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: | 4692 |
| Change Title: | CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats |
| Date Raised: | 01/04/2019 |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy |
| Email: | Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk  |
| Telephone: | 07812 973337 |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Paul Orlser |
| Email: | Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com |
| Telephone: |  |
| Change Status: | [x]  Proposal | [ ]  With DSG | [ ]  Out for Review |
| [ ]  Voting | [ ]  Approved | [ ]  Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

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

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Description: | 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.
7. XoServe Process Changes
8. Improved XoServe process for matching IGT data to GT data as the current process does not always match the most recent updates correctly.

 1. A “Positive Match” report is required. This should be generated to show that the files from the IGT and GT have been matched by XoServe and there are no differences in the key data items.
 |
| Proposed Release: | Release X: RX/June 2020 |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | [x]  10 Working Days | [ ]  20 Working Days |
| [ ]  30 Working Days | [ ]  Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | 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.1. XoServe Process Changes
2. The XoServe process for matching IGT data to GT data does not always match the most recent updates correctly.

For example, the IGT had raised the CSEP correctly and the DCI data submitted by the GT matched. This quotation was cancelled, and a new DCI was sent cancelling the project. A new quotation, with higher loads was raised and the IGT sent an update to record the new loads. The GT did the same. However, when the CIN was received, it had matched the new details provided by the IGT to the details for the cancelled quotation from the GT. This indicated that the details were incorrect, but in fact all of the correct data had been provided by both parties before the CIN was generated.1. A “Positive Match” report is required. This should be generated to show that the files from the IGT and GT have been matched by XoServe and there are no differences in the key data items.
 |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | The benefits will accrue to DNs, IGTs and Xoserve because a better process of matching DCI files will result in less reworking by all parties. Providing a confirmatory response that there are no mis-matches will enable IGTs and DNs to have confidence that all parties hold the same correct data for that CSEP. |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | None |
| *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 % |
| [ ]  Other <please specify> | XX % |
| Service Line(s) |  |
| ROM or funding details: |  |
| Funding Comments: |  |

# A7: ChMC Recommendation

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| Date Issued: | Click here to enter a date. |
| Comms Ref(s): |  |
| Number of Responses: |  |

# 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: |  |
| Name: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Telephone: |  |

# 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 |
|  |
| 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. |
|  |
| 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 long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months) |
|  |
| 4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area [X]. The funding for this area is [X% Shipper funding, X% NTS, X% DNS X% IGTs, X% Other]. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? |
|  |
| Change Proposal in principle: | [ ]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | [ ]  Publish | [ ]  Private |

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

Section C: DSG Discussion

# C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | Click here to enter a date. |
| DSG Summary: |  |
| 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: |  |
| Xoserve preferred option:(including rationale) |  |
| DSG preferred solution option:(including rationale) |  |
| Consultation closeout: | Click here to enter a date. |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: |  |
| Name: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Telephone: |  |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. |  |
| 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: |  |

Section F: Approved Solution Option

# F1: Approved Solution Option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| XRN Reference: | XRN#### |
| Solution Details: |  |
| Implementation Date: | Click here to enter a date. |
| Approved By: |  |
| Date of Approval: | Click here to enter a date. |

Section G: Change Pack

# G1: Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: |  |
| Comm Title: |  |
| Comm Date: | Click here to enter a date. |

**G2: Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: |  |
| Close Out Date: | Click here to enter a date. |

# G3: Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number:  |  |
| Change Class: |  |
| ChMC Constituency Impacted: |  |
| Change Owner:  |  |
| Background and Context: |  |

# G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional: |  |
| Non-Functional: |  |
| Application: |  |
| User(s): |  |
| Documentation: |  |
| Other: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Files |
| File | Parent Record | Record | Data Attribute | Hierarchy or FormatAgreed |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# G5: Change Design Description

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# G6: Associated Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Associated Change(s) and Title(s): |  |

# G7: DSG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target DSG discussion date: | Click here to enter a date. |
| Any further information: |  |

# G8: Implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Release: | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |
| Status: |  |

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to uklink@xoserve.com

Section H: Representation Response

# H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: |  |
| Name: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Telephone: |  |
| Representation Status: |  |
| Representation Publication: | [ ]  Publish | [ ]  Private |
| Representation Comments: |  |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No | If [No] please specify alternative |

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com

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): |  | Associated MOD Number(s): |  |
| 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: | Choose Item |
| 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 | <If [Yes] please provide details here> |
| [ ]  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: |  |

Version Control

# Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# 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. |