



ElectraLink - Data Catalogue Update

19 February 2020

- Action 1: Agree to publication of UK Link Manual
- Action 2: Xoserve to assess the options relating to ElectraLink Data Catalogue; consider the risks and benefits of each option and present back to CoMC in February.

- **Action 1:** Do you agree to Xoserve publishing the UK Link Manual without password protection?
 - It was previously agreed to publish without password requirements at which point it was moved to Xoserve.com. The scale of the information impacted performance – resulting in it being moved to sharepoint – which requires access to be granted to specific individuals
 - Regular customer feedback requests that this information is available without any access control
 - Does CoMC have any issues with access control being removed?

Action 2: Xoserve to assess the options relating to Single Gas Catalogue; consider the risks and benefits of each option and present back to CoMC in February.

Options

- 1) Do nothing
- 2) ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement but without any validation or support for change from Xoserve.
- 3) ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement; Xoserve validate and provide support to Electralink to maintain.
- 4) Xoserve publish a 'cloned' version on an ElectraLink platform but separate to any other product that ElectraLink hosts.

Options 2, 3 and 4 will need further development with ElectraLink to understand the commercial arrangements.

Consideration will also need to be given to the approach that is taken with regards the REC catalogue.

- Option 1 – Do nothing – CoMC does not approve this request
- Benefits
 - No action needed by Xoserve
 - No impacts to participant processes
- Risks
 - Any benefits offered by ElectraLink tool are not realised by industry
 - ElectraLink publish anyway
 - No control
 - Inaccurate data – lack of validation or maintenance following change
 - Loss of potential future value if IP is given away.
 - Increased resource cost to Xoserve due to potential increase in queries/validataions
- Cost
 - Nil

- Option 2 - ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement but without any initial validation or support for change from Xoserve
- Benefits
 - Any potential benefits of ElectraLink product can be realised
- Risks
 - Creates two repositories
 - UKLM would be maintained as 'source of truth'
 - ElectraLink product also maintained
 - No control
 - Risk that inaccurate data – lack of validation or maintenance following change
 - Loss of potential future value if IP is given away
- Cost
 - Xoserve – increase in resource/time spent answering queries which relate to new parties accessing data / migration errors / exposed UKLM errors / version changes around implementations
 - Industry
 - No additional cost to DTSA users as included within DTSA licence
 - Additional cost to non DTSA users

- Option 3 - ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement; Xoserve validate and provide support to ElectraLink to maintain
- Benefits
 - Any potential benefits of ElectraLink product can be realised
 - Xoserve validates data
 - Xoserve verifies any ongoing changes
- Risks
 - ElectraLink control Single Data Catalogue
 - Without express permission to use the IP in the UK Manual ElectraLink are still in breach
 - Loss of potential future value if IP is given away.
- Cost
 - Xoserve – additional effort in publication across UKLM
 - Xoserve – increase in resource/time spent answering queries which relate to new parties accessing data / migration errors / exposed UKLM errors / version changes around implementations
 - Industry
 - No additional cost to DTSA users as included within DTSA licence
 - Additional cost to non DTSA users

- Option 4 - Xoserve publish a 'cloned' version on an ElectraLink platform but separate to any other product that ElectraLink hosts.
- Benefits
 - Xoserve maintains control going forward
 - Xoserve manages any ongoing changes – becomes the formal UK Link Manual
- Risks
 - ElectraLink has peer reviewed the data as it's been uploaded, but there is no assurance that this is accurate. Detailed validation would be required if this were to be considered the formal UK Link Manual by the Industry.
 - Without express permission to use the IP in the UK Manual ElectraLink are still in breach.
 - Loss of potential future value if IP is given away.
- Cost
 - Xoserve – Licencing costs to ElectraLink (Higher than Option 3) - Cost TBC
 - Xoserve – resource cost to validate data in Flowbuilder
 - Xoserve – single product maintained – assumed nil cost
 - Industry – TBC – possible licencing cost incorporated in ElectraLink cost to Xoserve

Cost v Risk & Benefit

Option	Direct Customer Cost	Xoserve cost	Risk	Customer Benefit	Comments
1) Do nothing	None	Low *	High	Low	* May be some resource costs incurred
2) ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement but without any validation or support for change from Xoserve.	DTSA User – None None DTSA User – Low**	Medium	High	Medium	**Assumes ElectraLink cost to non DTSA user is low.
3) ElectraLink publish with CoMC agreement; Xoserve validate and provide support to ElectraLink to maintain.	DTSA User – None None DTSA User – Low**	High	Medium	Medium – High	** Assumes ElectraLink cost to non DTSA user is low.
4) Xoserve publish a 'cloned' version on an ElectraLink platform but separate to any other product that ElectraLink hosts.	None	High ***	Low	High	*** cost of licence is yet to be confirmed by ElectraLink but assume overall high cost due to resource effort required for this option.

Next Steps

- Which is the preferred option(s) that CoMC would like Xoserve to explore?
- If the preferred option is either option 2, 3 or 4, we still need to consider how we grant a licence to ElectraLink for use of the data in Flowbuilder.
 - Does CoMC have any views as to how Xoserve do this?
- What considerations do you want us take with respect to the REC catalogue?