



## UK Link - Programme Impact Assessment Process Templates

To be authorised by a minimum level of a XM1 manager

All fields are mandatory. IA Requests without sufficient information will be rejected & returned to the originator.

Section 1: Completed by Requestor (page 1-2)

Section 2: Completed by Flash Validators (page 3)

Section 3: Completed by Supplier of Change / UAT Testing Team (page 4)

Section 4: Completed by Impact Assessment Approvers (page 5)

Section 5: Completed by Development Team

Section 6: Completed by SIT Team

Section 7: Completed by UAT Team

Please submit this form to: .box.xoserve.UKLinkProgramme

Guidance notes in blue are to be deleted before submission

### Section 1: To be completed by the IA requestor:

UK Link Programme Impact Assessment Form	
<b>**Impact Assessment ID:</b>	<b>UKLP IADBI262</b>
<b>XRN log Number (if applicable):</b>	<b>Assigned by UK Link Programme management Office (PMO)</b>
Change Title:	<i>Change to RGMA validations for LI confirmations</i>
XM1 Owner	Dave Addison
Fast Track IA (Y/N):	<i>(Guidance note: XM2 approval is required to fast track IA)</i>
Date Raised:	28 <sup>th</sup> September 2016
Raised By:	Emma Smith
Originator:	Work stream
Source of Change:	<i>- New Requirement</i>
Date Approval Required By:	July 2017
Portfolio Impact (Yes/No):	No
Portfolio Impact Details:	N/A
Required in Legacy (Yes/No):	No
RRC Impact (Yes/No)	<i>Yes rule changes required</i>
Priority (1-Critical, 2-High, 3-Medium, 4 - Low):	3
Requested Implementation By Date:	<i>10 months post go live</i>



## UK Link - Programme Impact Assessment Process Templates

### UK Link Programme Impact Assessment Form

#### Change Description:

These are the existing RGMA validation rules in legacy and new UK Link, as detailed below, the validations are required to be changed to that detailed:

#### ONJOB submission:

ONJOB Shipper validations shall ensure that one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- ONJOB transactions received from a User with a **LI confirmation** for the specified meter point; If a retrospective effective date is specified
  - It should be greater than the last reading if transfer reads are loaded.
  - If transfer reads are not loaded then it can be as early as when the confirmation was in CO status.
  - **Amend the rule to allow for an update to have an effective date pre the CO status providing no other User has a confirmation at LI or CO on the effective date.**
- ONJOB transactions with DUC received from a user with LI confirmation for the specified meter point, then the user must hold LI confirmation on both the processing date and the effective date.
- ONJOB transactions received from a User with a **SU confirmation** for the specified meter point. ONUPDs with an Appointment dataset will be accepted provided that the date is within the ONUPD submitter's period of ownership, and a subsequent reading has not been loaded.
- ONJOB transactions submitted for a supply point where the User has a confirmation at **CO (confirmed) status**. Such transactions shall be accepted regardless of another user having a confirmation at LI status as long as the effective date of transaction is on or after the date when the confirmation was at CO status.
- ONJOB transactions submitted for a meter point where the User has a confirmation at CO (confirmed) status, and the appointment date indicates that the effective date is BEFORE the commencement of the CO or RQ will be accepted only if there is no other user having a LI confirmation.
- ONJOB transactions submitted for a supply point where the User has a confirmation at **RQ (requested) status** Such transactions shall be accepted provided that no other user has a confirmation at CO or LI status. Note: where an appointment and / or reading dataset is provided and the date is BEFORE the commencement of the RQ status this **will not** stop the ONJOB from being accepted, provided that does not fail validation on last activity date.

#### ONUPD submission:

ONUPD RSU Validation shall ensure that one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- ONUPD transactions received from a User with a **LI confirmation** for the specified meter point. If a retrospective effective date is specified – within the APPNT and READG datasets – this must be within the Users ownership.
  - **Amend the rule to allow for an update to have an effective date prior to the period of ownership providing no other User has a confirmation at LI or CO on the effective date.**
- ONUPD transactions received from a User with a **SU confirmation** for the specified meter point. ONUPDs with an Appointment dataset will be accepted provided that the date is within the ONUPD submitter's period of ownership, and a subsequent reading has not been loaded. In such instances any dates provided in a Reading dataset shall not be used. Where only a Reading dataset is received, such a transaction will be accepted where this has a date in the ONUPD submitters period of ownership, and a subsequent reading has not been loaded – e.g. the OPNT.
- ONUPD transactions submitted for a supply point where the User has a confirmation at **CO (confirmed) status**. Such transactions shall be accepted provided that no other user has a confirmation at LI status. Note: where an appointment and / or reading dataset is provided and the date is BEFORE the commencement of the CO or RQ status this **will not** stop the ONUPD from being accepted, provided that does not fail validation on last activity date.
- ONUPD transactions submitted for a supply point where the User has a confirmation at **RQ (requested) status** Such transactions shall be accepted provided that no other user has a confirmation at CO or LI status. Note: where an appointment and / or reading dataset is provided and the date is BEFORE the commencement of the RQ status this **will not** stop the ONUPD from being accepted, provided that does not fail validation on last activity date.

#### Reason for Change / Justification:

The amendment to the rules will allow for asset updates to be recorded with the correct effective date in the register and allow for Xoserve to currently bill Capacity and Commodity as set out in the UNC.

#### Requirement relevant to the Request:

*(Please detail the relevant requirements to the request and if it needs to be changed as a result of the request being raised)*

#### Impacted System(s):

New Uk Link