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: | james.rigby@npower.com |
| Telephone: | 07557 198020 |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Emma Smith |
| Email: | emma.smith@xoserve.com  |
| Telephone: | 0121 623 2386 |
| Change Status: | [ ]  Proposal | [ ]  With DSG | [x]  Out for Review |
| [ ]  Voting | [ ]  Approved | [ ]  Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Customer Class(es): | [x]  Shipper | [ ]  Distribution Network Operator |
| [ ]  NG Transmission | [ ]  IGT |
| [ ]  Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Description: | **Background**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 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 allocationPermanent 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: | [x]  10 Working Days | [ ]  20 Working Days |
| [ ]  30 Working Days | [ ]  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.   |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | Following analysis  |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: |  |
| *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.* |

# A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Final DSG Recommendation: | *Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.* |
| [ ]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| DSG Recommended Release: | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |

# A6: Funding

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Funding Classes: | [x]  Shipper | 100 % |
| [ ]  National Grid Transmission | XX % |
| [ ]  Distribution Network Operator | XX % |
| [ ]  IGT | XX % |
| [ ]  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 – 13th February 2019 / 13th March 2019

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | [ ]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [x]  Defer |
| Industry Consultation: | [ ]  10 Working Days | [x]  20 Working Days |
| [ ]  30 Working Days | [ ]  Other [Specify Here] |
| Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve) | 15/03/2019 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | [x]  Yes | [ ]  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: | [ ]  Shipper | Please select. |
| [ ]  National Grid Transmission | Please select. |
| [ ]  Distribution Network Operator | Please select. |
| [ ]  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: | [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes | If [Yes] please specify <Release> |

Please send the completed forms to: 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: | [ ]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [x]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  Private |

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

# 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 |
| *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 support the proposal and are in support of utilising existing Shipper funds if the task force has the financial availability. We would support this being delivered within fair and consistent deliverables and not at the expense of any existing changes.  |
| 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: | [x]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  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 |
| *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)**No*  |
| 2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. 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.  |
| 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.However, if the taskforce (Xoserve) themselves felt the proposal should be funded out of the taskforce budget then that would be ok.What we don't want is the task forces independence compromised  |
| Change Proposal in principle: | [x]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  Private |

# B4: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Scottish Power |
| Name: | Claire Louise Roberts |
| Email: | ClaireLouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com  |
| 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 |
| *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)*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. |
| 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: | [x]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  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

|  |
| --- |
| 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 have not identified any material risk/ cost to our businesses. 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.*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. |
| Yes, we believe that the analysis and subsequent report will be useful. |
| 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 would support implementation within a minor release. |
| 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.  |
| Yes |
| Change Proposal in principle: | [x]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  Private |

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

# B6: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Npower |
| Name: | Gas.Codes@npower.com  |
| Email: | Gas.Codes@npower.com  |
| Telephone: | Gas.Codes@npower.com  |

# 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*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?* *In principle yes, but would expect this decision to be taken once the work has been costed.**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*  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: | [x]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [x]  Publish | [ ]  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 |

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: | [ ]  CMA Order | [ ]  MOD / Ofgem |
| [ ]  EU Legislation | [ ]  License Condition |
| [ ]  BEIS | [x]  ChMC endorsed Change Proposal |
| [ ]  SPAA Change Proposal | [ ]  Additional / 3rd Party Service Request |
| [ ]  Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |
| Customer group(s) impacted if the change is not delivered: | [x]  Shipper | [ ]  IGT | [ ]  Network |
| [ ]  Xoserve | [ ]  NG Transmission | [ ]  NTS |
| [ ]  Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |
| Associated Change Ref Number(s): | N/A | Associated MOD Number(s): | N/A |
| Perceived delivery effort (days): | [ ]  0-30 | [ ]  30-60 |
| [x]  60-100 | [ ]  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. | [ ]  Yes (if selected please answer the next question) |
| [x]  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: | [ ]  New Technology  | [ ]  Theft of Gas |
| [ ]  Mass Data | [ ]  Xoserve Employee Data |
| [ ]  Vulnerable Customer Data | [ ]  Fundamental changes to Xoserve |
| [ ]  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:*How many market participant or segments stand to benefit this change?* | [ ]  Multiple Market Participants  | [ ]  Multiple Market Group |
| [ ]  All UK Gas Market Participants | [ ]  Xoserve Only |
| [x]  One Market Group | [ ]  One Market Participant |
| Primary Impacted DSC Service Area: | Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations  |
| Number of Service Areas Impacted: | [x]  One | [ ]  Two to Five |
| [ ]  Five to Twenty | [ ]  All |
| Improvement Scale? | [ ]  High | [x]  Medium | [ ]  Low |
| Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered? | [ ]  Safety of Supply at risk |
| [ ]  Customer(s) incurring financial loss |
| [ ]  Customer Switching at risk |
| Are any of the following required if the change is delivered? | [ ]  Customer System Changes Required |
| [ ]  Customer Testing Likely Required |
| [ ]  Customer Training Required |
| Primary Application impacted: | [x]  BW | [ ]  ISU | [ ]  CMS |
| [ ]  AMT | [ ]  EFT | [ ]  IX |
| [ ]  Gemini | [ ]  Birst | [ ]  API |
| [ ]  Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |
| Business Process Impacted: | [ ]  AQ | [ ]  SPA | [ ]  RGMA |
| [ ]  Reads | [ ]  Portal | [ ]  Invoicing |
| [x]  Other | UIG |
| Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change? | [ ]  Yes | <If [Yes] please provide details here> |
| [x]  No |

## Workaround Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Workaround in operation? | [ ]  Yes | If [No] please do not continue completing the [Workaround Details] section |
| [x]  No |
| Who is accountable for the workaround? | [ ]  Xoserve | [ ]  External Customer | [ ]  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? | [ ]  Low | *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)* |
| [ ]  Medium | *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)* |
| [ ]  High | *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)*  |

## 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 13th 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 13th 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 |

# 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 12th December 2018. |