***Change Proposal***

**Negative Consumption Period For Rolling AQ20171023**

**Mod reference: *N/A***

**CDSP Reference: XRN4510**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document Stage | Version | Date | Author | Status |
| ROM Request / Change Proposal | 0.1 | 25/10/17 | Linda Whitcroft | Draft |
| ROM Response |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome | 1.0 | 08//11/2017 | Deborah Coyle Spencer | Approved by Change Committee |
| EQR |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| BER | 0.1 | 07/11/17 | Debi Jones | Submitted to Change Committee |
| Change Management Committee Outcome | 1.0 | 08/11/2017 | Deborah Coyle Spencer | Approved by Change Committee |
| CCR | 0.1 | 28/03/18 | Debi Jones | Draft |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |

***Document Purpose***

This document is intended to provide a single view of a change as it moves through the change journey. The document is constructed in a way that enables each section to build upon the details entered in the preceding section. The level of detail is built up in an incremental manner as the project progresses.

The template is aligned to the Change Management Procedures, as defined in the CDSP Service Document. The template is designed to remove the need for duplication of information. Where information is required in one section but has been previously captured in a previous section, the previous section will be referenced.

The summary table on the front page shows the history and the current status of the Change Proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Section*** | ***Title*** | ***Responsibility*** |
| 1 | Proposed Change | Proposer / Mod Panel |
| 2 | ROM Request / Change Proposal | Proposer / Mod Panel |
| 3 | ROM Request Rejection | CDSP |
| 4 | Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Analysis | CDSP |
| 5 | Change Proposal: Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 6 | EQR: Change Proposal Rejection | CDSP |
| 7 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of delivery date | CDSP |
| 8 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR) | CDSP |
| 9 | Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 10 | Business Evaluation Report (BER) | CDSP |
| 11 | Business Evaluation Report (BER): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 12 | Change Completion Report (CCR) | CDSP |
| 13 | Change Completion Report (CCR): Committee Outcome | Change Management Committee |
| 14 | Document Template Version History | CDSP |
| ***Appendix*** | | |
| A1 | Glossary of Key Terms | N/A |

# *Section 1: Proposed Change*

Please complete section 1 and 2 and specify within section 2 the output that is required from the CDSP

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Originator Details** | | | | |
| **Submitted By** | Linda Whitcroft | | **Contact Number** | 07770794808 |
| **Email Address** | Linda.e.whitcroft@xoserve.com |
| **Customer Representative** | Emma Smith | | **Contact Number** |  |
| **Email Address** | Emma.smith@xoserve.com |
| **Subject Matter Expert/Network Lead** | Sue Prosser | | **Contact Number** |  |
| **Email Address** | Susan.g.prosser@xoserve.com |
| **Customer Class** | | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  iGT | | |
| **Overview of proposed change** | | | | |
| **Change Details** | | **Summary**   * We require a **Rolling AQ Calculation enhancement in ISU** *(as per the detailed info below)* * We require a **datafix to be performed on all erroneous AQs in UK Link (SAP ISU)** where there’s been a negative consumption used in the calculation prior to 1st June.   Where the AQ calculation has used a negative consumption value within the AQ calculation period, this being used to calculate a revised AQ value but where the AQ value is greater than 1, the existing AQ should be carried forward. Then a notification of explanation should be sent to the appropriate Shipper to advise them that the AQ failed to calculate because the consumption profile is not correct.  The main cause of the erroneous data is the missing TTZ count, so in essence poor data quality. This is creating large volumes of negative consumption as the shippers have not got a process/ work around that protects them from such a scenario.  The failure to calculate notification will be issued to the Shipper in the NRL/ AQ notification file (T98 segment of the NRL) in essence this will advise them that the AQ has failed to be calculated & the existing AQ has been carried forward. Failure to calculate notification reason code (CPN00321 (Negative consumption period for AQ calculation))  To avoid incorrect AQ calculation being derived and issued because the consumption period used for AQ calculation holds a negative energy value. This will lead to incorrect transportation charges as the SOQ/ Formula Year will also be incorrect.  When this functionality is delivered I would also request that the ZDT\_AQ\_Review table should be changed to compliment and allow the reporting of this scenario. The ZDT\_AQ\_Review should record both the positive and negative consumption values within an AQ calculation period. This will support Shipper queries and our reporting requirements.  The AQ calculations are correct but the erroneous consumption profile will directly influence the AQ value and will result in an under or over stated AQ value that will contribute to Unidentified Gas (UIG).  The revised Formula Year will use these understated values until they are corrected. This means that the rates for the SMP will be incorrect. The AQ needs to wait for the negative consumption period to be removed from the calculation which could take a maximum of up to 3 years in some cases. The AQ Correction process does not correct this scenario.  Future AQs values that do actually calculate will potentially fail the AQ Market breaker tolerance validation.  The reduced AQ values will potentially inhibit the Shippers ability to submit future reads as the meter reading will reflect the true consumption and could fail validation as the AQ has been reduced as a consequence of the negative consumption  As soon as possible to stop the erroneous AQ values that will have an influence on other downstream processes. | | |
| **Reason(s) for proposed service change** | | * Unintended consequences to rolling AQ process which is creating erroneous AQs...Impacts UIG outcomes. | | |
| **Status of related UNC Mod** | | N/A | | |
| **Full title of related UNC Mod** | | N/A | | |
| **Benefits of change** | | * AQs better reflective of actual consumption. * Current UIG impacts anticipated to be reduced. * December AQ position feeds 2018 billing AQ position, so charges will be more accurate. | | |
| **Required Change Implementation Date** | | **Datafix** – effective on 1st December 2017  **Validation (ISU) enhancement** – ideally before the next rolling AQ calculation, which at the time of CP submission is 12th November 2017. | | |
| **Please provide an assessment of the priority of this change from the perspective of the industry.** | | High  Medium  Low  Rationale for assessment: | | |

# *Section 2: Initial Assessment / ROM Request / Change Proposal*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Level of Quote/Estimate Robustness Requested** | **Evaluation Services**  Initial Assessment *(Mod related changes only)*  ROM estimate for Analysis and Delivery  **CDSP Change Services**  Firm Quote for Analysis  Firm Quote for both Analysis and Delivery |
| **Has any initial assessment been performed in support of this change?** | Yes  No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this considered to be a Priority Service Change?** | Yes (Mod Related)  Yes (Legislation Change Related)  No |
| **Is this change considered to relate to a ‘restricted class’ of customers?**  Consider if the particular change is only likely to impact those who fall under a particular customer class  If it impacts all customer classes (i.e. Transmission, Distribution & Shippers) then choose ‘No’. | Yes (please mark the customer class(es) to whom this is restricted)  No  -----------------------------------------------------------------------------  Shippers  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operators  iGT’s |
| **Is it anticipated that the change would have an adverse impact on customers of any other customer classes?**  Please refer to appendix one for the definition of an ‘adverse impact’ | Yes (please give details)  No |
| ***General Service Changes Only (please ensure that either A or B below is completed)*** | |
| 1. Customer view of impacted service area(s)   For a definition of the Service Areas, please see the ‘Charge Base Apportionment Table’ within the [Budget and Charging Methodology](http://www.xoserve.com/wp-content/uploads/BUDGET-AND-CHARGING-METHODOLOGY.pdf). Please indicate the service area(s) that are understood to be impacted by the change. Please enter ‘unknown’ if relevant. Where the change is likely to impact more than one service area please indicate the percentage split of the impact across the impacted service areas. For example if it is split equally across two service areas then enter 50% in the ‘split’ against each service area. | |
| Rolling AQ calculation | |
| 1. If the change is anticipated to require the creation of a new service area and service line please give further details stating proposed name of new service area and title of service line: | |
|  | |
| ***Specific Service Changes Only:*** | |
| Please detail the proposed methodology (or amendment to the existing methodology) for determining Specific Service Change Charges. | |
|  | |
| Please detail the proposed basis (that is, Charging Measure and Charging Period) for determining Specific Service Change Charges in respect of the Specific Service. | |
|  | |
| **Impacts to UKLink System or File Formats** | |
| Rolling AQ Calculation will require ISU code / configuration enhancement. | |
| **Impacts UKL Manual Appendix 5b** | |
| N/A | |
| **Impacts to Gemini System** | |
| The datafix to Rolling AQ will have to be done prior to the AAQ/MDS files are triggered for the effective dates of the new AQ value. | |
| **Please give any other relevant information.** | |
|  | |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Xoserve Portfolio Office | changeorders@xoserve.com |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 3: ROM Request Acceptance*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is there sufficient detail within the ROM Request to enable a ROM Analysis to be produced? | Yes  No |
| If no, please define the additional details that are required. |  |

If the ROM Request is not accepted. Please forward this document to the Portfolio Office for onward transmission to the Change Management Committee

# *Section 4: ROM Analysis*

This ROM is Xoserve’s response to the above Evaluation Service Request. The response is intended to support customer involvement in the development of industry changes.

Should the request obtain approval for continuance then a Change Proposal must be raised for any further analysis / development.

Disclaimer:

This ROM Analysis has been prepared in good faith by Xoserve Limited but by its very nature is only able to contain indicative information and estimates (including without limitation those of time, resource and cost) based on the circumstances known to Xoserve at the time of its preparation. Xoserve accordingly makes no representations of accuracy or completeness and any representations as may be implied are expressly excluded (except always for fraudulent misrepresentation).

Where Xoserve becomes aware of any inaccuracies or omissions in, or updates required to, this Report it shall notify the Network Operators’ Representative as soon as reasonably practicable but Xoserve shall have no liability in respect of any such inaccuracy or omission and any such liability as may be implied by law or otherwise is expressly excluded.

This Report does not, and is not intended to; create any contractual or other legal obligation on Xoserve.

© 2017 Xoserve Ltd

All rights reserved.

|  |
| --- |
| ROM Analysis |
| **Change Assessment**  High level indicative assessment of the change on the CDSP service description, on UKLink and any alternative options if applicable |
| **Change Impact:**  Initial assessment of whether the service change is / would have:   * a restricted class change, * a priority service change * an adverse impact on any customer classes |
| **Change Costs (implementation):**  An approximate estimate of the costs (or range of costs) where options are identified |
| **Change Costs (on-going):**  The approximate estimate of the impact of the service change on service charges |
| **Timescales:**  Details of timescale for the change i.e. 3 months etc.  Details of when Xoserve could start this change i.e. the earliest is release X. |
| **Assumptions:**  Any key assumptions that have been made by Xoserve when providing the cost and or timescale |
| **Dependencies:**  Any material dependencies of the implementation on any other service changes |
| **Constraints:**  Any key constraints that are expected to impact the delivery of the service change |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Xoserve Portfolio Office | changeorders@xoserve.com |
| Requesting Party | As specified in ROM Request |

# *Section 5: Change Proposal: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Change Proposal is approved. An EQR is requested | Approved (no EQR, going straight to BER) | | |
| Approved Change Proposal version | 1.0 | | |
| The change proposal shall not proceed |  | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the Change Proposal until a later meeting |  | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires the proposer to make updates to the Change Proposal: |  | | |
| Updates required: | | | |

# *Section 6: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Change Proposal Rejection*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Proposal Rejection | | | | |
|  | **Yes** |  | **No** | Is there sufficient detail within the Change Proposal to enable an EQR to be produced?  If no, please provide further details below. |
| Further details required: | | | | |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 7: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR): Notification of Delivery Date*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Notification of EQR Delivery Date | |
| Original EQR delivery date: |  |
| Revised EQR delivery date: |  |
| Rationale for revision of delivery date: |  |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 8: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Manager |  | Contact Number |  |
| Email Address |  |
| Project Lead |  | Contact Number |  |
| Email Address |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the proposed change on:   1. CDSP Service Description 2. CDSP Systems |  |
| Approximate timescale for delivery of ‘business evaluation report’  (N.b this is from the date on which the EQR is approved.) |  |
| Estimated cost of business evaluation report preparation  This can be expressed as a range of costs i.e. *‘at least £xx,xxx but probably not more than £xx,xxx’*. |  |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Restricted class change’ assessment (where provided)?  Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Adverse Impact’ assessment (where provided)?  Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Priority Service Change’ assessment (where provided)?  Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| **General service changes** | |
| Does the CDSP agree with the assessment made in the Change Proposal regarding impacted service areas?  This should refer to whether the proposing party considers the service change to relate to an existing service area or whether is constitutes a new service area. | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
|  |
| **Specific service changes** | |
| Does the CDSP agree with the proposal made in the Change Proposal regarding specific change charges?  This should refer to the proposed methodology (or amendment to existing methodology) for determining the specific service charges and the proposed basis for determining the specific service change charges. | Yes  No (please give detail below) |
| Please provide a draft amendment of the Specific Service Change Charge Annex setting out the methodology for determining Specific Service Change Charges proposed in the Change Proposal |  |
| EQR validity period: |  |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 9: Evaluation Quotation Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The EQR is approved |  | | | |
| Approved EQR version |  | | | |
| The Change Proposal shall not proceed. The Change Proposal and this EQR shall lapse |  | | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the EQR until a later meeting |  | | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires updates to the EQR: |  | | | |
| Updates required: |  | | | |
| **General service changes only**  (The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the change proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR) | | | | |
| 1. Does the committee agree with the assessment of the service area(s) to which the service line belongs and the weighting of the impact? | | Yes  No | | |
| 1. If no, please enter the agreed service area(s) and the weighting: | |  | | |
| **Specific service changes only**  (The detail upon which the response will be based is originally defined in the Change Proposal and potentially commented upon in the subsequent EQR) | | | | |
| 1. Please confirm the methodology for the determination of Specific Service Change charges | |  | | |
| 1. Please confirm the charging measure and charging period for the determination of Specific Service Change charges | |  | | |

# *Section 10: Business Evaluation Report (BER)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Implementation Detail** |
| 1.) Detail changes required to the CDSP Service Description |
| There are no impacts to Service Area 6: Annual Quanitity, DM Supply Point & Offtake Rate Reviews (Ref DS-CS SA6 – 17) |
| 2.) Detail modifications required to UK Link |
| The Code logic for Rolling AQ Calculation process will be amended in UK Link to include the required enhancement to remove the calculation of erroneous AQs following negative consumption. This change will not impact the downstream processes and does not intend to make changes to the existing file formats (NRL /NNL) used and the existing timings of the processes will remain per current process.  There is no impact to Gemini notification of AQ changes. |
| 3.) Detail changes required to appendix 5b of the UK Link Manual |
| N/A |
| 4.) Detail impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP |
| No impact. The changes will be applied in UK Link and updated AQs notified to Shippers via existing file flows. |
| 5.) Implementation Plan |
| The Analysis and Development Phase is planned to commence on 06/11/17. Target implementation date is by 08/12/17 To Be Confirmed. |
| 6.) Estimated implementation costs |
| The estimated cost for delivering requirements of Change Proposal is forecast to be £20,000 |
| 6a.) How will the charging for the costs be allocated to different customer classes?  (General Service Changes only) |
| Please mark % against each customer class:   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | National Grid Transmission | |  | Distribution Network Operators and IGT’s | |  | DN Operator | |  | IGT’s | | 100 | Shippers | | 100% |  | |
| 7.) Estimated impact of the service change on service charges |
| No impact to service charges. |
| 8.) Please detail any pre-requisite activities that must be completed by the customer prior to receiving or being able to request the service. |
| N/A |
| ***Implementation Options*** |
| Please provide details on any alternative solution/implementation options:  This should include:  (i) a description of each Implementation Option;  (ii) the advantages and disadvantages of each option  (iii) the CDSP preferred Implementation Option |
| **Do Nothing:** This option is not recommended.  UK Link will continue to hold MPRNs with erroneous AQs, furthermore there is a risk of additional erroneous AQs being calculated until a code fix is applied increasing the overall numbers of erroneous AQs held in the system. Any erroneous AQs held in the system will contribute to the UIG volatility.  **Recommended Option: Rolling AQ Calculation Code Enhancement and interim datafix of existing erroneous AQs in UK Link**  This option will implement a code enhancement in UK Link that will identify where an AQ has been calculated using a negative consumption value resulting in an AQ value greater than 1. In these instances UK Link will:   * Carry forward the existing AQ value as the next month’s AQ following the Rolling AQ Calculation and; * Generate Shipper notifications using the NRL file flow that there has been a failure to generate an AQ due to an incorrect consumption profile and that the existing AQ has been carried forward.   Due to the urgency of the fix required and timescales to develop and deliver the recommended code enhancement this change will also apply interim data fixes as necessary to existing erroneous AQs held in UK Link until the code enhancement is delivered. As with enduring code enhancement, Shipper notifications advising of failure to generate an AQ and the AQ carried forward will be completed using the existing NRL and NNL file flows.  The advantages of this option are:   * Address existing erroneous AQs due to Legacy Data Quality issues up to November AQ Calculation. * Correct any newly created erroneous AQs post November AQ Calculation until code implementation. * More reflective invoicing * Support ongoing industry initiatives to reduce the volatility of UIG.   The disadvantages of this option are:   * Notification of AQs will be submitted through existing NRL and NNL files. Files generated as part of the data code fix will not contain some optional data items usually provided in the file; i.e. start and end reads. This has been communicated to the Industry at SDG and is seen as a accepted minor disadvantage. |
| Restricted Class Changes only  Is there any change in the view of the CDSP on whether there would be an ‘Adverse Impact’ on customers outside the relevant customer class(es)? |
| Yes (please give detail below)  No |
| Dependencies: |
| Approval of the BER is required by 06/11/17 in order to commence the project on 06/11/17. |
| Constraints: |
| The solution needs to be delivered as soon as is practicable.  Target implementation date for the enduring code fix is 03/12/17 (TBC). As this will not be implemented in time for the Rolling Monthly AQ calculation in November a datafix will be applied to those values this, will be implemented by the 18/11/17. |
| Benefits: |
| By undertaking the changes, data held in UK Link will be corrected so that:-   * AQs better reflective of actual consumption. * Current UIG impacts anticipated to be reduced. * December AQ position feeds 2018 billing AQ position, so charges will be more accurate. |
| Impacts: |
| There are no identified impacts of this change. |
| Risks: |
| There is a risk that this change is being delivered during a time of high change because it is currently planned for the same implementation date as UK Link Release 1.1 leading to potential code conflicts. The mitigation for this is to conduct an assessment of all changes impacting the AQ process to determine if changes can be delivered and co-exist with no impacts. This assessment has already been completed and there are no code and data dependencies between the changes identified and controls have been put in place to ensure successful co-existence.  There is a risk that delivering this change will further add to the current change congestion by utilising the same shared resources. This is being mitigated by advance planning of any use of such resources. |
| Assumptions: |
| The SDG will provide confirmation of how to categorise the AQ calculation changes. |
| Information Security: |
| There are no impacts to information security. |
| Out of scope: |
| None |
| Please provide any additional information relevant to the proposed service change: |
| None |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 11: Business Evaluation Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The BER is approved and the change can proceed | Yes | | |
| ***Modification Changes Only***  Please ensure that the Transporters are formally informed of the Target Implementation Date | | | |
| Approved BER version | 1.0 | | |
| The change proposal shall not proceed and the BER shall lapse | na | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the BER until a later meeting | na | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires updates to the BER: |  | | |
| Updates required: | | | |

# *Section 12: Change Completion Report (CCR)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Overview | | | |
| The project was to carry out analysis and subsequent delivery of changes to the Code logic for Rolling AQ Calculation process to amend UK Link to include an enhancement to remove the calculation of erroneous AQs following negative consumption. The change also included the ability to generate Shipper notifications using the existing NRL file flow that there had been a failure to generate an AQ due to an incorrect consumption profile and that the existing AQ has been carried forward.  Due to the timing and criticality of the change data fixes were also completed (in agreement with the registered Shipper) to correct existing erroneous AQs held in UK Link until the code enhancement was implemented. | | | |
| Please detail any differences between the solution that was implemented and what was defined in the BER. | | | |
| The project conducted the analysis and code change as described in the approved recommended option in the BER. | | | |
| Detail the revised text of the CDSP Service Description reflecting the change that has been made | | | |
| N/A | | | |
| Were there any revisions to the text of the UK Link Manual? | | | |
| Yes (please insert the revised text of the UK Link manual below)  No | | | |
| Proposed Commencement Date | 08/12/2017 | Actual  Commencement Date | 08/12/2017 |
|  | | | |
| Please detail the main lessons learned from the project | | | |
| The main lessons learned were:   * Ensuring external customers had sufficient time to check potential erroneous AQs identified by Xoserve and confirm which AQs would need data fixing. * Ensure the testing scope includes sufficient level of test cases to identify any process scenarios where the AQ recalculation does not work per requirements. * The collaborative approach to the project enabled a shortened delivery timescale for implementation. | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Service change costs |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Approved Costs (£) | £20,000 | Actual Costs (£) | £12,424 |   Reasons for variance between approved and actual costs:   * Estimate included additional potential data fixes which were not required during project delivery, resulting in reduction in cost. * Due to the need to provide the quote at short notice additional risk margin was included in estimate for unforeseen costs which were not encountered. * Xoserve internal resource costs were estimated. |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 13: Change Completion Report: Committee Outcome*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The implementation is complete and the CCR is approved |  | | | |
| Approved CCR version |  | | | |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the CCR until a later meeting |  | | Date of later meeting: |  |
| The committee requires further information |  | | | |
| Further information required: | | | | |
| The committee considers that the implementation is not complete |  | | | |
| Further action(s) required: | | | | |
| The proposed changes to the CDSP Service Description or UK Link Manual are not correct | |  | | |
| Amendments to CDSP service description / UKLink manual required: | | | | |

# *Section 14: Document Template Version History*

The purpose of this section is to keep a record of the changes to the overall version template and the individual sections within. It will be updated by the CDSP following approval of the template update by the Change Management Committee.

**Version History:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 | Approved |  | CDSP | Version Approved by Change Committee |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**--- END OF DOCUMENT ---**

# *Appendix One: Glossary*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** |
| Adverse Impact | A Service Change has or would have an Adverse Impact on Customers of a particular Customer Class if:  (a) Implementing the Service Change would involve a modification of UK Link which would conflict with the provision of existing Services for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class;  (b) the Service Change would involve the CDSP disclosing Confidential Information relating to such Customers to Customers of another Customer Class or to Third Parties;  (c) Implementing the Service Change would conflict to a material extent with the Implementation of another Service Change (for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class) with an earlier Proposal Date and which remains Current, unless the Service Change is a Priority Service Change which (under the Priority Principles) takes priority over the other Proposed Service Change; or  (d) Implementing the Service Change would have an Adverse Interface Impact for such Customers. |
| General Service | A service provided under the DSC to Customers or Customers of a Customer Class on a uniform basis. |
| Non-Priority Service Change | A Service Change which is not a Priority Service Change |
| Priority Service Change | A Modification Service Change;  or  A Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made). |
| Relevant Customer class | A Customer Class is a **Relevant Customer Class** in relation to a Service or a Service Change where Service Charges made or to be made in respect of such Service, or the Service subject to such Service Change, are or will be payable by Customers of that Customer Class |
| Restricted Class Change | Where, in relation to a Service Change, not all Customer Classes are Relevant Customer Classes, the Service Change is a **Restricted Class Change**; |
| Service Change | A change to a Service provided under the DSC (not being an Additional Service), including:  (i) the addition of a new Service or removal of an existing Service; and  (ii) in the case of an existing Service, a change in any feature of the Service specified in the CDSP Service Description,  and any related change to the CDSP Service Description |
| Specific Service | A service (other than Additional Services) available under the DSC to all Customer or Customers of a Customer Class but provided to a particular Customer only upon the order of the Customer. |