

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4692**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Change Title** | CIN File - CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats |
| **Date Raised** |  |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | Wales & West Utilities |
| **Sponsor Name** | Richard Pomroy |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk 07812 973337 |
| **CDSP Contact Name** |  |
| **CDSP Contact Details**  |  |
| **Change Status** | **Proposal** / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected |
| **Section 1: Impacted Parties** |
| **Customer Class(es)** | ☐ Shipper☐ National Grid Transmissionx Distribution Network Operatorx iGT |
| **Section 2: Proposed Change Solution / Final (redlined) Change** |
| Files Affected: CIN1. Reduce the number of “Triggers” in the CIN File
2. Current CIN File Process: the current CIN file is produced if there is an inconsistency in any of the data items provided by the IGT and GT.
3. Suggested CIN File Process: change the validation process, so that only inconsistencies in crucial data items lead to the creation of a CIN.
4. Add the CSEP Status Field
5. Current CIN File: the current CIN file does not include a field for the “CSEP Status”.
6. Suggested CIN File: add the “CSEP Status” field and validate to ensure that there is a match.
 |
| **Proposed Release** | **Release / June/19** |
| **Proposed IA Period**  | 10WD / **30WD** / XXWD |
| **Section 3: Benefits and Justification**  |
| 1. Reduce the number of “Triggers” in the CIN File
2. The current process looks for any inconsistencies across all of the fields in the DCI (GT file) and the CIC/CAI (iGT Files). For example, if the IGT names the site “CSEP off High Street” and the GT names it “CSEP at High Street”, even if all other data items match, a CIN file would still be produced and sent to both parties. In practice this means that a CIN file is generated every time XoServe receive an update to the CSEP record.
3. Suggested CIN File Process: change the validation process, so that only inconsistencies in crucial data items lead to the creation of a CIN. This will reduce the number of files received by the IGTs and GTs and minimise the likelihood of significant inconsistencies being overlooked.

Critical Data Items:“CSEP Post Town”, “CSEP Postcode Outcode”, “Number of ISEPs”, “LDZ Identifier”, “CSEP Exit Zone Identifier”, “CSEP Connection Max AQ”, “CSEP Connection Max SHQ”, “Condition 16 Max AQ”, “Condition 16 Max SHQ” (new field, included in the “CSEP Creation Process” change form), “Nested CSEP Indicator”, “Directly Connected CSEP ID”, “Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number”, “IGT Short Code”, “CSEP Status” (new field, below”)Currently the GTs do not raise Nested CSEPs with XoServe which means that they do not appear in the CIN files. Making the “Nested CSEP Indicator”, “Directly Connected CSEP ID”, “Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number” critical data items will not change this as there will be nothing for the iGT file to match to. However, by making these critical items now, they are available if we wish to change the process so that GTs do submit Nested CSEPs.1. Add the CSEP Status Field
2. Current CIN File: the current CIN file does not include a field for the Status. However, the status is submitted to XoServe on all files, DCI (GT file) and the CIC/CAI (iGT Files), so there is no requirement for a change to these file formats.
3. Suggested CIN File: the CSEP Status is a critical data item, and should therefore be included in the CIN file format and validated to ensure that any inconsistency is highlighted.

Please note – to enable the validation to work correctly on the CSEP Status, the GT DCI/DCO and iGT CIC/CIR, CAI/CAO files must all contain the same statuses: CA – Cancelled; RQ – Requested; DE – Dead; LI – Live. Currently different files have different options, e.g. currently GTs cannot submit a CSEP as Live. |
| **Section 4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**  |
|  |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer  |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |
| **Section 5: DSC Consultation**  |
| **Issued** | Yes / No |
| **Date(s) Issued** |  |
| **Comms Ref(s)** |  |
| **Number of Responses** |  |
| **Section 6: Funding** |
| **Funding Classes**  | ☐ Shipper XX% = £XXXX.XX☐ National Grid Transmission XX% = £XXXX.XX☐ Distribution Network Operator XX% = £XXXX.XX☐ iGT XX% = £XXXX.XXTOTAL = £XXXX.XX |
| **Service Line(s)** |  |
| **ROM or funding details**  |  |
| **Funding Comments**  |  |
| **Section 7: DSC Voting Outcome** |
| **Solution Voting**  | ☐ Shipper Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain☐ National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain ☐ Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain☐ iGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  |
| **Meeting Date**  | XX/XX/XXXX |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA |
| **Overall Outcome**  | Approved for Release X / Rejected  |

**Please send the completed forms to:** **.box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**

**Section B: DSC Change Proposal: Initial views**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Katy Binch** |
| **User Contact Details** | **katy.binch@espug.com** |
| **Section B1: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)** |
| 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

 |
| Clarification is required on two points within the change – * CSEP Status is not submitted on CIC file by the IGT and is instead allocated by XO (please correct the text in the CR). Can the DN set submit/change the status of an IGT supply point through an existing file?
* The proposer has stated that GTs do not submit Nested CSEP details, but wants them to be included in the list of Critical Data Items. When the IGT submits this data, this will be matched to blank GT data and flagged as a mismatch – is the proposer intending this behaviour to produce a CIN file each time? One of the aims of the CR is to make the rejections more purposeful however this would flag as an exception in every case so would not align to the intended benefit of the change.
 |
| 1. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.
 |
| To be reassessed following the proposer addressing the comments in Q1. |
| 1. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a major release? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months)
 |
| Yes, June 2019 is suitable if it is 6months after baselined design. |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 6. The funding for this area is [X% Shipper funding, X% NTS, X% DNS X% iGTs]. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?
 |
| Yes, the funding should be split 50% DNs and 50% IGTs. |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | Defer |
| **Publication of consultation response** | Publish |

**Please note we have also received the following consultation response from Northern Gas Network for XRN4691, XRN4692, XRN4693 and XRN4694:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Name** | Shanna Key |
| **User Contact Details** | SKey@northerngas.co.uk |
| **NGN supports these Change Proposals**These change proposals seek to introduce new data fields and validations into the GT & iGT CSEP file formats received from Xoserve in order to make them more informative and relevant. The new data fields proposed are: Nested CSEP Indicator, Parent CSEP ID, CSEP Hierarchy Level, CSEP Connection Max AQ, Connection Date, CSEP Status, iGT System Max AQ, iGT System Max SHQ and Condition 16 Max SHQ. The new validations proposed are in relation to specifying invalid GT Reference Numbers, minimum levels for CSEP Connection Max AQ & SHQ, iGT System Max AQ & SHQ and Condition 16 Max AQ & SHQ, and Connection Date and CSEP Emergency Cover Date optionality.**Reasons for Support/Opposition:**We support all four change proposals as we agree that the new data fields and validations proposed are sensible amendments which could make the files more informative, and in the case of the CIN, more relevant as it would only be received when inconsistencies are present for crucial data items.**Impact and costs:**We believe that the implementation of these proposals would have minimal impact on NGN. **Implementation:**We agree with the proposed implementation date of June 2019.**Additional Comments**We believe the addition of criteria that states cancelled GT reference numbers must not be used would not be of benefit to industry as there is currently no systemised way to enforce it.  |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | Publish |

**Document Control**

**Details**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Version** | **Owner** | **Review Frequency** | **Next Review Date** |
| XRN Template  |  | Emma Smith  |  |  |

**Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1  | Draft  | 29/03/18  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Reviewers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Name** | **Role** | **Business Area** | **Date**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Approvers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Name** | **Role** | **Business Area** | **Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |