

# 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:	XRN4888		
Change Title:	Removing Duplicate Address Update Validation for IGT Supply Meter Points via Contact Management Service (CMS)		
Date Raised:	04/03/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation :	BUUK	
	Name:	John Cooper	
	Email:	<a href="mailto:John.Cooper@bu-uk.co.uk">John.Cooper@bu-uk.co.uk</a>	
	Telephone:	01359 302450	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Paul Orsler	
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Paul.orsler@xoserve.com">Paul.orsler@xoserve.com</a>	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2496	
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 checked="" 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>As an IGT, I need Xoserve to process my address updates in order to reflect the most accurate and up to date information associated to address details held against IGT Supply Meter Points in UK Link systems.</p> <p>The current duplicate address validation performed within Contact Management Service (CMS) was not designed with a full understanding of IGT address management processes, particularly those associated to the new housing development market. As such, CMS restricts IGTs in their ability to keep IGT Supply Meter Point address data up to date in line with changes that are made to plans on new housing developments.</p>
---------------------	--

	<p>IGTs are therefore seeking to remove the duplicate validations performed on address updates, in order to ensure address changes to IGT Supply Meter Points can be made within UK Link systems, as and when housing development plans are updated.</p> <p>As part of this change enduring reports and management information (MI) will need to be developed and implemented. Reports will need to provide detail of the address amendments that have resulted in a duplicate addresses being created in UK Link systems. Reports are proposed to be issued to IGTs, who in turn will be responsible to investigate and take the relevant course of action. Management Information should also be created to demonstrate whether improvements are being made to Supply Meter Point address data quality, and to quantify whether further improvements can be made to the process.</p> <p>No data migration or cleansing activities are required to be delivered as part of this change, with IGTs continuing to work closely with Xserve operational teams to work around the limitations that exist with the current process,</p>	
Proposed Release:	The proposer requests that this change be implemented as soon as possible, and supports this being assessed as a candidate for a Minor Release if necessary.	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input 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>For new housing developments there are often changes which result in bulk address updates being required. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to the site layout, plots being removed etc.</li> <li>• Changes to the street naming</li> <li>• removal of house numbers (such as 13) which cause consequential changes to multiple addresses.</li> </ul> <p>Currently, for these bulk address updates, CMS will apply duplicate address validation to the new changes based against the existing UK link database. This validation does not, therefore, take into account the whole suite of changes being proposed by the IGT and apply validation for duplicates against the proposed addresses. The current swapped address process only accounts for instances where there is a like for like swap (i.e. 2, The Street is swapping directly with 3, The Street). If, however number 2 is becoming number 3 and number 3 is becoming number 4 and then number 4 is becoming number 2 the proposed change would fail duplicate address validation even though, once all changes are processed, there would be no duplicate addresses.</p> <p>These addresses, therefore, go through 2 validation processes in Xserve system:</p>
----------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly, through automation (where rejections will initially occur) and then;</li> <li>• Secondly, manually, where the data/addresses can be challenged and therefore amended, as required. The second part of this validation is resource intensive for Xserve and IGTs often leads to delays and backlogs in changes being made to these addresses whilst rejections are being challenged and resolved via CMS.</li> </ul> <p>The above validation is causing issues as we are still in new development stages, and therefore addresses may also need amending a 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> time, due to developer/design changes, or shipper requirements. Removing the duplicate address validation or IGT initiated changes will reduce the amount of resource being spent providing the second check on the change within UK Link systems.</p> <p>IGTs would be required to proactively monitor duplicate addresses on their networks. To address this, it would be beneficial as part of this change, to develop reporting for IGTs that pulls out any genuine duplicate addresses. This would ensure that IGTs are provided information of instances where duplicate addresses occur and therefore be able to correct data.</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>Immediately after implementation of this change.</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>		
DSG Recommended Release:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: June 2020		

### A6: Funding

Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	XX %
Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %
Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	XX %
Funding Classes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	100 %

	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <please specify>	XX %
Service Line(s)	<b><u>DSC Service Area 2: Provide query management:</u></b> Xoserve has concluded that IGT equivalents for the following service lines are required: DS-CS SA2 - 01 Standards of Service query management DS-CS SA2 – 03 Non Standards of Service query management DS-CS SA2 – 04 Network Operator Queries DS-CS SA2 - 05 Project query services	
ROM or funding details:		
Funding Comments:	This change closest aligned to Service Area 2: Provide query management – However this Service Area isn't currently funded by IGTs. No alternative Service Areas can be used to cover a 100% IGT funded change. Agreement to be sought with Xoserve and ChMC on the most appropriate way to fund this change. It was acknowledge at the ChMC meeting on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that there is currently no DSC Service Area that indicates IGTs as being 100% responsible for the associated funding.  28/03/2019 – Xoserve is reviewing the DSC service lines to assess whether a new one is required.  11/07/2019 – Service Lines added above	

### A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 / 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019

Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve (10/04/2019)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defer (13/03/2019)
Industry Consultation:	<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]	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	29/03/2019		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (initial review)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	12/07/2019	
Comms Ref(s):	2264.2 – RJ – ES (initial review) / 2378.6 – RT – PO (solution review) / 2489.4 – RT – PO (Detail Design)	
Number of Responses:	7 reps: 6 approvals and 1 rejection (initial review) 3 Reps: 2 Approvals and 1 approved solution rejected implementation date (solution review) 3 approval Reps (Detail Design)	

### A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	N/A	
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	N/A	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Approve	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT	Approve	
Meeting Date:	07/08/2019		
Release Date:	26 <sup>th</sup> June 2020		
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	June 2020 Release

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

# Section B: Change Proposal Initial Review

## B1: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Northern Gas Networks
	Name:	Shanna Key
	Email:	<a href="mailto:SKey@northerngas.co.uk">SKey@northerngas.co.uk</a>
	Telephone:	07779 416 216

## B1: ChMC Industry Consultation

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	
Yes. We believe removing the duplicate validation from the Contact Management System (CMS) would create the risk of duplicate MPRNs being created on the Supply Point Register, which could lead to registration issues for Shippers and increase the number of unregistered sites.	
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.	
No. As this is an issue with the CMS system and Xoserve do these manually (one by one), we feel that taking out the validation is not the right thing to do for the industry due to the risks that could arise from its removal.	
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)	
NGN would not support implementation of this change proposal as currently drafted.	
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?	
We agree that if this proposal were to be implemented, it should be 100% IGT funded.	
Change Proposal in principle:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish <input type="checkbox"/> Private

## B2: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Indigo Pipelines Ltd
	Name:	Cher Harris
	Email:	Cher.harris@sse.com
	Telephone:	07747559101

## B2: ChMC Industry Consultation

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 risks or costs identified		
2. 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, the current Xoserve process is simply not fit for purpose as it was not designed to be used for the new build market that IGTs operate in. Xoserve are rejecting far too many valid IGT-initiated address updates. This does nothing to support the Ofgem drive to improve address data quality. This has been a problem area since Nexus implementation and we welcome this proposal as a step in the right direction.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)		
We would support this being implemented in a minor release as soon as possible		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
Yes, provided the costs are transparent and reasonable		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

### B3: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	BUUK
	Name:	John Cooper
	Email:	John.cooper@bu-uk.co.uk
	Telephone:	01359 302450

### B3: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

The change proposal has been presented as an IGT only change. Xoserve are confident that they can separate the validation to only apply to IGT address updates, therefore this should limit any concerns the industry have about opening all address updates to the entire industry. We recognise that any removal or change to validation is likely to be met with caution. To allay this, the additional reporting will enable the industry to see where duplicate addresses exist on IGT networks and allow IGTs to readily resolve and therefore making IGTs accountable.

It must be noted that duplicate addresses are already an issue for the industry. BUUK are aware that address update processes are being wrongly used currently by the industry e.g. upon submitting an address update the *multi service box* is being ticked which allows duplicate address to be submitted without validation. BUUK believe that by formally requesting via the change proposal route for the removal of the validation will ensure that there is sufficient transparency and accountability of our intentions.

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

The change proposed looks to positively improve the quality of address data. Ofgem have set high targets for address improvements on IGTs, specifically around plot to postal addresses. The IGT market contributes to nearly 90% of all new connections and addresses. Due to the relationship between IGTs and housing developers there are always high numbers of alterations to site plans which results in IGTs sending significant volumes of address and plot updates.

The benefits of this change are:

- Actively enhances IGT's capabilities of updating plot addresses more efficiently, without handling large volumes of incorrect rejections.
- Xoserve have been open in admitting that the current CMS system is not geared up to meet IGT requirements. This change will go some way in improving the interface and meet IGT requirements.
- Much of the current processing is done manually and often leads to delays in addresses being updated. The change will significantly reduce the amount of manual processing which is required within Xoserve. Due to the current volumes of address updates IGTs are submitting on daily basis, there is a backlog at Xoserve's end leading to a misalignment of data and delays in UK Link being updated. This change may lead to efficiency savings within Xoserve as it reduces the manual workload required to process IGT address updates.
- Improve address data quality, reducing the number of plot addresses and ensuring the correct addresses are being held in UK Link. As mentioned, this is being driven by Ofgem as part of the Faster Switching Programme stage 0 data requirements.



<p>3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)</p>		
<p>There would be no functional results as a result of the change required to our own internal systems. BUUK would push for a minor release or the next possible available release date. The change is required now to help support Ofgem's Faster Switching data requirements.</p>		
<p>4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?</p>		
<p>The original intent of this change was for it to apply to IGT supply points <u>only</u>. Based on this, IGTs would fund 100% of the change, this would cover off both the validation change and reporting element of the CP. However, if GDNs also determine that they would see benefits from the change and wish for the validation to be removed, we would expect a funding split. This could either be a direct 50/50 IGT/GDN split or based on the proportion of new connections in a given year 19/20.</p>		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

## B4: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities Ltd
	Name:	Olga Batsari
	Email:	olga.batsari@wwutilities.co.uk
	Telephone:	02920 278579

## B4: ChMC Industry Consultation

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

We do not wish to stand in the way of a change that will improve IGT address accuracy but we have some concerns about the consequential impacts on DN and Shipper processes. This depends on whether f IGTs use exactly the same CMS transactions/contact as DNs and Shippers.

The 2 CMS contacts that WWU is using for amendments of address are:

- UNC contact for unregistered MPRNs
- ADD contact for MPRNs confirmed by a shipper (mainly used by shippers. When WWU submits an ADD, prior validation is required with the shipper/supplier to make sure they agree on the ADD address details).
- For bulk uploads, we use an EFT template (provided by XOSERVE) and upload files as .QMP format.

On the “Benefits and Justification” section of the change proposal, an example is provided to

demonstrate where the current process is deemed to fail:

*“ If, however number 2 is becoming number 3 and number 3 is becoming number 4 and then number 4 is becoming number 2 the proposed change would fail duplicate address validation even though, once all changes are processed, there would be no duplicate addresses.”*

On the network side, we overcome these issues by using the “MULTI” indicator on the UNC or ADD contact. See the screen print from a UNC contact below with the relevant field highlighted.

By selecting ‘MULTI’, the user can override the duplication validation rules. This of course should be used sparingly and **only** on the circumstances that is needed rather than a default setting.

In WWU, we use it only for properties that have more than one service on site.

Examples: a hospital with multiple supplies that cannot be differentiated to individual units names or examples like the one above documented by John Cooper.

Validation rules for duplicates are important for data integrity. We should try to avoid removing them and then introducing manual reporting etc. Best practice should be to remove validation rules only when there is a justification for the particular MPRN/site. If validation is removed for IGT address we have some concern that this may result in duplicate addresses which could in turn lead to inaccuracies with CSEP data.

[Close Window](#)

**Xserve**

**Contact Management**

[Home>>](#) [Log UNC](#) Status: New [Queues](#)

TYPE : UNC | ORIGINATOR : OLGA BATSARI | EMAIL ADDRESS : Olga.batsari@wwutilities.co.uk  
 SSC \* : --select-- | TELEPHONE NO : 02920278579

Meter Point Reference Number \*

Type of Site \*  Domestic  Industrial | Type of Service \*  Single  Multi

**CURRENT ADDRESS**

Building Number/Name \*    
 Delivery Point Alias   
 Sub Building Name   
 Principal Street Name \*   
 Dependent Street   
 Dependent Locality   
 Post Town \*   
 Postcode \*

**PROPOSED ADDRESS**

Building Number/Name \*    
 Delivery Point Alias   
 Sub Building Name   
 Principal Street Name \*   
 Dependent Street   
 Dependent Locality   
 Post Town \*   
 Postcode \*

Swapped Address -

Top 50

The field is also available on the bulk upload EFT template.

	A	AJ	AK	AL	AM	AN	AO	AP
	<b>V1.0</b>	Proposed Address Postcode [CM] [T10]	Proposed Address Delivery Point Alias [O] [T50]	Swapped Address [O] [T1]	Swapped Address Meter Point Reference Number [CM] [N10]	Multi Service Type (Type of Service) [CM] [T1]	End User Contract [CM] [T1]	Site Cont Name [CM] [T6]
2	Check							
3	Check							
4	Check							
5	Check							
6	Check							
7	Check							
8	Check							
9	Check							
10	Check							

2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.

If IGTs work on the same transaction/CMS contact as DNs and Shippers and the 'MULTI' indicator that already exists serves their needs, then we do not see any need for the change

request.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)		
If the changes do not affect in any way the way DNS submit UNCs or ADDs, then a minor release is acceptable.		
However, if the CMS contacts the IGTs use are the same as the DNS and Shippers, then we would require testing and confirmation that our process has not been affected.		
The processing of UNCs and ADDs affect end users and their MPRNs. Customers expect a quick turnaround in order to organise contracts with suppliers against a PAF address, gas meter installation or change over suppliers.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
If the change is still required, then we agree that this should be 100% funded by IGTs.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private

## B5: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	ES Pipelines Ltd
	Name:	Kev Duddy
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Kev.duddy@espug.com">Kev.duddy@espug.com</a>
	Telephone:	01372 587 528

## B5: ChMC Industry Consultation

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, ESP believes there is no negative impact on our organisation or the market.			
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.			
<p>Yes, ESP believes this change will bring significant benefit across IGT new connection portfolios. Large scale address updates are necessary due to site variations during the build phase of new housing developments, often determined by the build or sale progress, and the timing of postal information being returned from the local authority.</p> <p>ESP believes that efficiencies can be gained by both IGTs and Xoserve by removing the existing validation. The current process is unable to support the volume of address updates required by IGTs and is causing a backlog, resulting in misaligned data within UK Link and additional issues being encountered by shippers when trying to register the supply points.</p> <p>In addition, dual fuel address data quality has been identified by Ofgem as a key requirement of Faster Switching. With the imminent creation of REL addresses linking with the MPAN address in electricity it is imperative that variations on new developments are able to be updated concurrently with the electricity market.</p>			
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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. ESP supports a deployment within a minor release, and benefits would be seen immediately.			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?			
Yes, IGTs should fund 100% of the change as it only applies to IGT address updates.			
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer

Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Private
---	---	----------------------------------

## B6: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Southern Electric Gas Ltd and SSE Energy Supply Ltd
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	Megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738

## B6: ChMC Industry Consultation

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, we do not anticipate any material risk or cost impact.		
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.		
We believe that this change to remove duplicate validation will have a positive impact, making it easier for IGTs keep their address data up to date, therefore improving SMP address quality overall.		
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)		
We agree that this change can be implemented as part of a minor release as soon as possible.		
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?		
Yes we agree that this change be 100% IGT funded.		
Change Proposal in principle:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish <input type="checkbox"/> Private	

## B7: User Details

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com">Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com</a>
	Telephone:	07875 117771

## B7: ChMC Industry Consultation

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			
<p>We believe this has the potential to cause the industry an increased volume of data discrepancies in the future. Where duplicate addresses are allowed and they are not resolved in a timely manner (or worst case scenario, at all). This could lead us into billing 2 customers for the same site and will make Meter/Address Mix-ups more difficult to validate and subsequently correct.</p> <p>It is not 100% clear whether this CP is asking for relaxation of this rule for iGT addresses only or to include GT – please could this be clarified.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to why this is now an issue – there will have always been issues with plot addresses as far as we understand it and are not clear why there is now a proposal to change the process. Without further understanding of the impacts &amp; scale of issue we are unable to support this change.</p>			
2. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions.			
No			
3. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? 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)			
No functional changes so minimum timescales could apply			
4. As currently drafted the Change Proposal is most likely to impact on service area 2 Provide query management. Despite the funding for this area is 90% Shipper funding, 10% DNS, it was agreed at ChMC on 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 that this change should be 100% IGT funded. Do you agree with the principles of this funding?			
Yes			
Change Proposal in principle:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private



# 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:	07/05/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Paul Orsler (PO) – Went out for initial consultation with IGT’s, GT’s and Shippers. Current validation is quite restrictive and requires manual checking. Change was voted on in April at ChMC. PO Stated that it cannot be ruled out there won’t be a consequential impact on other Users processes but will this was the intention and will be assessed as part of High Level Solution Options.</p> <p>PO – Verbal walkthrough of the change appendix 1 prioritisation of ratification score.</p> <p>EL noted that the Change Proposal workaround section wasn’t completed despite Xoserve indicating that existing business processes are currently picking these up these updates manually. PO noted that the workaround section had been introduced to the Change Proposal form post Project Nexus Implementation as a way of identifying whether any functional workarounds exist to mitigate issues that were being experienced with the solution, and that these were solution options</p> <p>P.O asked John Cooper (JC) about the requirements and to give some information to DSG members. JC noted that his understanding was that the change is for IGTs only, and that the suggestion to re-use Multi Service Flag to bypass existing validation rules was not appropriate as this would be misusing the purpose of the Multi Service Flag which should be to genuinely change address details for sites where multiple MPRNs are at the same premise. .</p> <p>PO asked JC to confirm whether he supported the view that the existing process (whereby address changes are being processed manually due to the validation failures) would be seen by IGTs as a workaround. JC noted that this was not a workaround as it isn’t able to handle the volumes of updates – as BUUK are recorded as the Proposer of the change it was agreed to leave the workaround section blank, and to ensure any future Change Proposals have given appropriate consideration of the validity of workarounds. Finally PO agreed to discuss reporting requirements offline with JC in order to get these established before High Level Solution Options could be presented back to the group. Action - PO/JC to clarify reporting requirements ahead of producing HLSO</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
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		



DSG Date:	15/07/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Paul Orsler (PO) stated that the change has come to DSG a couple of times and that there is only one viable solution option that was formulated collaboratively with the CDSP and customers getting involved. PO stated that the costs are estimated between £10,000 and £20,000 and involves some system and process impacts. PO stated that in regards to system impacts, there are low impacts to reports that involve SPA and systems SAP IS/SAP PO/AMT. There are also low impacts to the interface regarding SPA and CMS. PO added that this has been issued out in July's Change Pack and responses would be great for providing a view. John Cooper (JC) asked Paul, there was quite a difference in cost range as it could cost £10,000 or double that to £20,000. JC asked why is there such a wide range. PO stated he will take that away for clarification. PO added that there is normally a risk margin that is added during estimate to ensure the costings are within estimate. JC also asked about the process impact assessment slide presented and asked if there is any file formats affected and what file formats would be affected. PO replied that there is no proposal to change the way in which IGT's send their updates in to the CDSP but will be an internal CDSP process impact/change. JC PO encouraged DSG members to provide any feedback or views via the Solution Review Consultation Change Pack.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
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

Solution Option Summary:	<p>The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available in the following <a href="#">link</a>.</p> <p>The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified one viable option (Option 1) to deliver the requirements of the change. This option requires the removal of Duplicate Address validation rules against IGT Supply Meter Points. In addition, the solution also includes monitoring reports to ensure address data quality can be regularly reviewed and improved upon.</p>
Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)	Implement the solution (Option 1) as outlined in the HLSO above.

<p>DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>DSG members were generally supportive of the change, however some representatives raised concerns about the impact this may have on data quality and equivalent processes that other Customer Classes receive. The proposer has confirmed that they only require a solution for IGTs, and that any Xserve solution should reflect this requirement. In addition it has been described that the existing process actually restricts the ability of IGTs to maintain accurate data, and that monitoring reports have been included within the scope of the change to ensure data quality is regularly reviewed and can be actioned if issues are identified.</p>
<p>Consultation closeout:</p>	<p>26/07/2019</p>

<p>Impact on Service Line(s) and funding (A6) for each Solution Option:</p>	<p>(If differ from original assessment in A6)</p>
---	---

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Indigo Pipelines		
	Name:	Cher Harris		
	Email:	cher.harris@sse.com		
	Telephone:	07747559101		
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We support the proposed solution. The current process is simply not fit for purpose as it was never designed for the new connections market that IGTs primarily operate in. Any improvements to the process that enable Xoserve to accept more valid address updates from IGTs is welcome.			
Implementation Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private	

## E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for comments.
---	-------------------------

## 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 agree with the proposed solution option that has been presented. This change proposal is intended to only impact IGT address amendments and address the growing inadequacy on CMS to deal with the nature and volume of IGT address updates.</p> <p>As highlighted in our previous representation on this change proposal, IGTs are subject to many Developer site alterations and hence designs of sites are constantly changing. The current duplicate address validation currently in place inhibits us from updating whole sites as it recognises this wrongly as a duplicate address update, when in fact we are attempting to update a whole site.</p> <p>The intended change also encompasses a set of both daily duplicate address reporting and monthly. The daily reporting is intended to flag to IGTs what duplicates were created for that given day and the monthly</p>			

	<p>giving us a cumulative view. The reports will help us to cleanse genuine duplicate address where they exist and where and to be open and transparent around our performance. However, it must still be noted that there are large number of duplicate addresses on our networks that are caused by Shippers abusing the 'multi service' box functionality in CMS. To reiterate the point, this should only be used where there is multiple meters and connections at a single given address. This functionality clearly isn't policed and is leading to a decline in address quality, in order to suit Shippers processes without considering the consequences of doing so. For instance, accurate addresses are integral for networks when visiting sites in cases of emergencies and also serving priority customers.</p> <p>BUUK would also wish for this change proposal to be considered for a minor release. It has currently been scoped for a major release in June 2020. Considering Ofgem's requirement for improved address quality as part of the Faster Switching Programme, in which IGTs already have stringent targets imposed on us by Ofgem, it would be prudent for this change to come in earlier so such improvements can start to be realised.</p>		
Implementation Date:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private

## E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>Thank you for your representation. We appreciate the drivers for this particular change and the objective it sets out to achieve in terms of improving address data quality. With regards to the implementation date, this change will be presented to Change Management Committee (ChMC) on 7th August where we can consider whether any alternative implementation options are available.</p>
---	--

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Northern Gas Networks
	Name:	Helen Chandler
	Email:	HChandler@Northernngas.co.uk
	Telephone:	07580704123
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We support the proposed solution to remove the duplicate validation for IGT address updates only; however, we require confirmation of how the IGT address updates will be separated from those of GTs and what rules will be used for determining when the duplicate validations should not be applied.</p> <p>We also support the creation of new IGT monitoring reports to ensure IGT data quality once the validation is removed.</p>	

Implementation Date:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Xoserve preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG preferred solution option:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Publication of consultation response:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Private

## E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your comments. In regards to your queries on how are updates are separated from GT's and IGT's and rules around validations, this will be considered within detailed design.
---	--

# Section F: Approved Solution Option

---

## F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4888
Solution Details:	Remove the duplicate address validation and build new reports
Implementation Date:	26/06/2020
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	07/08/2019

# Section G: Change Pack

---

## G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2489.4 – RT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN4888- Removing Duplicate Address Update Validation for IGT Supply Meter Points via Contact Management Service (CMS)
Comm Date:	18/11/2019

## G2: Change Representation

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

## G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4888- Removing Duplicate Address Update Validation for IGT Supply Meter Points via Contact Management Service (CMS)
Change Class:	Functional Change
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Independent Gas Transporters (IGTs)
Change Owner:	Paul Orsler <a href="mailto:Paul.orsler@xoserve.com">Paul.orsler@xoserve.com</a>
Background and Context:	<p><a href="#">Link to CP</a></p> <p>As an IGT, I need Xoserve to process my address updates in order to reflect the most accurate and up to date information associated to address details held against IGT Supply Meter Points in UK Link systems.</p> <p>The current duplicate address validation performed within Contact Management Service (CMS) was not designed with a full understanding of IGT address management processes, particularly those associated to the new housing development market. As such, CMS restricts IGTs in their ability to keep IGT Supply Meter Point address data up to date in line with changes that are made to plans on new housing developments.</p>

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

Functional:	SPA, CMS
Non-Functional:	None
Application:	SAP ISU and CMS



User(s):	IGT
Documentation:	None
Other:	None

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## G5: Change Design Description

In current process CMS does not allow to insert duplicate address details in UK link system if the address already exists against another MPRN. If a duplicate request is processed through CMS a response 'Proposed Address already exists on UK Link' received for the duplicate addresses.

In the proposed to be process, if the request for address amendment is received from an IGT and Alternative Address is already present against Meter Point Reference Number then our system will not reject the request. The duplicate address will be stored in UK Link system and a daily report will generate which will contain such duplicate addresses created in the system due to removal of the IGT duplicate address validation.

So on a monthly basis a report which details all those MPRN on which duplicate address are being created on UKLink via CMS, each respective IGT the report will be delivered via email as an excel attachment. The expectation is that each IGT will act on this information and make the necessary amendments to ensure duplicate is remediated.

Please see the link below to the report layout:

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7583/xrn4888-supp-docs.pdf>

## G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	
------------------------------------	--

## 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@xserve.com](mailto:uklink@xserve.com)

# Section H: Representation Response

---

## H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	NGN	
	Name:	Helen Chandler	
	Email:	HChandler@northerngas.co.uk	
	Telephone:	07580704123	
Representation Status:	Support		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	We support the detailed design for removing the duplicate validation for IGT address updates only and the creation of new IGT monitoring reports to ensure IGT data quality once the validation is removed.		
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)

## 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)

## H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738
Representation Status:	Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	This is a positive change to keep address data up to date.	
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.
---	--

# Version Control

## Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	Proposal	05/03/2019	Xoserve	CP Raised
2	Out for initial review	15/02/2019	Xoserve	Sent out for an initial review following ChMC on 13/03/2019
3	Out for initial review	28/03/2019	Xoserve	Funding section updated
4	Out for initial review	29/03/2019	Xoserve	Reps added (initial review)
5	With DSG	12/04/2019	Xoserve	Outcome from ChMC on 10 <sup>th</sup> April added
6	With DSG	15/05/2019	Xoserve	Notes from DSG meeting on 8 <sup>th</sup> May
7	Out for review	12/07/2019	Xoserve	Funding comments added; sent out for solution review on Friday
8	Out for review	23/07/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG meeting 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2019
9	Voting	06/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with reps from July's Change Pack
10	Approved	12/08/2019	Xoserve	Solution option and release decision from ChMC added
11	Voting	10/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Change Pack and Reps added from November Change Pack

## Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Supersede d	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018.
4.0	Supersede d	07/09/2018	Emma Smith	Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1.
5.0	Supersede d	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.