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 – CIN Files | | | |
| Date Raised: | 01/04/2019 | | | |
| 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: | Paul Orlser | | |
| Email: | Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com | | |
| Telephone: |  | | |
| 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: | Files Affected: CIN   1. 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: | ☒ 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: | June 2020 | | |

# A6: Funding

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Funding Classes: | ☐ Shipper | XX % |
| ☐ National Grid Transmission | XX % |
| ☒ Distribution Network Operator | 100 % |
| ☐ IGT | XX % |
| ☐ Other <please specify> | XX % |
| Service Line(s) | DSC Service Area 10: Connected System Exit Points | |
| ROM or funding details: |  | |
| Funding Comments: | Funding area needs to be confirmed. Service most closely aligns to Service Area 10: Connected System Exit Points which is 100% GT funded. | |

# A7: ChMC Recommendation – 10th April 2019

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | ☒ Approve ( to go back into DSG to work on additional requirements) | 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: | 14/06/2019 | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 2346.1 – RJ – PO | |
| Number of Responses: | Two approval 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](mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@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: | 03/06/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | PO suggested to John Copper that this change be covered separately with wider GT and IGT participation. This was due to the HLSOA only being received and reviewed shortly that same morning. PO was concerned that limited IGT and GT representatives were available for DSG.  PO explained the difference between option 1 and 2 for delivering the requirements is the way that the reporting extract is provided. PO stated that in short Xoserve will deliver what is being asked of the customer and make changes in SAP ISU to make comparison on the data items and report on the differences in the existing file formats. The funding of the HLSOA will have to be agreed by GT’s and IGT’s at ChMC.  PO stated that this Change is seen as a medium level change in regards to complexity and medium change in terms of testing due to CSEP data is treated differently to how it is held in SAP, which when compared to SPA registration data activities is not as complex. | | |
| Capture Document / Requirements: | N/A | | |
| 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/4380/23461-xrn4692-high-level-solution-option.pdf)  The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified two viable options to deliver the requirements of the change. The difference between both options centres around either producing an automated output to share positive match details with respective parties, or having a more manual delivery mechanism which utilised operational teams to download and dispatch reports.  In order to achieve the primary objective of this change – which we understand is to trigger the CIN file less frequently and only where appropriate – our analysis identified that it would not be appropriate to add CSEP Status as a critical data item to the CIN file. The justification for this is that inclusion of CSEP Status is likely to trigger the CIN file more frequently, notably because timing of file receipt often leads to their being a variance in CSEP Status details. |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | Xoserve’s recommendation is to progress with Option 1.  This is due to a more robust approach to sharing reporting data as part of the ‘Positive Match’ requirements by having no manual intervention. Dependant on clarification on the reporting frequency it may be a more practical solution to have a manual delivery mechanism, particularly if requirements are for reports to be delivered at monthly intervals. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | No preference has been provided by DSG representatives at this stage. |
| Consultation closeout: | 28/06/2019 |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | BUUK |
| Name: | John Cooper |
| Email: | john.cooper@bu-uk.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 01359302450 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | BUUK supports the change proposal, as reducing the number of triggers on the CIN file will increase the usefulness of the file and the data that is contained within it. The additional Xoserve process changes will also lead to better CSEP data quality.   With regard to the options presented by Xoserve, BUUK’s preference is option 1. The key reason being that the automation of the reporting will reduce manual handling and thus errors occurring. It is also worth noting that this aligns with Xoserve’s and the industry’s push towards greater automation. Despite this, the associated costs of option 1 are greater than that of option 2 (10-20k more), the key difference being that the generation and delivery of reports for option 2 are via manual means. However, it is not clear from option 2 whether the enduring costs of manually generating and delivering the reports is included within the overall HLC estimate. You would expect that the enduring costs for an automated approach should be lower. Nonetheless for both options; what method will the reports be delivered via? Under what ‘new format’ will these reports be in? Both of these points will be important in terms of internal processing and compatibility for our own internal systems and processes. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Hi John. Thank you for the reply. We can confirm that no enduring costs for either option would be absorbed within Managing The Business (MTB) costs. With regards to the questions you have raised about delivery mechanisms and report formats, this information will be made available in the Detailed Design Change Pack, which would be produced at a later stage in the change lifecycle. To provide further clarity, if this change is agreed to be within scope for June 2020 Major Release, we would be looking to produce Detailed Design Change Packs during December 2019. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy |
| Email: | Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 07812973337 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Option 1 We prefer an system based solution both to reduce ongoing operating costs and because manual solutions carry an inherent risk of failure. We accept that Option 1 is estimated to be £10k more than Option 2, other than this there seems to be no difference in terms of delivery complexity | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments. |

Version Control

# Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 1 | With DSG | 12/04/2019 | Xoserve | Updated with outcome from ChMC on 10th April 2019 |
| 2 | With DSG | 11/06/2019 | Xoserve | CP updated with DSG discussions from 3rd June 2019 |
| 3 | Solution Review | 14/06/2019 | Xoserve | CP sent out for solution review in June 19’s Change Pack |
| 4 | Voting | 04/07/2019 | Xoserve | CP updated with reps, ready for ChMC solution options and release decision |

# 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. |