

Consultation Response

IGT115: Update to IGT UNC to formalise the Data Permission Matrix

Responses invited by: 10 Oct 2018

Respondent Details

Name: Chris Barker

Organisation: BUUK Infrastructure

Support Implementation ☐

Qualified Support X

Neutral ☐

Do Not Support ☐

Please briefly summarise the key reason(s) for your support / opposition

BUUK provided qualified support for this modification, on the condition that UNC 649S is also approved. This support is based on the principle that it will increase efficiency in the process of accessing data within the Data Enquiry Service (DES), in line with relevant objective F. This modification ensures and facilitates the alignment of processes between the IGT UNC and UNCC, which will provide commonality when changes to the data permission matrix is made. The intention going forward is that the data permissions matrix will be managed under the DSC Contract Management Committee. BUUK wish to see evidence of how this will work in practice, including processes and procedures that are to be followed to ensure sufficient representation is made but also to protect data where deemed appropriate.

Self-Governance Statement

Do you agree with the Modification Panel's determination with respect to whether or not this should be a self-governance modification?

It is agreed with the workgroup that Self-Governance is the best approach for the modification, on the condition that thoughts remain the change should only be implemented if its UNC counterpart (649S) is also implemented.

Please state any new or additional issues that you believe should be considered

N/A

Relevant Objectives

How would implementation of this modification impact the relevant objectives?

It is not felt that the modification directly achieves Relevant Objective D, although it is recognised how this could be indirectly affected. It is however agreed, along with the workgroup, that Relevant Objective F is best achieved from the modification which is working to improve the efficiency of the process.

Impacts and Costs

What development and ongoing costs would you face if this modification was implemented?

The creation of this additional activity to be undertaken by the CDSP will lead to the creation of additional DSC Service Lines and therefore additional ongoing costs. It would be beneficial to note whether this will be a general service line and therefore a cost to all parties or specific constituency service lines. The modification will also lead to the raising of DSC Change Proposals, which party(ies) will be funding this change.

Implementation

What lead time would you wish to see prior to this modification being implemented, and why?

It is agreed that the implementation date should coincide with the UNC equivalent, 649S, and as such if the November release is required to be pushed back to November 9th/10th, this would be the preferred approach to release.

Legal Text

Are you satisfied that the legal text will deliver the intent of the modification?

Yes, the alterations made by the IGTs from the Proposers original suggestion meet the requirements more clearly.

Further Comments

Is there anything further you wish to be taken into account?

The workgroups findings on the UNC legal text is agreed, and it should be noted that the recommendation is for the term *DSC Contract Management Committee* instead of *Contract Managers* is used to ensure consistency and prevent confusion. While the two modifications will need to align and have matching approaches, this should be reinforced before implementation.

Responses should be submitted by email to IGTUNC@gemserv.com