Change Request Proposal & Portfolio Board Appeal Form - Version 9

Originator Details			
Submitted By	Richard Cresswell	Contact Number	0121 623 2535
		Email Address	Richard.cresswell@xoserve.com
Authorising Manager M2/E2*	Dave Ackers	Business Area	Customer Data Services
		Cost Centre	Xos014

*M2/E2 Approval required for all Change Requests and EXEC Approval is required for Business & Process Improvements (Prior to ICAF Review)

Change Request Details	
Change Request Title	Change to validation of address fields
Internal/External Change	Internal Change	Analysis Only?	No
Change Driver Type	Business / Process Improvement
Change Description	Address amendments and M number creations are processed using CMS Contacts: ADD and UNC. CMS will validate the submitted address against its data. If the address submitted is the same as the address held for 5 mandatory fields - Since the onboarding of iGT supply points, the validations are no longer fit for purpose. This is mainly due to two main reasons: 1) iGTs wish to retain the plot number (generally within the DPA field) - The problem with this is that when there is an amendment request, the validations are often finding the proposed 'Buidling No.' in the 'DPA' on UKLink which is populated by the Plot No. which happens to be the same number as the proposed 'Building No.' Current Outcome: This rejects as 'Proposed Address Already Exists' as the first validation is checking to see if the Proposed Building No. exists on that street, in that town, at that post-code – it finds that it does when it finds '23' in the 'DPA', regardless of what is populated in the other fields (see attached for example) 2) The quality of the iGT addresses migrated and now held on UKLink - Often, Shippers wish to just remove a data item from a field, but CMS will not check for a 'null' field and so it looks to CMS as though no change is being made. Current outcome: A Contact will reject as 'Proposed Address already exists' as CMS skips validation when a Proposed address field is blank. i.e. it's looking for the whole address as written in the Proposed address, but won't take into account if that same address exists in UK Link but with another field populated (see attached for example) There are two validation changes required: 1) CMS to stop searching for a duplicate address as soon as it doesn't find the Proposed Building No. in either the Building No. field or Building Name. If it does find it there it will continue to search for the other Proposed fields to see if it can further differentiate and 'prove' it's not a duplicate address. 2) CMS to consider blanks fields when validating proposed addresses to that existing in UKLink. So, for the Sub-Building Name, it will look to see if the address currently on UKLink is blank, see that it's not, recognise that it's a change, and not reject. • These scenarios have become much more prevalent following the onboarding of iGT data and the volumes of amendments being requested by both Shippers and iGTs on iGT supy points. Additionally, the retaining of Plot information within the DPA (or any other field) has meant this issues arises high percentage of the time • Xoserve having to reject valid address amendment requests from the customer, which is affecting

	Customer service, and resulting unnecessary manual investigation and intervention.
	• Customers are having to raise Contacts twice – the initial request, then on a PSC (Previously Submitted Contact)
	• The raising of the PSC means that each request has to be investigated at desk
	• Subsequently, as there isn't the means to amend the address on CDS, due to there having not been a screen built to enable amendments on iGT Supply Points, there is the requirement for IS to create and load an ACR file directly on to UKLink
	• Requests that would normally take a day to complete are now taking between 4 and 8 days.
	• Customer satisfaction is suffering
	• The resourcing of managing these workarounds for CDS are becoming intolerable
	ASAP
	Examples to support UKLP IADBI359.docx
	<See Attached for examples of manifestation of issues>

Solution Type	Enduring Solution	Interim Solution Duration (If Known)	
Target Date	01/11/2017	Urgency	High
Associated XRN Number(s)			
Associated COR Number(s)			
Associated MOD Number(s)			
Associated Risk Reference(s)			

Impact to Systems / Processes	
Detail of UKLP Scope / Impact Assessment	
Other Impacted System(s) / Processes	UKLink / CMS
Detail of Impact to System(s) / Processes	
Has this change been approved in UK Link Committee?	If the Change Impacts UK Link Systems / UK Link Manual / File Formats it has to be approved by UK Link Committee. Please mention the outcome of discussing this change in UK Link Committee.
Date of UK Link Committee approval	

Network Code Impact

Detail of Impact to Network Code	

Change Request Scoring

Mandatory/ Network Code	Customer Service/Satisfaction	Safety	Cost Benefit (£)	Total*
2 = Limited Impact	3 = Significant Impact	2 = Limited Impact	2 = >Ten Thousand	**9**

* The Total is automated and will refresh when you reopen this Change Request

Please submit your Change Request along with the appropriate authorising evidence to the following mail address:

bss.change.mgt@xoserve.com

Portfolio Board Appeal

(Section to be completed only if seeking to appeal a rejection at ICAF)

Date of ICAF Rejection	Click Here For Calendar	Portfolio Board Appeal Date	Click Here For Calendar
Reason for Appeal			
Impact of changing the ICAF Decision			
Impact of not changing the ICAF Decision			

Outcome of Portfolio Board Appeal

Outcome of Portfolio Board Appeal	