Data Breakout

1. Questions arising from the data heads-up

2. Data risks discussed at RIAG

3. IGT Data risks

Risk	Mitigation
Risk that insufficient testing has been done on IGT meters in market trials, as it was difficult to pick data that met all the criteria (eg specific circumstances of change of supply involving an iGT site) so that the data isn't proven to work with the current functionality	Assessing level of testing on IGT data as part of market trails debrief. Also taken forward to planning / scoping market trials regression.
There is a risk that the sequencing of 72 transformation rules, especially the 37 created post market trials data extract, could mean that a later transformation has an adverse impact on an earlier transformation rule	PwC have performed an exercise looking at data objects touched more than once, and assessed potential risks. First pass of evidence is that there are no sequencing issues, 3 minor points to follow up.

Risk	Mitigation
Market Trials testing was not performed on data migrated via the delta load process so there is a risk that this data will not operate in the same way as data loaded through the bulk load process (note that this only impacts GT data)	After IDR1 (and planned after each IDR cycle) Xoserve carry out some functional testing, including the 6 critical message types, on migrated data, including IGT migrated data and delta load data, to ensure that the load has worked. This provides some evidence of functional testing on data migrated with the full set of transformation rules.

ofgem Making a positive difference for energy consumers

Risk	Mitigation
The data that has been used for testing is not consistent with actual data because 37 transformation rules have been applied subsequent to the data extract - so data and functionality have not been tested together, leading to the risk that, in production, there will be unexpected errors.	1) The data that has been used in market trials has to pass compliance requirements in order to be processed by SAP - so to a certain extent would have complied with the full set of transformation rules and data have been tested together. This is only a partial mitigation as it does not test all data elements (eg asset, meter read, customer, etc) together. However, there are further mitigations: 2) Performance testing was carried out on data which was subject to a more complete set of transformation rules, as will Gas Day testing, so this provides some evidence of data and functionality being tested together. 3) After IDR1 (and planned after each IDR cycle) Xoserve carry out some functional testing, including the 6 critical message types, on migrated data, including IGT migrated data and delta load data, to ensure that the load has worked. This provides some evidence of functional testing on data migrated with the full set of transformation rules.

Risk	Mitigation
The data that participants used in Market Trials was highly selective, picked for specific scenarios and therefore does not provide sufficient confidence that the full data set will operate consistently with the results of market trials.	Xoserve have extensive validation routines as explained during RIAG (and to DMG) to ensure data quality. Also, results of performance testing and post IDR testing as discussed above.
Participants cleanse their data in relation to the 37 new transformation rules but misinterpret the transformation rules leading to non-compliant data that is subsequently rejected in production.	Mitigation (GT) There have been very few new GT transformation rules and so the impact on GT of this risk is minimal Mitigation (IGT) If an error is made in transforming iGT data then it would be detected during the iGT portfolio reconciliation process and loading onto the staging database.

Risk	Mitigation
Participants cleanse their data in relation to the 37 new transformation rules but misinterpret the transformation rules leading to non-compliant data that is subsequently rejected in production.	Mitigation (GT) Primarily IGT impact There have been very few new GT transformation rules and so the impact on GT of this risk is minimal Mitigation (IGT) If an error is made in transforming iGT data then it would be detected during the iGT portfolio reconciliation process and loading onto the staging database.

Risk	Mitigation
Completeness – not all relevant MPRNs are on the migration database	Portfolio reconciliation – Xoserve working with IGTs to resolve differences – number of sites no on migration database reduced from 98k (end September) to 31k (end October).
Compliance – data will not work in SAP	IGT Transformation rules
Consistency/alignment – although the MPRN is consistent between supplier, IGT, and Xoserve and the data is SAP compliance there are differences in the details – for example different supplier id or gas act owner	Progressive identification of misalignments and resolution (both supplier id and Gas Act Owner have been fixed – in September and November respectively).