

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4713**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Title** | Actual read following estimated transfer read calculating AQ of 1 (linked to XRN4690) | |
| **Date Raised** | 12th July 2018 | |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | npower | |
| **Sponsor Name** | James Rigby | |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** |  | |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | Emma Smith | |
| **Xoserve Contact Details** | 07596 933903 | |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / With DSG / Out for Consultation / **Voting** / Approved or Rejected | |
| **Section A1: Impacted Parties** | | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  iGT | |
| **[Section A2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "WHAT – What is the required change? WHY – Why is the change needed? WHEN – Detail when the solution should be started/implemented.  )** | | |
| **Temporary Solution as per XRN4690**  The original Change proposal XRN4690 was raised, and following solution review the recommendation was to implement a transitional solution (‘Option 2’) to carry forward the prevailing Rolling AQ in the instance outlined below.  **Scenario**  Where an actual read is submitted following an estimated transfer reading, if the Actual reading is less than the estimated reading a negative volume is created (the actual read validates to the last Actual read recorded so the period last actual to estimated transfer read would be a positive value). In the instances where the estimated transfer reading and the Actual read are the only reads considered for the AQ Calculation the AQ will be re-calculated to 1, if other reads are considered within the optimum or sub-optimum period for the AQ Calculation the AQ may still be incorrectly calculated resulting in a reduced AQ.  **Potential Enduring Solution**  Change Managers would also like to consider implementing an enduring solution, that will re-estimate the transfer reading where the next actual reading creates negative volume between transfer read and actual read. This will be considered for delivery as part of a future major release, therefore this change proposal has been raised to potentially deliver the enduring solution (and allow the solution in XRN4690 to be retired).  **Out of Scope**  AQs that have been resolved via XRN4690 will not be ‘corrected’ as part of this change. | | |
| **Proposed Release** | Release: November 2019 | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | 10WD / 30WD / XXWD (not required) | |
| **[Section A3: Benefits and Justification](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "Benefit Description: What, if any, are the intangible and tangible benefits of the change?Benefit Realisation:When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised? Benefit Dependencies:Detail any dependencies that are outside the scope.)** | | |
| **Benefit Description**  *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?*  *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | | The actual read supplied will be considered for AQ calculation and will calculate an accurate AQ. |
| **Benefit Realisation**  *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | | Immediately following implementation (for those where an actual read is submitted) |
| **Benefit Dependencies**  *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.* | | None |
| **Section A4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | | |
|  | | |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer | |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | |
| **Section A5: DSC Consultation** | | |
| **Issued** | **Yes** / No | |
| **Date(s) Issued** | 10/05/2019 | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** | 2315.1 – RJ – ES | |
| **Number of Responses** | 4 approvals and one deferral | |
| **Section A6: Funding** | | |
| **Funding Classes** | X Shipper 100%  ☐ National Grid Transmission XX%  ☐ Distribution Network Operator XX%  ☐ iGT XX% | |
| **Service Line(s)** | 6: Annual quantity, DM supply point capacity and offtake rate reviews  This Change Proposal is covered under DS-CS SA6 – 17. | |
| **ROM or funding details** |  | |
| **Funding Comments** | Agreed change would be 100% shipper funded | |
| **Section A7: DSC Voting Outcome** | | |
| **Solution Voting** | X Shipper **Approve** / Reject / NA / Abstain  ☐ National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / **NA** / Abstain  ☐ Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / **NA** / Abstain  ☐ iGT Approve / Reject / **NA** / Abstain | |
| **Meeting Date** | 11th July 2018 | |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA | |
| **Overall Outcome** | Approved for Release X / Rejected | |

**Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion**

**(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | **24/08/2018** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| [Click here](https://www.xoserve.com/index.php/dsc-delivery-sub-group/) to find the presentation pack.  RH presented slides 50 to 53. For the issue associated with this change, four options were presented to DSG. XRN4713 refers to option 4, which is the long term solution, whereas 4690 refers to the interim solution which was presented as option 1.  Option 4 (4713) would involve the system re-estimating the read once the actual read is received. Since the re-estimated read will be less than the actual read, negative consumption can be avoided.  RH presented this at DSG following feedback from ChMC; they wanted DSG to validate it again. Due to the complexity of the change, RH stated that the change would be in scope of a major release.  RH asked if DSG support this solution option. DSG recommended this solution option.  **Action: - 0822: Rachel Hinsley to raise 4713 (Actual read following estimated transfer read calculating AQ of 1) at the next ChMC for approval)** | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | **04/02/2019** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| Simon Harris (SH) provided a background of XRN4713 and its associated change: XRN4690 (Actual read following estimated transfer read calculating AQ of 1).  XRN4690 was raised an interim solution where, during the AQ process, if the first variance considered is a negative then the previous AQ would be rolled over as the associated positive consumption would not be considered if AQ was to be calculated.  XRN4713 was raised to look into a long-term solution to the original issue by re-estimate an estimated Shipper Transfer Read for scenarios when the next actual read is lower than the estimated read, thus causing a negative consumption.  SH presented a set of considerations associated with XRN4713 on slide 27, and set of associated solution options on slide 28 and is proposing a solution of a report highlighting where the negative consumption is present to allow Shippers (incoming and outgoing) to discuss and potentially submit a Shipper Agreed Read (SAR) to re-apportion the consumption more accurately.  There was discussion about the implications of faster switching: Shane Preston (SP) stated that when a supplier switches, they can be held for 30 days; JB and SH disagreed and said it was 10 days.  DSG provided little comment on the considerations and solution options, but agreed to take the following action:  Action 0402 - Regarding XRN 4713 (Actual Read Following Estimated Transfer Read Calculating AQ of 1 Enduring Solution), DSG members to consider the solution options on slide 28 and report back at the next DSG meeting | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

Section D: High Level Solution Options

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | **Solution Option 3**  DSG agreed that only solution option 3 is needed to have a HLSO carried out on it. Please [click here](https://www.xoserve.com/media/4081/xrn4713-high-level-solution-option-assessment.pdf) to view. |
| Implementation Date for this Solution Option: | Data Office Change (TBC) |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | Option 3 is Xoserve’s preferred solution option due to the complexity and potential cutting across UNC with other solution options. The low number of sites that would need investigation leads itself to a none systemised solution where any affected MPRNs are notified to Shipper for appropriate action. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | Option 3. DSG agreed that solution option 3 is the most pragmatic approach to the issue posed in the Change Proposal and recommends this solution as the way forward. |
| Consultation closeout: | 24th May 2019 |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | npower |
| Name: | Amie Charalambous |
| Trial: | Gas.codes@npower.com |
| Tetrialne: | 07917271763 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | npower are supportive of option 3 - We would like to see the current ‘interim’ solution of rolling the existing AQ to continue … With the report just highlighting to shippers where this has occurred for action to be taken if required…. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation. Regarding your request that the ‘interim’ solution continues, this will be the case. The interim was to ensure the issues being faced with AQ are mitigated and that will continue. The proposed report will only contain instances where there is a negative consumption either side of the estimated transfer reading. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy |
| Name: | Alex Cebo |
| Trial: | aleksandra.cebo@edfenergy.com |
| Tetrialne: | 07875119544 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support the change in principle. We do believe ,however, that the enduring solution should allow for CDSP to re-estimate the CoS estimated read following an actual read submission which then should be sent to the shipper. As a result, we would like to defer the change. | |
| Implementation Date: | Defer | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation. Regarding your solution preference to allow the CDSP to re-estimate the estimated transfer (in the instances of negative consumption), the reason this is not being proposed as the preferred option by DSG and Xoserve is due to the potential that annually read Supply Meter Points could have an extended period of time before a new CoS read is re-estimated, and as a result concerns were raised by Shippers that consumer billing may have already closed out potentially causing additional issues. Due to the low numbers of sites since NEXUS, DSG are favourable of highlighting to Shippers where instances of negative consumption are present for further investigation to see if any remedy action would be needed. It was also highlighted that to facilitate the re-estimation process, a UNC modification could be required which could impact delivery timescales for this change. For these reasons, option 3 has been proposed as the preferred option. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Southern Electric Gas Limited and SSE Energy Supply Limited |
| Name: | Megan Coventry |
| Trial: | megan.coventry@sse.com |
| Tetrialne: | 02392277738 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We agree that option 3 is the best approach. We request some more information from Xoserve in the form of indicative volumes. We would expect the reports to be split by shipper ID rather than by organisation, as we’ll require the shipper reports to be sent to different email addresses for different shipper IDs. This will also help us in understanding any changes to our resource requirements. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation. Regarding indicative volumes, more up to date numbers are being obtained and will be made available as soon as possible. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Energy |
| Name: | Alison Neild |
| Email: | [Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com](mailto:Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com) |
| Telephone: | 0161 829 0039 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Gazprom support the progression of either Option 1 or 3 as the process for us as shipper isn’t materially impacted by either option.  Both options require the SAR process to be instigated.  Option 2, re-estimation is deemed as not required as SAR will need to be created between shippers.  Currently on receipt of a lower actual first read this already triggers a SAR process internally.  The read is not sent to Xoserve on the understanding that it would be rejected (however, the existence of this CP indicates that the negative consumption read is accepted.  Please can you confirm?). For this reason we believe the report in Option 3 is not required as we would be working towards resolution prior to Xoserve knowing the issue exists.  However appreciate the report could be useful to others if their processes do not match this and therefore would support Option 3. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your support in the recommended option 3 (and also option 1), regarding your question surrounding negative consumption read being accepted, this is the case, but only where there is an estimated transfer reading being present. This is because the energy tolerance checks that are carried out on the submitted reading (next cyclic post Shipper transfer) against the last actual reading in UKL and not the estimated Shipper transfer read.  If the last actual is lower than the submitted cyclic read (and within tolerance) then the read is accepted into UKL, but when the system creates the reconciliation volumes, where the estimated Shipper transfer read is higher than the cyclic read, it creates a negative consumption. The interim solution (XRN4690) was to ensure the issues being faced with the AQ process (causing AQ’s of 1) was mitigated, all other downstream processes can handle negative consumptions, however the apportionment between the incoming and outgoing Shippers would be inaccurate, that would (as you’ve indicated) require a SAR to be raised to replace the estimated Shipper Transfer reading. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | E.ON |
| Name: | Kirsty Dudley / Lee Stone |
| Email: | [Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com](mailto:Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com) |
| Telephone: | 07816 172 645 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support solution option 3 - Notification report to Shippers.  We support Xosereve’s assessment that a non-systemised approach will best facilitate Shippers to take appropriate actions manually.  E.ON believe an appropriate lead time would be November (at the earliest) to mobilise the appropriate internal arrangements. | |
| Implementation Date: | November 2019 | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: |  | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | «e1\_dsgSolutionOption» | |
| Publication of consultation response: | Public | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation. |

**Appendix 1**

**Change Prioritisation Variables**

Xoserve uses the following variables set for each and every change within the Xoserve Change Register, to derive the indicative benefit prioritisation score, which will be used in conjunction with the perceived delivery effort to aid conversations at the DSC ChMC and DSC Delivery Sub Groups to prioritise changes into all future minor and major releases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change Driver Type** | CMA Order  MOD / Ofgem  EU Legislation  License Condition  BEIS  ChMC endorsed Change Proposal  SPAA Change Proposal  Additional or 3rd Party Service Request  Other*(please provide details below)* |
| **Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered** | Shipper Impact iGT Impact Network Impact Xoserve Impact National Grid Transmission Impact |
| **Associated Change reference Number(s)** | **XRN4690** |
| **Associated MOD Number(s)** |  |
| **Perceived delivery effort** | 0 – 30  30 – 60  60 – 100  100+ days |
| **Does the project involve the processing of personal data?**  *‘Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier’ – includes MPRNS.* | Yes *(If yes please answer the next question)*  No |
| **A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the delivery of the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:** | New technology  Vulnerable customer data  Theft of Gas  Mass data  Xoserve employee data  Fundamental changes to Xoserve business  Other*(please provide details below)*  *(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.* |
| **Change Beneficiary**  *How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?* | Multiple Market Participants  Multiple Market Group  All industry UK Gas Market participants  Xoserve Only  One Market Group  One Market Participant |
| **Primary Impacted DSC Service Area** | Choose Item |
| **Number of Service Areas Impacted** | All  Five to Twenty  Two to Five  One |
| **Change Improvement Scale?**  *How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?* | High  Medium  Low |
| **Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?** | |
| Safety of Supply at risk Customer(s) incurring financial loss  Customer Switching at risk | |
| **Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?** | |
| Customer System Changes Required  Customer Testing Likely Required  Customer Training Required | |
| **Known Impact to Systems / Processes** | |
| **Primary Application impacted** | BW  ISU  CMS  AMT  EFT  IX  Gemini  Birst  Other *(please provide details below)* |
| **Business Process Impact** | AQ SPA RGMA  Reads Portal Invoicing  ☐ Other *(please provide details below)* |
| **Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?** | Yes *(please provide details below)*  No |
| **Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.** | Shipper impact  Network impact  iGT impact  Xoserve impact  National Grid Transmission Impact |
| **Workaround currently in operation?** | |
| **Is there a Workaround in operation?** | Yes  No |
| **If yes who is accountable for the workaround?** | Xoserve  External Customer  Both Xoserve and External Customer |
| **What is the Frequency of the workaround?** |  |
| **What is the lifespan for the workaround?** |  |
| **What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround?** |  |
| **What is the Complexity of the workaround?** | Low *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)*  Medium *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)*  High *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)* |
| **Change Prioritisation Score** | 30% |

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

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 | In Progress | 24/08/18 | Richard Johnson | CP updated with DSG discussions from 20th August |
| 2.0 | With DSG | 11/02/19 | Richard Johnson | CP updated with DSG discussions from 4th February |
| 3.0 | Voting | 31/05/19 | Richard Johnson | Updated with reps following the May consultation period |

**Template Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 2.0 | Approved | 01/05/18 | Emma Smith | Layout and cosmetic changes made following internal review |