

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Request and Response

1. Purpose of a ROM

The DSC CDSP Service Document – Change Management Procedure sets out the expectations of the ROM process.

4.6.2 Subject to paragraph 4.6.3, within 10 Business Days after receiving a ROM Request, the CDSP shall send to the Customer and the Committee a report (Rough Order of Magnitude Report or ROM Report) setting out (so far as the CDSP is able to assess at the time):

- (a) a high level indicative assessment of the impact of the Potential Service Change on the CDSP Service Description and on UK Link;
- (b) the CDSP's opinion as to whether the Potential Service Change would be a Restricted Class Change, would have an Adverse Impact on any Customer Class(es) or would be a Priority Service Change, where applicable;
- (c) the CDSP's approximate estimate of:
 - (i) the Costs (or range of Costs, where options under paragraph (e) are identified) of Implementing the Potential Service Change;
 - (ii) the impact of the Potential Service Change on Service Charges; and
 - (iii) the period of time required for Implementation;
- (d) any material dependencies of Implementation on other Proposed Service Changes or other likely Priority Questions; and
- (e) if it is apparent to the CDSP that there are likely to be materially different options as to how to Implement the Potential Service Change, a high level description of such options.

2. ROM Request – To be completed by the customer

Please populate the details below and send to box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com, to enable the CDSP to undertake the impact assessment to provide the ROM Response (section below).

Please note, the ROM requestor may be asked for further details if it is believed that request is not clear and additional information is required in order to provide a ROM Response.

2a. ROM Request Details

ROM Request Details	
Change Title	Modification IGT 173 Gateway delivery for RPC backing data
Regulatory Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Regulatory Reference (if applicable)	Regulation change allocated reference and associated Code – IGT MOD 173
Change Overview	<p>BACKGROUND:</p> <p>Currently the Relative Price Control (RPC) invoicing backing data is issued using the IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Template document. It is encrypted using the IGT Password Protection Protocols. This is sent by the IGTs to Shippers.</p> <p>The RPC invoicing backing data is issued to the relevant Shipper either via email or via a bespoke portal. The delivery mechanism varies from IGT to IGT, so Shippers have different operational processes for each IGT. The proposer has also raised security concerns around the password protection and delivery mechanisms currently in use stating they are not as secure as an encrypted gateway such as Information Exchange (IX).</p> <p>IGT MOD 173 proposes that the RPC invoicing backing data should be sent via the IX (according to the DSC Agreement) as Communication Type 2*. The proposer believes the benefit of this would be to create a secure gateway delivery mechanism that is consistent across all IGTs, streamlining Shippers' in-house operational processes and alleviating any security concerns for both Shippers and IGTs.</p> <p>*Further information on Communication Type 2 can be found here: UKLAD3 - UK Link File Transfer Definition v15L.doc (sharepoint.com).</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt Communication Type 2 is a 'postbox' delivery mechanism via the IX which is provided by the CDSP to send files between two parties. The CDSP would not be required to validate or hold any information in the files in any way. The CDSP would also not have permission to view the content of .RPC files.</p>

MAIN REQUIREMENTS OF IGT 173:

Please see below what we require to be assessed as part of this ROM:

- 1) *If IGTs were mandated under IGT UNC to send all RPC invoice backing data to Shippers via the IX what is the impact?*
 - a) *Is the assumption that all IGTs currently have IX correct?*
 - b) *If yes, would IGTs need new nodes or just node configuration to facilitate this?*
 - c) *Would any new nodes or node configuration for Shippers be required so they could receive files from IGTs?*
 - d) *Please call out any other steps that the CDSP would need to carry out to ensure that IGTs and Shippers can communicate in a technical capacity via IX in the way described above?*
 - e) *Please confirm **if** there are any additional costs to accommodate IGT 173 (if any additional costs associated).*

- 2) *CDSP to facilitate the delivery of RPC backing data files via the IX from IGTs to Shippers via Communication Type 2.*
 - a) *Proposed unique file name: .RPC. CDSP are required to confirm the suitability of using .RPC file extension, as in can this file extension be used? If not due to duplication or another reason, please can the CDSP propose a suitable file extension which can be utilised.*
 - b) *Format of file name is anticipated to be as follows: 'ORGnn.PNNNNNN.RPC'. We understand this follows the Communication Type 2 file naming convention. Please confirm this is the correct file naming convention for this?*
 - c) *What format does the .RPC file need to be in in order to be sent down the IX as Communication Type 2? Is there any particular requirement i.e. CSV format?*

- 3) *CDSP responsible for receiving the .RPC files from the IGT and sending on to recipient Shipper as per the sending IGTs instructions.*
 - a) *What is the current turnaround time for IX files sent via Communication Type 2? Business Rule 11 states that the CDSP must turnaround the .RPC file **within the same day**. IGTs will be expecting to send the RPC backing data via the IX no later than 5pm on the 5th business day of the month. Does the current logic for Communication Type 2 allow us to send the file on the same day as receipt? If not, what is possible? This will be fed back to the mod proposer.*

- 4) Where the CDSP identifies issues with the IX and cannot receive or cascade .RPC files, the CDSP must communicate issues to the IGTs and Shippers' Contract Managers.
 - a) Is this standard process if there is an issue with transmission of files via the IX? And is this the case for Communication Type 2?
 - b) Are their additional costs associated with this support that IGTs may not currently be paying for if there are issues with file transmission?
- 5) If the IX is down what are the work arounds available for customers to still be able to issue the .RPC invoice backing data files via the CDSP?

Assumptions:

- 1) CDSP will be a postbox and deliver .RPC backing data files via Communication Type 2 only. This ROM is based on costs for Communication Type 2 only.
- 2) CDSP will not be responsible if any issues are found within the content of the .RPC backing data files. The IGTs and Shippers will liaise with each other directly via their contract managers independent of the CDSP. The IGTs will be responsible for ensuring that any issues with the content of the RPC backing data files are resolved and a replacement file reissued via the IX or via alternate means as mutually agreed between the IGT and Shipper. The IGT will need to inform the CDSP of their chosen redelivery method.
- 3) Business Rule 13 outlines a requirement for a window of testing to be available (approx. one month before implementation). IGTs are being asked to volunteer to provide test files to Shippers.
 - a) Test files would be sent within the live production environment. b) It would be the responsible of the sending IGT to inform the relevant Shipper that a test file is on route so that is not mistakenly received as a 'live' file. c) The difference between test and production files is also called out in the file naming convention referenced earlier in this document. PN indicates a production ('live') file and TN indicates a test ('non-live') file. d) For the avoidance of doubt, any test files sent by the IGT will be treated like production files and sent via the IX to the relevant Shipper. e) The CDSP will not be involved in the creation or sending of test files other than providing IX as the sending mechanism. Correla to advise what normally happens if a file is sent via Communication Type 2 but is undeliverable? The assumption is that any notifications the CDSP provide to the sending party on non-delivery would apply here. Please call these out as part of the ROM.
- 4) As per Business Rule 14 - any further process requirements agreed offline between the IGTs and Shippers which are not

	<p>covered in the Business Rules and do impact the CDSP will require another Modification and/or a further DSC Change Proposal.</p> <p>5) It is expected that IGTs and Shippers will carry out the necessary enhancements in-house to facilitate the delivery/receipt of .RPC backing data files via the IX. If said enhancements are not carried out correctly and/or there are teething issues, the CDSP cannot be held responsible for the non-delivery of files to the relevant IGT.</p> <p>6) It is at the relevant IGT and Shipper's discretion whether or not to utilise the CDSP to reissue missing/undelivered files via the IX/disaster recovery kit OR to use alternative delivery mechanisms which directly operate between the IGT and Shipper. It will be the IGT's responsibility to notify the CDSP which method they prefer to use to resend any missing/undelivered files.</p> <p>7) Any alternative delivery mechanisms outside of IX and disaster recovery kits will not involve the CDSP in any capacity.</p> <p>The CDSP requires a cost estimate for implementing IGT 173 under the existing IX services as per the above requirements. This is to provide a cost range for any configuration work to allow these files to be sent via IX between IGTs and Shippers, and cost ranges if DR equipment is required.</p> <p>Our understanding of the support required where there is an issue with file transmission is BAU and therefore already provided by the CDSP. Please confirm if this is not the case and requires additional support above that we currently provide.</p>	
Date Raised	18/01/2024	
Required Response Date	<p>31/01/2024</p> <p>The proposer's intention is to progress IGT 173 through the modification and DSC change process within tight timescales in order to see IGT 173 implemented in November-24 release. The ROM Response for IGT 173 is expected to be presented at February-24 IGT workstream.</p>	
Requestor Contact Details	Name:	Kathryn Adeseye
	Organisation:	Xoserve Limited
	Email:	kathryn.adeseye3@xoserve.com
	Number:	0121 2292351

Xoserve Lead Contact (to be provided by the CDSP)	Contact Name:	Kathryn Adeseye
--	---------------	-----------------

3. ROM Response – To be completed by the CDSP

The ROM response provided is based on a high-level indicative assessment of the impact of the change.

Please note, all the sections within this template should be populated by the CDSP when providing a ROM response.

To find the high-level costs and timescales please go to section 3c which can be found [here](#).

3a. Impacted Constituency

Customer Class(es) Impacted by Change:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input type="checkbox"/> All	<input type="checkbox"/> Other <Please provide details here>
Justification for Customer Class(es) selection	The Change includes Relative Price Control (RPC) invoicing backing data file exchange between IGTs and Shippers. There are no other anticipated Customer Classes impacted by this change.	

3b. Overview of impacts

Overview of impacts	<p>The high-level impact analysis has been carried out based on the information contained within this ROM request and the following solution is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New configuration of IX to enable exchange of RPC invoicing backing data from IGTs to Shippers. • The existing 5.8.3 file format will be utilised with no content validations being performed by the CDSP. • There will be a period of external testing for IGTs and Shippers to test the file exchange. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>For the avoidance of doubt, once the configuration / set up has been completed by the CDSP to allow the .RPC file to be sent, we do not expect further involvement from the CDSP to coordinate the testing. We expect the facilitation of testing will be coordinated between IGTs and Shippers directly. If questions are raised around sending the files, CDSP can support.</i>
----------------------------	--

Below are the CDSP responses to the specific questions asked. CDSP responses are in bold.

- 1) *If IGTs were mandated under IGT UNC to send all RPC invoice backing data to Shippers via the IX what is the impact?*
 - a) *Is the assumption that all IGTs currently have IX correct?*
Yes, all IGTs currently have IX configurations.
 - b) *If yes, would IGTs need new nodes or just node configuration to facilitate this?*
IGTs would be able to use the same nodes along with their existing folder structure so no new nodes required. The CDSP would need to undertake configuration activities to ensure the .RPC file can be sent over the network by IGTs to Shippers.
 - c) *Would any new nodes or node configuration for Shippers be required so they could receive files from IGTs?*
No new node or configuration by the CDSP would be required for Shippers as they would only be in receipt of the file.
 - d) *Please call out any other steps that the CDSP would need to carry out to ensure that IGTs and Shippers can communicate in a technical capacity via IX in the way described above?*
No additional activities required by the CDSP. There maybe internal IGT/Shipper configurations required to enable communications, for example whitelisting which should be considered by individual IGTs and Shippers.
 - e) *Please confirm **if** there are any additional costs to accommodate IGT 173 (if any additional costs associated).*
For the CDSP, only initial configuration costs will be incurred, there will be no ongoing costs. Details of the cost range can be found in the sections below.

- 2) *CDSP to facilitate the delivery of RPC backing data files via the IX from IGTs to Shippers via Communication Type 2.*
 - a) *Proposed unique file name: .RPC. CDSP are required to confirm the suitability of using .RPC file extension, as in can this file extension be used? If not due to duplication or another reason, please can the CDSP propose a suitable file extension which can be utilised.*
We can confirm .RPC can be used for this file name.
 - b) *Format of file name is anticipated to be as follows: 'ORGnn.PNNNNNNN.RPC'. We understand this follows the Communication Type 2 file naming convention. Please confirm this is the correct file naming convention for this?*
We can confirm the above is the correct naming convention.
 - c) *What format does the .RPC file need to be in in order to be sent down the IX as Communication Type 2? Is there any particular requirement i.e. CSV format?*

CSV format is the most popular however there is no restriction to specifically use this format from a technical perspective. Shippers and IGTs should agree the format for consistency between all parties prior to using this service. For the avoidance of doubt, we require all the .RPC files to be sent in the same format.

3) CDSP responsible for receiving the .RPC files from the IGT and sending on to recipient Shipper as per the sending IGTs instructions.

a) What is the current turnaround time for IX files sent via Communication Type 2? Business Rule 11 states that the CDSP must turnaround the .RPC file **within the same day**. IGTs will be expecting to send the RPC backing data via the IX no later than 5pm on the 5th business day of the month. Does the current logic for Communication Type 2 allow us to send the file on the same day as receipt? If not, what is possible? This will be fed back to the mod proposer.

Yes, it is expected that files will be transferred within the same day, however this does depend upon factors like file size and network traffic, or any issues experienced with IGTs/Shippers IX equipment.

4) Where the CDSP identifies issues with the IX and cannot receive or cascade .RPC files, the CDSP must communicate issues to the IGTs and Shippers' Contract Managers.

a) Is this standard process if there is an issue with transmission of files via the IX? And is this the case for Communication Type 2?

Contacting the Shipper Contract Manager where there is an issue with the transmission of a file is not standard process. There is a set process as defined within the UK Link Manual – UK Link File Transfer Definition to manage failed files. It is proposed this file follows the existing BAU process which involves the unsuccessful files being moved to the error directory which can be accessed by the sending party.

b) Are their additional costs associated with this support that IGTs may not currently be paying for if there are issues with file transmission?

No, this is covered under BAU processes.

5) If the IX is down what are the work arounds available for customers to still be able to issue the .RPC invoice backing data files via the CDSP?

Disaster recovery to include the .RPC file exchange will form part of existing BAU processes for each IGT/Shipper, the use of disaster recovery kit is optional and entirely subject to each customer's risk appetite. The cost of kit will depend on the size and scale of disaster recovery put in

place. If a UK Link User has a secondary User Gateway for the purpose of DR, DR processes maybe invoked if a UK Link User experiences a loss of the file transfer service.

Assumptions:

1. All IGT organisations will participate in market trials. *For the avoidance of doubt, the CDSP have no requirement for all IGT organisations to participate in MT.*
2. The costs provided are to enable the .RPC file to be successfully sent over the IX. If new IGTs enter the market the configuration to allow this file to be sent, will form part of the BAU IGT Registration process managed by the Customer Lifecycle team.
3. A delivery receipt will be sent to IGTs upon successful delivery of the file to the Shipper (as per BAU process for existing IX file exchanges). If there is an issue with transmission, this will go to the sending IGTs error directory. Please see the UK Link Manual – File Transfer Definition for the details on this.
4. Existing invalid file exception processes will apply to the .RPC file.
5. Market trials will be carried out on the live production nodes but using the non-production folder and file name structure. E.g 'ORGnn.TNNNNNNN.RPC'
6. The timeline provided are based on a stand-alone release. If bundled into a major release, for example, there may be efficiencies identified.

UK Link Component Systems	Level of Impact (L/M/H)	File Format (Y/N)	Screens (Y/N)	Reporting (Y/N)	Batch Jobs (Y/N)	Validation (Y/N)	Processes (Y/N)	Other
UK Link Gemini	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<i>If 'Other' is ticked, please provide justification</i>
UK Link System Application (e.g. SAP ISU, BW, PO)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<i>As above</i>
UK Link Portal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<i>As above</i>
UK Link Online Services	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<i>As above</i>

Contact Management Service (CMS)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	As above
UK Link Network (Inclusive of IX, EFT and AMT)	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	<p>Technical validations will only be carried out on file format/configuration and not file content.</p> <p>Process is Y because this is a new file type being exchanged.</p>

Additional Systems	Level of Impact (L/M/H)	File Format (Y/N)	Screens (Y/N)	Reporting (Y/N)	Batch Jobs (Y/N)	Validation (Y/N)	Processes (Y/N)	Other
Data Discovery Platform (DDP) Core	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	If 'Other' is ticked, please provide justification
Discovery API	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	As above
Reporting	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
Gas Enquiry Service (GES) –	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	

3c. High level costs and timescales

Costs provided within the ROM response are indicative and high level based on high level analysis.

Below details the high-level implementation cost range and provides an indication of any ongoing costs identified from the high-level analysis.

Implementation costs

Please provide below a high-level indicative cost range for this request.

For each costed solution option:

An enduring solution will cost at least £15,000, but probably not more than £50,000,

[Please note, the Cloud IX (CIX) programme is currently in progress. This is the programme to transition to a cloud-based service, with the aim to have all customers on CIX by the end of 2025 (noting it will be a gradual transition across customers rather than a big bang approach).

The cost range above is related to the configuration activities required to allow the .RPC file to be sent. These activities and therefore costs are required regardless of the CIX programme.

The way in which parties are charged for IX as a result of the CIX rollout, will be shared in due course with DSC Parties. As a result, we cannot within this ROM include any potential charges as a result of this change following a rollout to CIX.

Ongoing costs

Please provide a view on whether any ongoing costs are anticipated as a result of this change being implemented.

If ongoing costs are anticipated, please provide an indication of the expected annual ongoing cost.

No ongoing costs are anticipated in association with this ROM. This will be confirmed at detailed design.

Please note, there is an ongoing cost associated with IX already in place. This is detailed within the CDSP Annual Charging Statement.

Timescales:

The high-level estimate to develop and deliver this change is approximately 10 weeks, this does not include up to 4 weeks of Post Implementation Support (timescale or PIS is to incorporate the issuing or the RPC backing data from the IGTs by the 5th business day of the month, may be reduced dependent on delivery date).

Validity of ROM:

Please note, the information provided in the ROM response is an 'at a point in time' assessment which is valid for [6] amount of time.

3d. Release Type

Please provide a view on the anticipated release type this change would need to be delivered under.

Release Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad-hoc / Stand-alone	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major	

Next available Release (based on the Release Type)	ChMC approval to Release scope	ChMC approval of Detailed Design
Major Release – November 2024	TBC	14/08/2024
Ad-hoc – TBC		

3e. Impact of Service Line(s)

Impact on Service Line(s)	<p>Specific Service Lines already exist within the DSC for IX services.</p> <p>This includes the obligation / service to provision an IX connection for DSC parties. (SS-SA22-17). There are specific options available to parties for IX provision which again are detailed within the DSC as existing Service Lines. The associated charges to IX options are detailed within the CDSP Annual Charging Statement.</p> <p>Based on this, we currently do not believe there is any additional Service Line required as a result of this Modification.</p> <p>We do believe the UK Link Manual - UK Link Access Document -, UKLAD3 UK Link File Transfer Definition, will need updating if IGT 173 is implemented. This is to document this new use of Communication Type 2.</p>
---------------------------	---

3f. Assumptions

- Any changes in the approach to the solution may affect the overall schedule and costs for the change.
- Costs are high level, based on high level analysis. Detailed analysis will be needed to determine the final solution which will impact both cost and schedule.
- The high-level analysis is based on changes to central systems and does not account for changes to customer systems as a result of any potential work.
- The high-level analysis and costs are based on current production system

4. Version Control

Version	Date:	Author	Status
1.0	20/07/2022	Ellie Rogers	Clean version
2.0	07/11/2023	Josie Lewis	Minor updates made