| Shipper | Name        | Date     | In Support<br>/<br>Not In Support | Publish | Shipper Comments  | Xoserve Comments  |
|---------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|---|---|
| NPO     | Kiran Samra | 24/04/15 | Not Provided                      | Y       | <ul> <li>There isn't any system or process impact for this change, however there are a few questions/suggestions from the business;</li> <li>Following the implementation of Mod 487V, is it possible to have the ASP included within the new screens as well as the ASP effective date?</li> </ul> | Incorporating this field was<br>not in scope for MOD0487v<br>which is why it has not<br>been included as part of the<br>Data Enquiry Service<br>design.   |
|         |             |          |                                   |         | • For the community view, would be useful to know which fields are visible to each organisation type I.e. shipper or supplier.  | Existing screens may<br>change in terms of look and<br>layout however all current<br>data items will be<br>transposed. As a result of<br>UKLP there are additional<br>fields these include:<br>Withdrawal Status, Network<br>Exit Agreement Indicator,<br>Twin Stream Site Indicator,<br>CSEP ID, Seasonal Large<br>Supply Point Indicator &<br>Current Supplier Shortcode<br>(following additional T&C<br>being accepted). |
|         |             |          |                                   |         | • Will new user logins be required once this goes live or will existing logins still be valid?  | Each Data Enquiry account<br>would require a new<br>account as access to all of<br>Xoserve's online services<br>will be through the new UK<br>Link Services Portal  |

|  |  | • Users that have CMS use an npower wide login therefore are able to see details for all shipper ID's under the npower umbrella. Is this also possible for DES, or are logins only at a shipper ID level? | solution (single sign on)<br>which will also include the<br>Data Enquiry Service.<br>Parent Child capability will<br>be available for the Data<br>Enquiry Service as it is for<br>CMS.  |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | • This would require communications to be issued to all impacted parties.   | Please see above response regarding a new single sign on.   |
|  |  | <ul> <li>On switch over, it is not clear if password resets will be required.</li> </ul>  | At cutover, existing Data<br>Enquiry accounts will no<br>longer work as access to<br>the new Data Enquiry<br>Service will be through the<br>new UK Link Services<br>Portal solution. New<br>accounts will need to be in<br>place for UK Link Services<br>Portal access, which will<br>enable single sign on to all<br>of Xoserve's online services<br>that can be accessed<br>through the Portal. |
|  |  |   | In advance of cutover it is<br>expected that all required<br>accounts will be set up and<br>a default password<br>provided to all Users to log<br>on post cutover. When they<br>access the account for the  |

|     |            |     |          |   |  | first time with their default<br>password, they will be<br>required to re-set their<br>password and create their<br>security profile to enable<br>the self-password reset<br>capability. |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|---|--|--|
|     |            |     |          |   | <ul> <li>This would impact on normal<br/>operations, as this is a system that is utilised.</li> </ul>          | Please see above<br>response. We envisage<br>that all Users will be set up<br>prior to go live.  |
| EDF | Bryan Hale | Not | Provided | Y | • We are not sure why the AMR info (ASP ID) is not shown on the 'Meter Asset Data' screen alongside SMSO info. | Incorporating this field was<br>not in scope for MOD0487v<br>which is why it has not<br>been included as part of the<br>Data Enquiry Service<br>design.                                  |
|     |            |     |          |   | • The Community view only shows SMSO<br>ID and not ASP ID – this needs to be<br>changed.                       | Incorporating this field was<br>not in scope for MOD0487v<br>which is why it has not<br>been included as part of the<br>Data Enquiry Service<br>design.                                  |
|     |            |     |          |   | • ASP ID is not showing on the 'Daily<br>Read Equipment Data' screen – it needs to<br>be added.                | Incorporating this field was<br>not in scope for MOD0487v<br>which is why it has not<br>been included as part of the<br>Data Enquiry Service<br>design.                                  |

| Shipper    | Name        | Date     | In Support<br>/<br>Not In Support | Publish | Shipper Comments   | Xoserve Comments   |
|------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| EDF Energy | Bryan Hale  | 16/05/15 | Not Provided                      | Y       | I feel there is a problem with the example given for the signed numerics.<br>Image: Control of the signed numerics         Image: Control of the signed numerics | Any leading zeros are stripped<br>for numeric fields in csv files –<br>the statement that you refer to<br>references creation of the flat<br>file which then references the<br>truncation at conversion to<br>csv. This makes it consistent<br>with the example.<br>The max value does include<br>the space for the sign that<br>won't be provided in a csv file<br>– i.e. as written from flat will be<br>099999999999999 (11 '9's to<br>the left of the decimal place<br>(dp), with two to the right) to -<br>99999999999999 (11 '9's to<br>the left of the dp, with two to<br>the right). So as it appears in<br>the csv is for a positive value it<br>will be 13 characters and 14 to<br>take account of the negative. |
| BGT        | Graham Wood | 14/05/15 | Not Provided                      | Y       | One of our comments was rejected with the reason:-<br>Reject – 'should' reflects that aspirationally we should be striving to create a standard definition.<br>However, this reflects the tension between the fact that some Users wished for minimum changes were to be made to existing records – therefore some areas of inconsistency remain to reflect this aspiration from Users.<br>I'm OK with that approach, but they should explicitly list where a data item has synonyms.<br>Can a list of synonyms be included please?  | We have eliminated a<br>significant number of<br>synonyms as a result of the file<br>format review in UKLP. We<br>will work through these in the<br>next few weeks, and will<br>identify the scale of these.<br>In the meantime, I propose to<br>publish the glossary as is,<br>ensuring it is available for all<br>parties.   |

| Npower | Kiran Samra | Not Provided | Y | Zeroes (on the back of the British Gas comments):                                  | As a result of the previous<br>representations (made by<br>British Gas) we have<br>amended the document which<br>we hoped would have<br>provided the clarity that you<br>have requested.<br>I have assumed that this<br>references the treatment of<br>optional numeric fieldsi.e.<br>the statement that appears in<br>the reps received for the<br>Glossary: "Zero value numeric<br>fields will reduce to a single<br>zero (0) if the field is<br>mandatory and will be<br>comma'ed out (i.e. ,.) where<br>the field is optional."<br>Yes, if the field is optional and |
|--------|-------------|--------------|---|--|--|
|        |             |              |   | • Need further clarity is this in relation to<br>'all files' if an optional field? | the field does not need to be<br>populated by the conditionality<br>of this field, this need not be<br>populated   |
|        |             |              |   | Currently don't populate, so do we now need to, as currently it is left blank?     | If you currently don't populate<br>we would not expect there to<br>be a change in treatment. i.e.<br>you can continue to provide<br>this optional field as blank.  |
|        |             |              |   | • Or, is this in relation to one particular file and if so, which one(s)?          | This is a general statement<br>that is relevant to existing UK<br>Link standards.  |

| Shipper |                    |          | In Support<br>/<br>Not In Support | Publish | Shipper Comments  | Xoserve Comments   |
|---------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|---|--|
| BGT     | Oorlagh<br>Chapman | 22/04/15 | Not Provided                      |         | <ol> <li>The log is normally 600kb to 1.5Mb.</li> <li>Have Xoserve estimated the files<br/>sizes post NEXUS?</li> </ol> | The monthly audit log is<br>forecast to increase in size<br>individually for all Shippers<br>by 25% when new UKLink<br>goes live in October 2015,<br>rising to 50% by 2017.<br>Therefore, to mitigate<br>against the increase<br>affecting the IX bandwidth<br>utilisation, we are<br>proposing to change the<br>monthly audit logs into<br>daily. |

## RE: 1397.2 – LH – SN - COR3312 Security of Supply SCR – GDE Cashout and Compensation Arrangement – Phase 2

| Shipper | Name         | Date     | In Support<br>/<br>Not In Support | Publish | Shipper Comments   | Xoserve Comments   |
|---------|--------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| SSE     | Anne Jackson | 01/05/15 | Not Provided                      | Y       | <ul> <li>On the file format for the<br/>changes to the IDB file, I believe that<br/>for record type<br/>D02_INVOICE_ITEM_SUMMARY<br/>needs to be increased from 45 to 51<br/>occurrences to allow for the addition<br/>of the new charge types.</li> </ul> | Accept comment – Revised<br>File Record to be issued in<br>Change Summary  |
|         |              |          |                                   |         | • The communication document<br>for 1397.2 states new codes B94,<br>B96 and B98, but the new IDB file<br>format lists B94, B95, B96.   | Accept comment,<br>communication document<br>incorrect, the charge types<br>in .IDB file (B94, B95, B96)<br>are the correct ones. Re-<br>issue correct ones in<br>Change Summary                                       |
|         |              |          |                                   |         | <ul> <li>The record format document<br/>E59 states DRP charge type and not<br/>DSP.</li> </ul>   | Accept comment, minor<br>update required but has no<br>bearing on<br>structure/content of<br>supporting information.<br>Header to be updated from<br>DSR to DSP on page 1 and<br>page 3. Re-issue in<br>Change Summary |