

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4691**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| **Change Title** | CGI File - CSEPs: IGT and GT File Formats |
| **Date Raised** |  |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | Wales & West Utilities |
| **Sponsor Name** | Richard Pomroy |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | [Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk](mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk) 07812 973337 |
| **CDSP Contact Name** |  |
| **CDSP Contact Details** |  |
| **Change Status** | **Proposal** / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected |
| **Section 1: Impacted Parties** | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | ☐ Shipper  ☐ National Grid Transmission  x Distribution Network Operator  x iGT |
| **Section 2: Proposed Change Solution / Final (redlined) Change** | |
| Files Affected: CGI   1. New Fields 2. Nested CSEP Indicator 3. Parent CSEP ID 4. CSEP Hierarchy Level 5. Level 6. CSEP Connection Max AQ (provided by GT) 7. Connection Date 8. Increase Breach Figure from 85% to 101% | |
| Proposed Release | Release / June /19 |
| Proposed IA Period | 10WD / **30WD** / XXWD |
| **Section 3: Benefits and Justification** | |
| Files Affected: CGI   1. New Fields 2. Nested CSEP Indicator   When analysing the data contained within the CGI file, whether the CSEP is a Parent or a Nest is relevant, but the indicator is not currently included in the CGI file.   1. Parent CSEP ID   Include the Parent CSEP ID for Nested CSEPs to aid analysis.   1. CSEP Hierarchy Level   Cadent have submitted Change XRN4354 to reintroduce the Nested CSEP Hierarchy Report, including this in the CGI will aid the analysis of the data.   1. Level   As above.   1. CSEP Connection Max AQ (provided by GT)   The current CGI format is that it does not include the CSEP Connection Max AQ supplied by the GT, only the figure provided by the iGT.   1. Connection Date   Currently there is no way to determine if the CSEP is taking gas or not, and the CGI files are often generated when the MPRNs are created and linked to the CSEP ID by the iGT. This means that a CGI may show a CSEPs are breaching when no gas is flowing. Including the Connection Date will help iGTs and GTs identify, which CSEPs are live and which are not.  The possibility of basing the CGI file on actual Meter Readings has been discussed in the iGT/GT Meetings, but it was ruled as too complex. However, using actual meter reads to give a true reflection of the gas being taken would be preferential to using potential figures.   1. Increase Breach Figure from 85% to 101%   Having the breach figure at 85% in practice means, that all completed CSEPs that have an AQ between 85%-100% (which they should do), generate a CGI file every time the AQ is recalculated on receipt of meter readings. By raising the breach figure to 101%, attention will be focused on those CSEPs that are actually breaching the contracted CSEP Connection Max AQ. | |
| **Section 4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
|  | |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |
| **Section 5: DSC Consultation** | |
| **Issued** | Yes / No |
| **Date(s) Issued** |  |
| **Comms Ref(s)** |  |
| **Number of Responses** |  |
| **Section 6: Funding** | |
| **Funding Classes** | ☐ Shipper XX% = £XXXX.XX  ☐ National Grid Transmission XX% = £XXXX.XX  ☐ Distribution Network Operator XX% = £XXXX.XX  ☐ iGT XX% = £XXXX.XX  TOTAL = £XXXX.XX |
| **Service Line(s)** |  |
| **ROM or funding details** |  |
| **Funding Comments** |  |
| **Section 7: DSC Voting Outcome** | |
| **Solution Voting** | ☐ Shipper Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  ☐ National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  ☐ Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  ☐ iGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain |
| **Meeting Date** | XX/XX/XXXX |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA |
| **Overall Outcome** | Approved for Release X / Rejected |

**Please send the completed forms to:** [**.box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**](mailto:.box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com)

**Section B: DSC Change Proposal: Initial views**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Katy Binch** | |
| **User Contact Details** | **katy.binch@espug.com** | |
| **Section B1: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)** | | |
| 1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market?  Please can you provide the rationale for your response | | |
| No | | |
| 1. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. | | |
| Yes, this will improve the ability of both IGTs and GTs to accurately reconcile network creation and nested chains. The increase in the breach figure from 85% to 101% will reduce the number of records being created and therefore enable the network owners to focus resource on sites where the percentage breaches require a more timely resolution. | | |
| 1. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a major release? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months) | | |
| Yes, June 2019 is suitable if it is 6months after baselined design. | | |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area 6. The funding for this area is [X% Shipper funding, X% NTS, X% DNS X% iGTs]. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | |
| Yes, the funding should be split 50% DNs and 50% IGTs. | | |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |

**Please note we have also received the following consultation response from Northern Gas Network for XRN4691, XRN4692, XRN4693 and XRN4694:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Name** | Shanna Key |
| **User Contact Details** | SKey@northerngas.co.uk |
| **NGN supports these Change Proposals**  These change proposals seek to introduce new data fields and validations into the GT & iGT CSEP file formats received from Xoserve in order to make them more informative and relevant. The new data fields proposed are: Nested CSEP Indicator, Parent CSEP ID, CSEP Hierarchy Level, CSEP Connection Max AQ, Connection Date, CSEP Status, iGT System Max AQ, iGT System Max SHQ and Condition 16 Max SHQ. The new validations proposed are in relation to specifying invalid GT Reference Numbers, minimum levels for CSEP Connection Max AQ & SHQ, iGT System Max AQ & SHQ and Condition 16 Max AQ & SHQ, and Connection Date and CSEP Emergency Cover Date optionality.  **Reasons for Support/Opposition:**  We support all four change proposals as we agree that the new data fields and validations proposed are sensible amendments which could make the files more informative, and in the case of the CIN, more relevant as it would only be received when inconsistencies are present for crucial data items.  **Impact and costs:**  We believe that the implementation of these proposals would have minimal impact on NGN.  **Implementation:**  We agree with the proposed implementation date of June 2019.  **Additional Comments**  We believe the addition of criteria that states cancelled GT reference numbers must not be used would not be of benefit to industry as there is currently no systemised way to enforce it. | |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | Publish |

**Document Control**

**Details**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Version** | **Owner** | **Review Frequency** | **Next Review Date** |
| XRN Template |  | Emma Smith |  |  |

**Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1 | Draft | 29/03/18 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Reviewers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Name** | **Role** | **Business Area** | **Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Approvers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Name** | **Role** | **Business Area** | **Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |