DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

# A1: General Details

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Reference: | XRN4850 | | | |
| Change Title: | Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters | | | |
| Date Raised: | 30/01/2019 | | | |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities | | |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy | | |
| Email: | [Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk](mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk) | | |
| Telephone: | 07812 973337 | | |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Ellie Rogers | | |
| Email: | [Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com](mailto:Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com) | | |
| Telephone: | 0121 623 2611 | | |
| Change Status: | Proposal | | With DSG | Out for Review |
| Voting | | Approved | Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

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

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Description: | This change has two elements and ultimately aims to improve communications with end consumers during planned and unplanned gas supply disruptions.  The first element involves the implementation of a process by which customer contact details will be provided to the CDSP by Suppliers. The process will be developed by a SPAA working group set up to progress SPAA [SCP 443 – Notification of customer contact telephone numbers to Transporters.](https://www.spaa.co.uk/SitePages/CPDetails.aspx?UID=1324&Source=https://www.spaa.co.uk/SitePages/CPCurrent.aspx)  The process of getting the customer contact details could involve Shippers and be via the IX within a UK Link file format(s). Please note, other solutions are also possible.  The second element of the change involves the provision of a web portal to allow GDNs and IGTs to send messages to selected customers.  A ROM response for the initial change (XRN4555) raised in March 2018 gave the following change impact:   |  | | --- | | **Change Impact:**  Initial assessment of whether the service change is / would have:   * This is a restricted class change. * This not a priority service change * This would have an adverse impact on customers | | **Change Costs (implementation):**  The solution will cost at least **£150k**, but probably not more than **£250k** to develop.  The funding split is to be determined by the Change Management Committee. | | **Change Costs (on-going):**  The solution will cost at least **£8k**, but probably not more than **£15k** to support per annum**.**  The above ongoing cost includes the telecom cost to send the messages. | | **Timescales:**  The strategy adopted for Post Nexus change is a Release strategy (changes grouped and  implemented together at a set date) and it is expected that this change would form part of a  Major Release. | | **Assumptions:**   * Each SMS and email message would be tailored to each GDN. | | **Risks:**   * Not all Suppliers have IX * Not all telephone numbers will accept a SMS message |   This ROM response was based on the initial Change Request (XRN4555) and therefore does not capture all of the latest requirements but it provides an indication of the change impact.  **Web Portal requirements**  Two levels of functionality “Broadcast” and “Extract”  There will be five uses cases:   1. Unplanned interruptions including purge and relights; 2. Planned interruptions including reinstatement of ground (e.g. mains replacement); 3. Gas Safety Regulation (GSR) cut-offs; 4. Appointments for Multiple Occupancy Buildings (e.g. riser replacement), and; 5. Guaranteed Standards of Performance compensation payments.   Broadcast facility   1. Ability for Transporters to request that SMS messages and emails to be sent to customer contact details for each MRPN in the selection criteria. 2. Transporter will submit text of message to be sent 3. Requests will not be processed without a use case 4. For use cases 1 and 5 GDNs will be able to send messages to IGT customers where the IGT has authorized that GDN for that use case. This authorization to be held in a permissions matrix in the portal 5. MPRNs to be selectable by postcode including outcode only and outcode and parts of incode, by road name and within that by number range for example 1 to 30 either all numbers or odds and evens separately. 6. Customer contact details will not be visible to Transporter at any time 7. Customers will be able to request “STOP”, this will stop messages for a particular incident but customers will be told to contact their Supplier if they want to remove their details entirely   Extract facility   1. Transporters will be able to down load customer contact details for a single MPRN for use in special circumstances. 2. Requests will not be processed without a use case 3. Facility will be restricted to particular users in a Transporter 4. For use cases 1 and 5 GDNs will be able to send messages to IGT customers where the IGT has authorized that GDN for that use case. This authorization to be held in a permissions matrix in the portal 5. Customers will be able to request “STOP”, this will stop messages for a particular incident but customers will be told to contact their Supplier if they want to remove their details entirely   Reporting facility   1. Facility to run reports on number of times portal used by:    1. Type of use (Broadcast or Extract)    2. Date range    3. Transporter submitting request    4. Use Case     **Communications**  Current view of the SCP443 SPAA workgroup is that the IX is utilized in a similar way to the PSR data being sent from Suppliers to CDSP by means of the Shippers  Data items to be sent   * MPRN; * Up to four email addresses; * Up to four telephone numbers; * Customer Name; * Contact Name; * Contact telephone number; * Contact email address; * Mailing Address, and; * Preferred contact method.   Xoserve to scope out options for communicating this data by means of IX  Note as the SPAA schedule will not be mandatory on I&C TRAS Suppliers and I&C only Suppliers are not required to be parties to SPAA the Xoserve solution should not require Shippers to make changes if they are not required to transfer the data. | |
| Proposed Release: | Release June 2020 | |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | 10 Working Days | 20 Working Days |
| 30 Working Days  This is being raised as a place holder and is dependent on SPAA CP 443. This change will be further developed as the 443 solution is developed. A consultation is appropriate when the high level design for the solution has been developed. The portal could go out for consultation earlier but it seems sensible to keep both parts of the change together. | Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | These changes will mirror those put in place in electricity following the storms in 2013. They will allow gas distribution businesses to proactively communicate information relating to the disruption of customer’s gas supplies. Distribution businesses will only use this information to contact the customer concerning disruptive events impacting that customer’s connection to the network. The portal will work by GDNs/ IGTs informing the CDSP of the message to be communicated and the MPRNs to which it should be sent. This means that GDNs/ IGTs do not directly access the customer contact details except in very limited cases thereby minimising the risk of data breaches. See SPAA CP 443 for further details. |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | Ongoing during any planned or unplanned interruption |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | This is dependent on SPAA CP 443 being developed and implemented and Suppliers passing customer information to the CDSP. |
| *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: | Shipper | XX % |
| National Grid Transmission | XX % |
| Distribution Network Operator | XX % |
| IGT | XX % |
| Distribution Network Operator and IGT | 100 % |
| Service Line(s) | DSC Service Area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence  New Service Lines Required | |
| ROM or funding details: |  | |
| Funding Comments: | **04/03/2019-** Originally, the DSC Service Area assigned to this change was DSC Service Area 13: Emergency Contact Information, which is 100% by the DNs. However, the reps within the February Initial Review Change Pack asked for the funding arrangements to be split between DNs and IGTs as this service would be used by the latter, and therefore the service area is now DSC Service Area 16: Provision of supply point information services and other services required to be provided under condition of the GT Licence. This was agreed at ChMC on 10th April 2019.  **28/03/2019 -** Xoserve is also reviewing the Service Description Table to assess if there is any impact to the service lines.  **11/07/2019 –** Potentially two new service lines are required; one for the receipt of consumer contact details from Shippers, the second for the provision of said data to the DNOs and IGTs upon request. | |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | Approve (10/04/2019)) | Reject | | Defer (13/02/2019) |
| Industry Consultation: | 10 Working Days | | 20 Working Days | |
| 30 Working Days | | Other [Specify Here] | |
| Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve) | 1st March 2019 | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | Yes (initial review) | No |
| Date Issued: | 12/07/2019 | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 2234.2 - RJ - ES (initial review) / 2378.7 – RT – PO (solution review) | |
| Number of Responses: | 7 reps: 4 approvals and 3 deferrals  5 Reps: 3 approvals, 1 Approve date and defer option and 1 defer date and approve option (solution review) | |

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

# A8: DSC Voting Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Please select. |
| National Grid Transmission | | | Please select. |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Please select. |
| IGT | | | Please select. |
| Meeting Date: | 07/08/2019 | | | |
| 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](mailto: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](mailto:Skey@northerngas.co.uk) |
| Telephone: | 07779 416 216 |

# B1: ChMC Industry Consultation XRN4850 – Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters

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

B2 User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Wales and West Utilities |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy |
| Email: | [Richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk](mailto:Richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk) |
| Telephone: | 029 2027 8552 or 07812 973337 |

# B2: ChMC Industry Consultation XRN4850 – Notification of Customer Contact Details to Transporters

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

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

# B3: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | E.ON |
| Name: | Kirsty Dudley |
| Email: | [Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com](mailto:Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com) |
| Telephone: | 07816 172 645 |

# 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 | | | | |
| The proposed change could pose a cost and material risk through these initial identified areas:   1. GDPR – sharing customers’ information would need to be in controlled & secure manner. Using file exchanges e.g. via the IX gateway could remove this risk. 2. The development of a mechanism to share the data from Supplier > Shipper > CDSP > Transporter would have a cost associated and depending on the approach could has costs associated – we would require detailed specs to cost this further. | | | | |
| 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 recognise the Transporter benefits, as well as potentially those of the customers’, however, we are concerned that the solution could end up costing more to deliver overall. We have participated in the SPAA workgroup for this and the joint MRA/SPAA Secure Communications Work Group (SCWG), and are assessing the possible overlap in the deliverables and solutions. We are currently unsure if what the SCWG is developing could also extend to this solution reducing what could be significant industry development and costs.  We recognise that the charging of the CDSP costs has been suggested as 100% DN, however there might be significant industry costs to deliver this as each Supplier and Shipper develop their systems to deliver the solution.  We would ask that the Transporters and the CDSP discuss with the Secretariat which is hosting the SCWG and the SPAA to assess if the solution could be utilised as an option to deliver this solution as wel. We appreciate that the SCWG solution is itself still under development but we would prefer to have deliverables which integrate into existing or a single solution where possible. | | | | |
| 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 not support a minor release, this would introduce a new process so would have to be a major release with a minimum of 6 months’ lead time. | | | | |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 13: Emergency Contact Information. The funding for this area is 0% Shipper funding, 0% NTS, 100% DNS 0% IGTs, 0% Other. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | | | |
| Yes, we support with the funding principles but it would need recognising that Shippers and Suppliers would also have their own development costs to deliver this. | | | | |
| Change Proposal in principle: | Approve | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | Private | |

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

# B4: User Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence |
| Email: | [Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com](mailto:Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com) |
| Telephone: | 07875 117771 |

# B4: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

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

# B5: User Details

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

# B5: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

# B6: User Details

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

# B6: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

# B7: User Details

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

# B7: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

Section C: DSG Discussion

# C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

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

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

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

Section D: High Level Solution Options

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be found [here](https://www.xoserve.com/media/6946/xrn4850-high-level-solution-option-assessment-solution-cp-120719.pdf)  The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified two viable options to deliver the requirements of the change. The only difference between the two options is around the method in which the Shipper sends the End Consumer details to the CDSP.  Option 1 seeks to utilise existing records (S66 and S82) to submit the End Consumer details to the CDSP. Please note, these records will need to be enhanced to ensure all required information can be sent by the Shipper to the CDSP.  Option 2 seeks to create a new record within the CNF and CNC for Shippers to submit End Consumer details specifically for the purpose of this change. Amendments to the existing records (S66 and S82) will be out of scope of this change and the intention will be a new record is created.  Please note, these are the only differences between the two options. All other functionality to deliver the change such as the trigger for GDNs and IGTs to request the service and the method for the notifications being sent or extracted are exactly the same.  As per HLSO slide 9, the costs provided within slide 3 and 6 are related to the CDSP system costs only which are required to deliver this change. This is not inclusive of the SMS Service Provider efforts which will be required to send the messages to the End Consumers.  As this change has not been approved by Change Managers yet, we are not in the position to have an SMS Service Provider secured therefore we do not have firm costs for this element of the change. However, we have investigated options in terms of Service Providers and have provided an indication of the high level costs associated.  Please note, this is not a firm cost for this element of the change, it is just an indication. If approval is received from Change Managers, we will seek to procure a Service Provider and the delivery and ongoing costs will be fed back through ChMC.  The Change Proposal can be found in the [Change Proposal Library](https://www.xoserve.com/change/change-proposals/?customers=&statuses=&search=4946) |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | Xoserve do not have a preferred option for this change.  We are comfortable delivering either and will progress with whichever option is preferred and more suitable for Shippers.  To provide some extra detail, it has been discussed that a new record could be a ‘cleaner’ option as it explicitly details exactly what is required and for this purpose. However, it has been highlighted that enhancing the existing record could avoid duplication of data items already provided within existing records.  As you can see from the HLSO, the cost difference between the two options is minimal (option 1 being slightly cheaper), therefore it is up to Shipper to decide which is their preferred mechanism. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | No preference has been provided by DSG representatives at this stage. This HLSO is on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting on Monday 15 July 2019. |
| Consultation closeout: | 26/07/2019 |

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

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy | | | |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence | | | |
| Email: | eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com | | | |
| Telephone: | 07875117771 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We are unable to specify our preferred option without further detail around proposed hierarchies and record structure. Without this it is not possible to fully impact assess changes. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Northern Gas Networks | | | |
| Name: | Helen Chandler | | | |
| Email: | HChandler@Northerngas.co.uk | | | |
| Telephone: | 07580704123 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | NGN has no comments regarding the method for Shippers to send End Consumer details to the CDSP.  We support the introduction of a new Web Portal for GTs/IGTs to communicate with End Consumers; however, we would like more details regarding the funding for the SMS Service Provider once they become available. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

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

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

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

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

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

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

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 | | | 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: | Shipper | | IGT | | | Network |
| Xoserve | | NG Transmission | | | NTS |
| Other | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | | |
| Associated Change Ref Number(s): | XRN4555 (ROM) | | Associated MOD Number(s): | | | SPAA SCP 443 |
| Perceived delivery effort (days): | 0-30 | | | 30-60 | | |
| 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) | | |
| 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 Information Security team (Kevin Eltoft-Prest) 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 | |
| One Market Group | | | | One Market Participant | |
| Primary Impacted DSC Service Area: | Service Area 16: Provision of Supply Point Information Services and Other Services Required to be Provided Under Condition of the GT Licence | | | | | |
| Number of Service Areas Impacted: | One | | | | Two to Five | |
| Five to Twenty | | | | All | |
| Improvement Scale? | High | | 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: | 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 |
| Other | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | | |
| Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change? | Yes | Shippers/Networks System changes required to provide additional contact information | | | | |
| No |

## Workaround Details

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Workaround in operation? | Yes | If [No] please do not continue completing the [Workaround Details] section | | |
| 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: | 33% |

Version Control

# Document

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

# Template

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