change being funded by the existing UIG taskforce. This taskforce was specifically created to provide an independent root cause analysis on the UIG volatility. Whilst there may be benefits from this change request, we believe that any funding should be managed separately and not influence the focus/budget of the work currently being undertaken by the taskforce.

*If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)*

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 would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.

We have not been able to do any analysis on the impact of this change, so unable to comments on any benefits to our organisation.

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)

4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

Please send the completed forms to: [uklink@xserve.com](mailto:uklink@xserve.com)

## B2: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com">Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com</a>
	Telephone:	07816 172 645

## B2: 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><i>Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds??</i></p> <p><i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)</i></p> <p>We support the proposal and are in support of utilising existing Shipper funds if the task force has the financial availability.</p> <p>We would support this being delivered within fair and consistent deliverables and not at the expense of any existing changes.</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. We would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.			
We believe there will be benefits but have been unable to fully quantify these to confirm if the assumptions are correct. We believe if this is not as beneficial as anticipated that the solution can be reversed.			
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 would consider a minor a release but would complete a solution assessment to ensure that no system impacts occur to push for a major release and 6 months' notice.			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.			
We would prefer UIG Task Force funding, however, should this not be possible we would be accepting of 100% Shipper funding.			
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

### B3: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Gazprom Energy
	Name:	Steve Mulinganie
	Email:	Steve.mulinganie@gazprom-energy.com
	Telephone:	

### B3: 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><i>Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds?</i></p> <p><i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)</i></p> <p>No</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. We would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.			
Yes			
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)			
N/A			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.			
<p>The CP is marked as 100% shipper but infers it could be completed under the currently allocated UIG Taskforce budget. We have some concerns regarding this proposal.</p> <p>However, if the taskforce (Xoserve) themselves felt the proposal should be funded out of the taskforce budget then that would be ok.</p> <p>What we don't want is the task forces independence compromised</p>			
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
---	---	----------------------------------

## B4: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power
	Name:	Claire Louise Roberts
	Email:	<a href="mailto:ClaireLouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com">ClaireLouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com</a>
	Telephone:	

## 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			
<p><i>Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds?</i></p> <p><i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)</i></p> <p>No. The additional data and analysis will provide more visible insight into the sensitivities surrounding UIG, so participants can be more able to predict likely final cost to their business.</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. We would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.			
Yes, benefits are to be expected as per the proposal, through the wider understanding of trend and performance information impacting UIG movement/reconciliation.			
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)			
Yes			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.			
We would prefer UIG Task Force funding, particularly for the initial analysis proposed.			
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

## B5: User Details

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

## B5: 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><i>Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds?</i></p> <p><i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)</i></p> <p>We have not identified any material risk/ cost to our businesses.</p> <p>No, we would not support this change being funded from existing UiG taskforce funds, because the UiG taskforce funding is finite and should be used only for investigating the causes of UiG, rather than on reporting. The change should be funded by Shippers.</p> <p><i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail)</i></p>
<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. We would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.</p> <p>Yes, we believe that the analysis and subsequent report will be useful.</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>Yes, we would support implementation within a minor release.</p>
<p>4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.</p> <p>Yes</p>

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@xserve.com](mailto:uklink@xserve.com)

## B6: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower
	Name:	<a href="mailto:Gas.Codes@npower.com">Gas.Codes@npower.com</a>
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Gas.Codes@npower.com">Gas.Codes@npower.com</a>
	Telephone:	<a href="mailto:Gas.Codes@npower.com">Gas.Codes@npower.com</a>

## 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			
No			
<i>Additional Point: DSC Change Managers has specifically requested reviewers to assess if they would support this change being funded from the existing UiG taskforce funds?</i>			
<i>In principle yes, but would expect this decision to be taken once the work has been costed.</i>			
<i>If in support of this change being funded from UiG taskforce do you consider this to be a higher priority than current recommended actions (please see link for more detail</i>			
A forward view of post-reconciled UiG at a national level should be seen as a priority.			
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 would also like to understand where you think this change stands in the priority of all UIG related changes.			
All shippers would benefit from having a greater insight as to how their initial exposure to UiG will evolve via amendment. As such, it should be seen as a priority alongside other root cause solutions to UiG, as promoted by the relevant UiG workgroups / DSC / UNC Committees .			
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)			
A minor release would be sufficient and preferable – there is no functional change required for shippers.			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 3: Record, submit data in compliance with UNC. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other.			
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:	18/02/2019
DSG Summary:	ES presented the Change Proposal to DSG. ES explained that this Change Proposal was sent out in the Change Pack on Friday for initial review, 20 day consultation period. ES provided an overview of the requirements specified in the Change Proposal; its purpose trying to provide a view to shippers about what we conceive to be temporary position. Complex change and potentially funded from UIG taskforce funding, however Xoserve have also been given the go ahead to continue with taskforce work also, . There are specific question to consider in the Change Pack.
Capture Document / Requirements:	N/A
DSG Recommendation:	N/A
DSG Recommended Release:	N/A

### C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	03/06/2019
DSG Summary:	<p>James Hallam Jones (JHJ) presented this change and stated this change was raised due to Shippers seeing high levels of UIG and is not reconciling out with what was expected by the Shippers. Xoserve has been challenged with providing forecasts of what the final level of UIG will be.</p> <p>This is quite a complex bit of analysis with a couple of options, JHJ stated</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> is for Xoserve to analyse the high level market wide reconciliation.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> is Xoserve's recommended option and will be to use the analytics partner who has been used by the UIG task force to analyse detailed market wide reconciliation data and metering data to identify trends and create a robust forecast of potential rec levels. Estimated cost of work is circa £105k, subject to change if customers wanted a model rather than a predicted number as an output. JHJ clarified that the £105k estimated cost is the Analytics Partner Cost only, Xoserve cost is TBC.</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> We need to scale up our analytics capabilities which are on the road map which there will be tools coming in to use towards the end of this year. Once the timeline is worked out, it will be scheduled for implementation by all the way to April and summer next year.</p> <p>Sean cooper asked if there is any option to blend option 2 and option 3 so that techniques and tools used by the Analytics partner can be transferred in-house when Xoserve has implemented its analytics capability. JHJ</p>

	responded by stating that he will have discussions around the portability of the tools so that there is potential for us to continue this work in-house if this analysis requires updating on a continual basis. This should be possible in principle as the code developed for the UIG Task Force analysis is portable.
Capture Document / Requirements:	N/A
DSG Recommendation:	N/A
DSG Recommended Release:	N/A

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ChMC endorsed Change Proposal	
	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	<input 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):	N/A	Associated MOD Number(s):	N/A
Perceived delivery effort (days):	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 30-60	
	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes (if selected please answer the next question)
			<input checked="" 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 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 Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) 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 type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Group
	<input type="checkbox"/> All UK Gas Market Participants	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Only
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One Market Group	<input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area:	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations	
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 type="checkbox"/> High	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety of Supply at risk	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer(s) incurring financial loss	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer Switching at risk	
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer System Changes Required	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer Testing Likely Required	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required	
Primary Application impacted:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BW	<input type="checkbox"/> ISU <input type="checkbox"/> CMS
	<input type="checkbox"/> AMT	<input type="checkbox"/> EFT <input type="checkbox"/> IX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gemini	<input type="checkbox"/> Birst <input type="checkbox"/> API
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>
Business Process Impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> AQ	<input type="checkbox"/> SPA <input type="checkbox"/> RGMA
	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads	<input type="checkbox"/> Portal <input type="checkbox"/> Invoicing
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	UIG
Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<If [Yes] please provide details here>
	<input checked="" 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:	31%
------------------------------	-----

## Version Control

---

### Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	For Approval	05/02/2019	Xoserve	CP Raised
2	For Approval	13/02/2019	Xoserve	Appendix added
3	With DSG and out for an initial review	14/02/2019	Xoserve	Notes from ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> February added and send out for an initial review
4	With DSG and out for an initial review	26/02/2019	Xoserve	Ratification of the prioritisation score with DSG
5	With DSG and out for an initial review	04/03/2019	Xoserve	Reps added during initial review
6	With DSG and out for an initial review	15/03/2019	Xoserve	Output from ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March added
7	With DSG and out for an initial review	18/03/2019	Xoserve	Reps added following completion of the initial review consultation

8	With DSG and out for an initial review	28/03/2019	Xoserve	Funding comments updated
9	With DSG	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Updated with ChMC outcome from 10 <sup>th</sup> April 2019
10	With DSG	11/06/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with DSG discussion from 3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2019

## Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Superseded	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018.
4.0	Superseded	07/09/2018	Emma Smith	Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1.
5.0	Superseded	10/12/2018	Heather Spensley	Template moved to new Word template as part of Corporate Identity changes.
6.0	Approved	12/12/2018	Simon Harris	Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018.