

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:	XRN4851		
Change Title:	Moving Market Participant Ownership from SPAA to UNC/DSC		
Date Raised:	31/01/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	E.ON	
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley	
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com	
	Telephone:	07816 172 645	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Dave Addison	
	Email:	david.addison@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 type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implemented

A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	All DSC Customers and SPAA Parties

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Change Description:	<p>**This proposal is to be part of a suite of changes which are also being raised in the SPAA, UNC and IGT UNC – the changes are yet to be formally accepted into the change process, Mod/SCP numbers will be added to this change once formally known**</p> <p>As part of the Switching Programme there is an intent to move the activities relating to creation and management of Market Participants within Market Domain Data (MDD) from the Supply Point Administrative Agreement (SPAA) into the Uniform Network Code (UNC). The intent will be for the UNC to direct the activities to be conducted by the DSC Agreement.</p> <p>The primary aim of this XRN is to 'lift and shift' the current MDD Market Participant process from SPAA into the DSC. It may require</p>
---------------------	--

	<p>formatting changes of the current SPAA table to align it to UK Link standard (to be outlined as part of capture). But the intent is not to redevelop or align to electricity at this stage.</p> <p>This XRN is to deliver the necessary enabling changes to move Market Participant management (creation, name changes, deletions etc) into the DSC. This will be subject to a guidance document.</p> <p>The change process to manage these MDD changes will also be developed as part of these changes. The change process will be developed further in conjunction with the capture process.</p> <p>The target date is currently Feb 2020 to ensure it is implemented and working smoothly in time for integration testing. It is important that changes in SPAA, UNC, UK Link and the IGT UNC all deliver at the same time or in an order which doesn't cause process disruption.</p> <p>The consultation period can be suggested by DSG.</p>	
Proposed Release:	Feb 2020	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input 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:	The benefit is to deliver the Ofgem switching intention of moving MDD Market Participants from SPAA to UNC/DSC.	
	<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:	From implementation.	
	<i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i>	
Benefit Dependencies:	None identified at this time, maybe identified as the change evolves.	
	<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:	<p>11/04/2019 – Service area updated from 1 to 3; this causes no change in who pays for the service.</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>	

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 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 th March 2019		
Comments	13/03/2019 –the consultation period for this change is still in progress, and will end on Friday 15 th March. This change was presented to ChMC only to give an update on the progress of the consultation period. Change to be presented for approval to proceed to DSG in April.		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	15/02/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2234.3 – RJ – ES	
Number of Responses:	6 responses received – 5 approved the change in principle, the other one was a deferral.	

A7: ChMC Recommendation – 08/01/20 (Solution Approval)

Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<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 responses (to Xoserve)	02/01/2020
Comments	

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	16/12/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2505.5 - JLR - JR	
Number of Responses:	4 approval responses received	

A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Approve
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	Please select.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Approve
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	Approve
Meeting Date:	08/01/2020	
Release Date:	Release X: Adhoc 28/02/2020	
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

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

XRN4851 – Transfer of MDD Management from SPAA to UNC (DSC)

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 as a result of this proposal; however, we would like confirmation of the delivery mechanism to be used for communicating new Market Participants to the industry. We currently receive an email from SPAA at no additional cost to us which we then forward on to internal teams; however, if system changes or a new delivery mechanism are required, this may cause NGN to incur internal costs.			
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 have not identified any specific benefits to NGN from this change; however, we understand that Ofgem wishes for this transfer to be made to support their Switching Programme and the eventual closure of the SPAA when it is replaced by the Retail Energy Code (REC).			
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 support implementation within a minor release as long as there are no system changes or new delivery mechanism required for the communication of new Market Participants. Our preference would be for the delivery mechanism to remain as email as this should not require any particular lead time.			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?			
Yes, we agree that this change should be 100% Shipper funded as this is the current funding arrangement within SPAA for Market Participant and Market Domain Data (MDD) management.			
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:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.Com
	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		
The changes proposed will have impacts to our organisation and will have a cost associated but to identify the actual costs and to confirm if they are significant or not we require the detailed CDSP solution.		
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.		
This is being directed by Ofgem via the Switching Programme but we do believe there will be a benefit to the market and will begin to bring similarities to electricity. This initial proposal is not looking to align with elec but instead focus on moving to a new location, however, future enhancements could see further alignments in the MDD activities.		
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)		
No, we would not support a minor release, this would need to be a major release with at least 6 months' notice and also delivered in line with the SPAA, UNC and IGT UNC changes (yet to be formally raised). The CDSP will lead the changes but to ensure successful delivery all change proposals need to be delivered as a suite.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
We are happy to support 100% Shipper funding; however, the process also benefits the DNs and the IGTs, we would like to review the possibility of proportionate funding for this solution.		
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:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875 117771

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>The move to UNC itself will not cause a risk to our organisation, however the move should not happen without an agreed and transparent governance process. Any change to MDD data should have an opportunity for review and comment prior to final confirmation with sufficient/standard/agreed notice period of intended changes.</p> <p>In order to see the benefits - a central repository should be visible to all.</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>We agree that we need one owner only of MDD data as this has been a problem in past where Xoserve and SPAA are not aligned so this change will benefit the industry.</p> <p>We should consider future proofing this process and consider whether responsibility could sit under the REC for both gas and electricity as a single process and whether this is feasible.</p> <p>Please see comments in section 1 for conditions.</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)		
No notice would be required for the move to UNC itself – however see comments in section 1 for notice required for changes to MDD data either as part of alignment activity or enduring changes		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
N/A		
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:	Npower
	Name:	Amie Charalambous
	Email:	Gas.Codes@npower.com
	Telephone:	07917271763

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		
Whilst we understand the intent of this change we, would like to see further development of this change so that a proper assessment can be made		
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)		
Potentially we could support a minor release however we would require at least six months implementation lead time from the point of approval		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
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	

B5: User Details

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

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		
There may be an impact to our internal systems. It is not possible to know the level of impact at present, so it is difficult to say whether this would result in material cost.		
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.		
Yes, by fulfilling the Ofgem switching intention of moving MDD Market Participants from SPAA to UNC/DSC.		
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. We request a minimum of 4 months lead time ahead of implementation.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% 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:	Wales & West Utilities
	Name:	Richard Pomroy
	Email:	Richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk
	Telephone:	029 2027 8552 or 07812 973337

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, we think it reduces risk by removing handoffs between Xoserve and SPAA.		
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.		
It should speed up the process of approving new ids and should facilitate a more rigorous approach and remove the risk of inconsistencies between ids used in different systems.		
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)		
The process change can be implemented at any time but we realise that the data cleanse is likely to have impacts that need to be coordinated.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration. The funding for this area is 100% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 0% 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 type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	04/03/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>DA stated that from November 19, Xoserve have to give Ofgem Market Participant Identities for the CSS programme. With the introduction of REC version 2 CDSP will be responsible for Gas Market Participant data. There will be some impacts to UKLink however it will be down to CDSP and not SPAA to supply Market Participants ID. The UNC Mod will be raised for March UNC Panel. DA highlighted that a portfolio reconciliation exercise was underway between the SPAA listings and those already in UK Link systems. 107 discrepancies have been identified. Some are very simple to resolve e.g. 40 map IDs that can be loaded to UKLink once an application is received. There are more complex scenarios where CDSP / UNC have rules granting ID where legal entities, whereas, SPAA had provided short codes where licences had not been granted, or the application wasn't for a legal entity applied.</p> <p>Xoserve have written to parties (where we have been able to track down contact details!). Conclusion of this exercise is needed by end of November to get to CSS.</p> <p>DA went on to say the next stage (for which he will seek views from DSG) is how to get CDSP Mastered Market Participant Id data out to all. Responsibility is planned as part of the February 20 in a UKLink Release. This will be a nominal release with limited system impacts. Proposal from the working group is from 2020 to try to honour the existing format – unless there are reasons not to do so. DA is worried about our commitment as there are fields in the SPD that look like they are not best controlled via MDD – e.g. MAP / MAM relationships and SPAA do not try to master Trader User role types.</p> <p>With CSS implementation looking at system flows from UKL to CSS, consideration as to flows to Users / other Market Participants will need to be considered.</p> <p>EL fed back to change pack and concerned on process and how will work within a monthly cycle. DA gave details what had been discussed in the workgroup – such as representation opportunity, approval at a Change Board, publication in advance of go live about a week notice before publication</p> <p>Action – DA to send out the Guidance doc from the MOD. (Completed and added to the DSG documents on 4th March)</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>MT Presented slides in relation to this change. The CDSP are due to take over the management of the MDD Market Participant process from February 2020, and the slides highlighted the approach we intend to take on this process with any feedback from DSG being welcomed. SP asked whether the MDD Release reference number will restart or increment on from the current SPAA reference numbers. MT to liaise with SP offline to understand which approach would be preferred from this aspect. No specific views of a preferred approach were fed in from DSG members.</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>XRN4851 – Moving Market Participant Ownership from SPAA to UNC/DSC</p> <p>Link to CP</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>As a result of UNC Modification [0682] and SPAA Change SCP467 the responsibility for Market Participant ID management moves from SPAA to UNC. The DSC Contract Management Committee is responsible and the CDSP will administrate the regime.</p> <p>The CDSP will ensure that the organisations requesting a [market role] are appropriately licenced / qualified in line with the verification approach that was developed within the 0682 Modification development and will form part of the UK Link Manual.</p> <p>This change will develop the processes and interactions with industry participants to support this process.</p> <p><u>Change/Solution Overview</u></p> <p>We are anticipating that solution options will need to highlight the status of organisations through their lifecycle – including pre-entry assessment (in Retail Energy Code (REC) and DCC testing under Smart Energy Code (SEC)); awaiting MDD approval; live; end dated (e.g. not valid for registration or UK Link flows); closed (i.e. purged from industry systems).</p> <p>The following solution options are proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilise existing process within the Gas Market (i.e. manually updated spreadsheet for download by industry parties) expanded as required to accommodate additional data items and formatting. We are proposing to indicate the roles that each organisation hold to be reflected by status. This extract will be published on the Xserve website for Industry parties to download the latest version. <p>Link which shows an example format for this option.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Also utilise existing process within the Gas Market (i.e. manually updated spreadsheet for download by industry
---------------------------------	--

	<p>parties). Each role for the listed Market Participants are indicated by a cross identifier. Three separate sheets will be provided within the excel file:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sheet 1 - For main Industry use, containing live and end dated Market Participant parties. ○ Sheet 2 – Parties that are pending Market Participant sub-committee approval (which will be included in the next Market Participant Release after approval) ○ Sheet 3 – for the purpose of REC and SEC testing. This contains parties that are live, end dated, and in a pre-entry status before they enter the Market Participant process to be added. <p>Link which shows an example format for this option.</p> <p>Consideration for Reps: We have included an 'Industry end date' of two years after the organisation closure on UKL following feedback that these parties should still be referenced within the Market Participant list for respective industry messages (excluding UK Link Communications) that these parties may still need to be referenced within.</p> <p>The two options described above are proposed for Feb 2020 in preparation for the CDSP to take over the management of Market Participant information.</p> <p>A potential third option is being considered as described below, however this is just for consideration after the recommendation from ChMC was that this should potentially be delivered within another change and be delivered in a later release:</p> <p>Develop new method of delivery for MDD Market Participant data from the CDSP to interested Industry parties. This should take into consideration how the data is currently delivered in the electricity market (D0269/D0270) and, also, how it will be shared from CDSP to the CSS. Sub options of a new delivery method include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New file formats to be transmitted via industry connection ▪ Request and response files ▪ API interface for Industry parties <p>Feedback is welcomed on both Options 1 & 2, and the potential third option which would be delivered out of scope of this change.</p>
<p>Implementation Date for this Solution Option:</p>	<p>Feb 2020</p>
<p>Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>We believe either Option 1 or 2 deliver the industry requirement. As this will need to be maintained manually, the CDSP can support either Option 1 or 2 depending on customer preference.</p>

DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	<i>We have highlighted excel options to DSG, which were supported. Option 1 or 2 were not specifically defined.</i>
Consultation closeout:	02/01/2020

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We prefer solution option 2</p> <p>It looks to provide a better forward view for new parties & provides more detailed information. In terms of 'option 3' (to look at different mechanism to send to parties), given small size of gas MDD data in comparison to the electricity data - this would need to be explored further as to whether it would actually provide cost/benefit for any changes to be made. This should happen before progression.</p>	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve's Response

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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd
	Name:	Alison Price

	Email:	alison.price@npower.com
	Telephone:	07557202065
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We are supportive of this change	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve's Response

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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Option 2 preferred as the use of 'X' indicators for market participant roles is close to the current format that all parties are familiar with.	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve' s Response

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

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
	Telephone:	07816172645
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We are supportive of the excel spreadsheet and would be happy to accept the option with the majority support. We see the benefits of option 2 and would be comfortable to utilise that option. SPAA currently has multiple tabs (live and closed) and if the main list is on the main tab and the rest is for reference purposes we believe it is the same approach as today. We recognise there are minor formatting changes when compared with current MDD but we are again comfortable with this. We believe this to be the initial step (moving the location) and there will be additional development to MDD either in 2020 or 2021 (option 3 described). We support a format which helps the initial smooth transition for the Feb 2020 approved implementation date. We would support further development and alignment to elec MDD but not as part of the scope of this XRN.	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve' s Response

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

Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4851 Moving Market Participant Ownership from SPAA to UNC/DSC
Solution Details:	Option 2 Utilise existing process within the Gas Market (i.e. manually updated spreadsheet for download by industry parties). Each role for the listed Market Participants are indicated by a cross identifier. Three separate sheets will be provided within the excel file.
Implementation Date:	28/02/2020
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	08/01/2020

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network
	<input checked="" 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 (Kevin Eltoft-Prest) to complete the DPIA.			
Change Beneficiary: <i>How many market participant or segments stand to benefit this change?</i>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> One Market Group	<input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant	
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area:	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations		
Number of Service Areas Impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> One	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two to Five	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty	<input type="checkbox"/> All	
Improvement Scale?	<input type="checkbox"/> High	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required		
Primary Application impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> BW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ISU	<input type="checkbox"/> CMS
	<input type="checkbox"/> AMT	<input type="checkbox"/> EFT	<input type="checkbox"/> IX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gemini	<input type="checkbox"/> Birst	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	Administration	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If [No] please do <u>not</u> continue completing the [Workaround Details] section	
Who is accountable for the workaround?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Xoserve	<input type="checkbox"/> External Customer	<input type="checkbox"/> Both
What is the Frequency of the workaround?	Monthly		
What is the lifespan for the workaround?	01/10/2021		
What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround?	One FTE required for workaround		
What is the Complexity of the workaround?	<input checked="" 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:	47%
------------------------------	-----

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	For Approval	31/01/2019	Xoserve	CP Raised
2	For Approval	13/02/2019	Xoserve	Appendix added
3	With DSG and Out for review	14/02/2019	Xoserve	Result from ChMC on 13 th February added, and out for an initial review
4	With DSG and Out for review	11/03/2019	Xoserve	Minutes added from DSG 4 th March 2019
5	With DSG and Out for Review	15/03/2019	Xoserve	Outcome from ChMC on 13 th March 2019 added
6	With DSG and Out for Review	18/03/2019	Xoserve	More reps added following completion of initial review consultation period.
7	With DSG and Out for Review	28/03/2019	Xoserve	Funding comments updated

8	With DSG	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Updated with outcome from ChMC meeting on 10 th April 2019
9	With DSG	26/11/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with minutes from DSG meeting 18 th November 2019
10	Approved	15/01/20	Rachel Taggart	Change Pack and Reqs added. Preferred solution option and intended release approved at ChMC on 8 th January 2020.
11	Implemented	12/03/20	Chan Singh	Change Implemented 28//02/2020 - February 2020 Release

Template

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