

TRANSCO NETWORK CODE MODIFICATION PROPOSAL No. 0706

"Change to Nomenclature for Priority Levels Relating to UK Link Problem Management "
Version 1.0

Date: 09/07/2004

Proposed Implementation Date: 14/10/2004

Urgency: Non-Urgent

Justification

Nature of Proposal

Modification of section U 7.6.1 of the Network Code is required to reflect a change in nomenclature to the priority levels used to reference reported UK Link problems contained in section 3.5 "Problem Management" of the UK-Link Manual, IS Service Definition. This is a housekeeping exercise to reflect new terminology being introduced by the NGT IS service provider.

The current UKLink Manual IS Service Definition document refers to 6 priority levels, labeled IM6 to IM1. NGT have outsourced their IS provision to CSC and as part of this process problem management will be provided from a CSC Service Desk. The toolset used by this new Service Desk is configured to use 5 priority levels labeled P1 to P5. There are no detrimental changes to the definitions or response times associated with these levels and for the most significant there is a direct one to one mapping to the new labels as follows.

IM6 becomes P1 – Loss of service that affects more than one UK Link User.

IM5 becomes P2 – Loss of service to an individual UK Link User that affects all ARs.

IM4 becomes P3 – Loss of service to an individual UK Link User that affects more than one but not all ARs.

IM3 becomes P4 – Loss of service but restricted to an individual UK Link User.

IM2 becomes P4 – There is a problem but does not affect the functionality of the service, e.g. poor response times.

IM1 becomes P5 – The call has no impact upon the use of the service, such as general enquiries or queries.

The new service desk will be taking calls from 14th October 2004. There is no change to telephone numbers, however a new fax number will be provided.

Purpose of Proposal

To amend the references to priority level IM6 in section U 7.6.1 to P1 to reflect the new terminology being introduced by the NGT IS service provider.

Consequence of not making this change

Failure to implement the proposal would necessitate NGT IS “translating” between the current IM labels for priority levels and the new P labels. This could increase the risk of misunderstanding which could have the potential to effect service restoration times.

Area of Network Code Concerned

Section U 7.6.1(a) and U 7.6.1(e)(i) and changes to the UKLink Manual, IS Service Definition

Proposer's Representative

Martin Evans (Transco)

Proposer

Paul D Hastings (Transco)

Signature

.....