

**Rough Order Magnitude (ROM) Request**

**Change Reference Number: (XRN 4958)**

**Please send completed form to:** **mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section A: Change Details** |
| **Change Title** |

|  |
| --- |
| CDSP to convert Class 3 or 4 meter points to Class 1 when G1.6.15 criteria are met  |

 |
| **Will the Change impact the UNC ( YES / NO )** | Yes |
| **MOD Reference (if raised)** | UNC 0691S<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0691> |
| **Contact Details of Person Requesting the ROM**  |
| **Contact Name**  |

|  |
| --- |
| Kate Mulvany  |

 |
| **Contact Email** |

|  |
| --- |
| kate.mulvany@centrica.com  |

 |
| **Contact Phone** | 07789 572420  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section B: Xoserve Acknowledgement and Business Analyst Contact Details***(Xoserve CIO Office will add)* |
| **ROM Received Date** | 24th May 2019 |
| **ROM Response date** | 10th June 2019 |
| **Business Analyst Name** | Andrew Steed |
| **Business Analyst Email** | Andrew.steed@xoserve.com |
| **Business Analyst Phone** |  |

**Rough Order Magnitude (ROM) Response**

|  |
| --- |
| **Type of ROM Evaluation** |
| *ROM for Code-Modification* |
| **The Proposed Change** (Xoserve’ s understanding of the Modification) |
| This Modification proposes that where the requirement for a Class 3 or 4 meter point to become Class 1 (number of calculations and number of months) has been met, and the Shipper has not taken steps to convert the site to Class 1 within a [**1 month**] grace period, that the CDSP would take steps to convert the meter point to Class 1.The Modification also proposes a new Performance Assurance report of sites where the CDSP has taken action, over the previous 12 months.Two Solution options have been considered. A fully automated solution (option 1) and a manual solution (option 2) |
| **Change Impacts** |
| **General Impacts to Xoserve and External Parties:****Option 1(Fully Automated)**1. **ISU UKLINK**: In ISU, a new screen can be created where the list of sites can be interrogated to identify those that meet the criteria for a change in class (from class 3 & 4 to class 1). A trigger will then generate a report which will initiate the necessary workflows to automatically update the class for identified sites.
2. **BW**: It is assumed that there will be no changes required and data will flow as is from ISU. However, if required the requested report can be designed only in BW which is proposed in Option 2. A second BW report is required to highlight where the CDSP has performed some action on those identified sites.

**Option 2(Manual)**1. **BW**: It is proposed to design the report in BW system and identify the impacted sites which can be used as a baseline for Xoserve users to interrogate manually. BW and BO changes would be required to deliver this report. This report may be implemented as part of XRN4958 which may be utilised for this purpose. As this report is not yet live in the system, the upper cost estimate has considered the need to develop this report specifically for this change.

A second BW report is required to highlight where the CDSP has performed some action on those identified sites. 1. **ISU UKLINK**: Supply Point change file can be used by CDSP Users to manually request the class changes for identified sites.
2. **AMT/PO**: There will be minor effort involved from AMT/PO App Support team to manually move the file to production environment and file will be picked up automatically.
 |
| **External Interface Impacts (Changes to Screens, Portals, Files, Permitted Values, etc.)**None identified |
| **Impacts to Gemini System:**None identified |
| **Impacts UKL Manual Appendix 5b:**Not assessed at this time |
| **DSC Service Areas Impacted:**1. **Manage Supply Point Registration**

Shippers – 100%Note: DSC Change Committee will resolve any difference between the funding split implied by the above and the benefit split of the proposed change. |
| **Costs and Timescales** |
| **Change Costs (implementation):**Option 1 - Automated SolutionAn enduring solution will cost at least **£40,000**, but probably not more than **£70,000** to implement.Option 2 - Manual SolutionAn enduring solution will cost at least **£7,500**, but probably not more than **£50,000** to implement. Top end costs consider that the report currently being developed for XRN4958 is not yet live functionality so may need to be built as part of this change. |
| **Change Costs (on-going):**Option 1 - Automated SolutionNo on-going costs identifiedOption 2 - Manual SolutionAt current volumes, the manual solution could be managed as part of business as usual activities so no on-going costs have been considered. |
| **Timescales:**Option 1 - Automated SolutionThis would require a **UK Link Major Release** for implementation.Option 2 - Manual SolutionThis would require a **UK Link Major Release** for implementation if it is necessary to develop the reporting functionality. If not then this could be considered a **Minor Enhancement**. |
| **Assumptions:*** Any changes in the approach to the solution may impact the overall costs of the change.
* Inclusion of any new requirement or modification of the requirements will change the cost.
* These efforts are based on very high level analysis, based on the discussion for requirement and solution, the stated efforts may change.
* There will be existing environments used to deliver this change
* For PIS, it is assumed dedicated team is required.
* It is assumed that in order to support manual solution, BW report is required to be developed as part of the change request and it will use the existing integration channel to flow to the ends user.
* It is not recommended to use the BW system to support fully automated solution as BW is a D-1 system and is best to identify the sites in ISU system and kick off the process according to live data.
* Impacts to the response and notifications files will require further discussions and will impact the efforts.
* It is assumed that thorough regression testing of SPC file is required for the manual solution option.
* It is assumed that solution will require customization to pick up the defined number of months by ABAP code.
* Further discussion would be required to define the generation of manual SPC file as it will be owned by Xoserve and not initiated by as-is process.
* BW solution has been proposed considering that data items are available in BW and no extractor modifications are required to pull data from ISU.
* Performance testing is required, as it will iterate over 24 million records.
* FUT is proposed for ISU Solution only.
* SIT has been factored for solution developed with BW to ensure BODS, BW, Universe and BO changes are well integrated.
* There would be further discussion required to finalise the process of storing CDSP activities in ISU system. The solution might impact the estimated efforts.
 |
| **Dependencies:**None identified |
| **Constraints:**None identified |
| **Observations:**None identified |
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