

# 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:	<a href="mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk">Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk</a>	
	Telephone:	07812 973337	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Paul Orsler	
	Email:	Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:		
Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected

## A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>

## A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Change Description:	<p>Files Affected: CIN</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduce the number of “Triggers” in the CIN File             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 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.</li> <li>b. Suggested CIN File Process: change the validation process, so that only inconsistencies in crucial data items lead to the creation of a CIN.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
---------------------	---

	<p>2. Add the CSEP Status Field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Current CIN File: the current CIN file does not include a field for the “CSEP Status”.</li> <li>b. Suggested CIN File: add the “CSEP Status” field and validate to ensure that there is a match.</li> </ul> <p>3. XoServe Process Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Improved XoServe process for matching IGT data to GT data as the current process does not always match the most recent updates correctly.</li> <li>b. 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.</li> </ul>	
Proposed Release:	Release X: RX/June 2020	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]

#### A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	<p>4. Reduce the number of “Triggers” in the CIN File</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 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.</li> <li>b. 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.</li> </ul> <p>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”,</p>
----------------------	--

“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.

#### 5. Add the CSEP Status Field

- a. 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.
- b. 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.

#### 6. XoServe Process Changes

- c. 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.
- d. A “Positive Match” report is required. This should be generated to show that the files from the IGT and GT

	<p>have been matched by XoServe and there are no differences in the key data items.</p> <p><i>What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?</i></p>
Benefit Realisation:	<p>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 mismatches will enable IGTs and DNs to have confidence that all parties hold the same correct data for that CSEP.</p> <p><i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i></p>
Benefit Dependencies:	<p>None</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>

### A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

Final DSG Recommendation:	<i>Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.</i>		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	June 2020		

### A6: Funding

Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	90 %
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	10 %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <please specify>	XX %
Service Line(s)	DSC Service Area 10: Connected System Exit Points	
ROM or funding details:		
Funding Comments:	<p>Funding area needs to be confirmed. Service most closely aligns to Service Area 10: Connected System Exit Points which is 100% GT funded.</p> <p>Agreed at July ChMC to 90% DN 10% IGT – incorporate market share. New service line may be needed.</p>	

### A7: ChMC Recommendation – 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve ( to go back into DSG to	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
----------------	--	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

	work on additional requirements)		
Industry Consultation:	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	14/06/2019	18/11/2019
Comms Ref(s):	2346.1 – RJ – PO	2489.2 – RT - PO
Number of Responses:	Two approval responses (solution review) Two approval responses (detail design)	

### A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Please select.
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	Please select.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Approve
	IGT	Approve
Meeting Date:	10/07/2019	
Release Date:	June 2020	
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
	Approved to be included within the June 2020 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:	<p>PO suggested to John Copper that this change be covered separately with wider GT and IGT participation. This was due to the HL SOA only being received and reviewed shortly that same morning. PO was concerned that limited IGT and GT representatives were available for DSG.</p> <p>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 HL SOA will have to be agreed by GT's and IGT's at ChMC.</p> <p>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.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	N/A		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

# Section D: High Level Solution Options

---

## D1: Solution Options

<p>Solution Option Summary:</p>	<p>The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be <a href="#">found here</a></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>Xoserve’s recommendation is to progress with Option 1.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>No preference has been provided by DSG representatives at this stage.</p>
<p>Consultation closeout:</p>	<p>28/06/2019</p>

# 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.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
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:	<p>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</p>
---	---



	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.	<p>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</p>	
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.
---	------------------------------

# Section F: Approved Solution Option

---

## F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4692 CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats – CIN Files
Solution Details:	Option 1; a more robust approach to sharing reporting data as part of the 'Positive Match' requirements by having no manual intervention.
Implementation Date:	26/06/2020
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	10/07/2019

# Section G: Change Pack

---

## G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2489.2 – RT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN4692- CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats – CIN Files
Comm Date:	18/11/2019

## G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For representation
Close Out Date:	02/12/2019

## G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4692- CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats – CIN Files
Change Class:	Functional Change
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Distribution Networks (DNs) and Independent Gas Transporters (IGTs)
Change Owner:	Paul Orsler
Background and Context:	<p><a href="#">Link to CP</a></p> <p>Following implementation of Project Nexus on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017, a number of changes were introduced to the CSEP Creation and Maintenance processes. These allow IGTs to master parent data which is essential to ensure MPRNs can be created within UK Link systems. This shift in responsibility has led to GTs having a lack of control over the true picture of CSEPs connected to their networks and crucially, the offtake demand in a given area, which are crucial for GT monitoring responsibilities. Attempts have been made to focus on improving data quality however these have not yielded significant results.</p> <p>GTs have made it clear that they feel it is now appropriate to change the CSEP processes, having spent several months discussing concerns with IGTs, with the primary aim to support creating good quality information in the first instance, whilst also looking to increase visibility of a number of those key data items between parties.</p> <p>This change aims to deliver the requirements detailed below:</p> <p><b><u>Requirement 1</u></b></p>

	<p>Reduce the number of “Triggers” in the CIN File to ensure only data items deemed critical for CSEP processes are validated when notifying parties of mismatches.</p> <p>There will be changes made in SAP ISU to modify the critical data items in order to reduce the triggers to create a .CIN file. The crucial data items would be : “CSEP Post Town”, “CSEP Postcode Out code”, “Number of ISEPs”, “LDZ Identifier”, “CSEP Exit Zone Identifier”, “CSEP Connection Max AQ”, “CSEP Connection Max SHQ”, “Condition 16 Max AQ”, “Nested CSEP Indicator”, “Directly Connected CSEP ID”, “Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number”, “IGT Short Code”.</p> <p><b><u>Requirement 2</u></b></p> <p>Improved XoServe process for matching IGT data to GT data as the current process does not always match the most recent updates correctly.</p> <p><b><u>Requirement 3</u></b></p> <p>A new positive match report will be developed to display the successfully matched critical data items provided within the DCI (GT file) and the CIC/CAI (iGT file) and sent to GTs and iGTs. The report will include the following fields: GT Short Code, IGT Short Code, GT Reference Number, IGT Project Reference, CSEP ID, CSEP Status, CSEP Effective Date.</p>
--	--

#### G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration (CSEP)
Non-Functional:	None
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW
User(s):	GT & IGT
Documentation:	None
Other:	None

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
Please see the attached file format document below				

#### G5: Change Design Description

--

**Requirement 1.**

The current CIN file is produced if there is an inconsistency in any of the data items provided by the GT and IGT. As part of this change there will be changes in the validation process such that only inconsistencies in the critical data items lead to the creation of a CIN file. The critical data items are “CSEP Post Town”, “CSEP Postcode Out code”, “Number of ISEPs”, “LDZ Identifier”, “CSEP Exit Zone Identifier”, “CSEP Connection Max AQ”, “CSEP Connection Max SHQ”, “Condition 16 Max AQ”, “Nested CSEP Indicator”, “Directly Connected CSEP ID”, “Directly Connected CSEP GT Reference Number”, “IGT Short Code”.

**Requirement 2.**

There will be an enhancement to the CIN file trigger process to ensure the latest updates which are received in the CIC, CAI, DCI files from the respective parties are utilised to perform the validation and associated matching activities, as the current process do not always match the most recent updates provided by parties due to timing differences in batch runs.

**Requirement 3.**

As part of the change a new report will be developed (Positive Match) for all the critical data items provided within in the DCI (GT file) and the CIC/CAI (IGT file) which have matched successfully, and the report will be sent to GTs and IGTs. Data items to include: GT Short Code, IGT Short Code, GT Reference Number, IGT Project Reference, CSEP ID, CSEP Status, CSEP Effective Date. The positive match report will run on the first day of every month in BW to extract previous month’s updates from UK Link system. This report would be sent to the IGT and GT customers.

Positive match report will be generated only for CSEPs with status ‘LI’-Live or ‘RQ’-Requested as on the first of the next month.

Report layout template is summarised within the table below:

Positive Match Report Field names	Field Description
CSEP ID	The unique identifier for the Connected System Exit Point.
GT REFERENCE NUMBER	A unique reference allocated by the larger Transporter which identifies the directly connected CSEP Project.
GT SHORT CODE	The short code of the GT responsible for the CSEP.
IGT CSEP REFERENCE	A unique reference allocated by the IGT which identifies the CSEP Project.
IGT SHORT CODE	The short code of the IGT responsible for the CSEP.
CSEP STATUS	The status of the CSEP:

	VALUES: LI – Live, RQ- Requested
CSEP CHANGE EFF DATE	The date from which the CSEP is created or CSEP amendment is applicable

### G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	XRN4691- CSEPS: IGT and GT File Formats – CGI Files
------------------------------------	---

### G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	N/A
Any further information:	

### G8: Implementation

Target Release:	June 2020
Status:	

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

# Section H: Representation Response

---

## H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities	
	Name:	Alison Davies	
	Email:	Alison.Davies@wwutilities.co.uk	
	Telephone:	02920278648	
Representation Status:	Publish		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	<p>The proposed design meets the requirements identified for the CIN file.</p> <p>By reducing the number of “triggers”, the number of files received by the IGTs and GTs, enabling them to concentrate resources on inconsistencies in critical data.</p> <p>Enhancing the “matching” process, will prevent the wrong IGT and GT records being matched, triggering CIN files for CSEPs that have already been addressed.</p> <p>The “Positive Match Report” will confirm that records from the IGT and GT have been correctly linked, currently there is no way to check this.</p>		
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	De-scoped from June 2020 - release date to be confirmed.	

## H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.
---	--

Please send the completed representation response to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

## H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd	
	Name:	Alison Price	
	Email:	alison.price@npower.com	
	Telephone:	07557202065	
Representation Status:	Large Shipper		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	No comments		
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes		«h1_userDataAlternative»

### H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.
---	--

Please send the completed representation response to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)



# Version Control

---

## Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	With DSG	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Updated with outcome from ChMC on 10 <sup>th</sup> April 2019
2	With DSG	11/06/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with DSG discussions from 3 <sup>rd</sup> 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
5	Approved	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Outcome from ChMC meeting on 10 <sup>th</sup> July added
6	Voting	10/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Change Pack and Reps added from November Change Pack

## Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Superseded	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11 <sup>th</sup> 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 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2018.