**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4780**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section A1: General Details** | | |
| **Change Title** | Inclusion of Meter Asset Provider Identity (MAP Id) in the UK Link system (CSS Consequential Change) | |
| **Date Raised** | 13th September 2018 | |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | SSE | |
| **Sponsor Name** | Mark Jones | |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | [Mark.jones@sse.com](mailto:Mark.jones@sse.com) / 07810 858716 | |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | David Addison | |
| **Xoserve Contact Details** | [David.addison@xoserve.com](mailto:David.addison@xoserve.com) / 07428 559800 | |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / With DSG / Out for review / **Voting** / Approved or Rejected | |
| **Section A2: Impacted Parties** | | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | Shipper  ☐ National Grid Transmission  ☐ Distribution Network Operator  ☐ IGT | |
| [**Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change**](file:///C:\Users\Rebecca.perkins\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\EXD06YFG\Change_Proposal_Template%20v2.0.docx) | | |
| Within the Ofgem Switching Programme (OSP) that will introduce the Central Switching Service (CSS) it is expected that the source of the Meter Asset Provider identity (MAP Id) for gas Registrable Meter Points (RMP) will be the UK Link system. This data will be passed to CSS within a Synchronisation flow.  The requirement is to define and implement MAP Id within UK Link systems. This change will need to consider:   * Initial population of the MAP Id – including cleansing and migration * Ongoing maintenance of the MAP Id * Assessment of the parties who need to be informed with respect to the MAP Id, the events when they need to be informed (e.g. provision to Shipper at a Change of Shipper event) and the form in which this data should be made available to these parties. E.g. it is expected that the MAP Id will be available via DES, the parties who can view this will need to be defined. * Assessment of the notification to the MAP, and if relevant, the circumstances in which information may be provided to the MAP – e.g. Change of Shipper event, Meter Asset amendment. The form in which this data is made available to the MAPs will need to be defined and may include consideration of a MAP Portfolio view – as per MAM portfolio view.   Population and maintenance of the MAP Id will need to consider which industry party or parties will provide and retain responsibility for maintaining the MAP Id to the UK Link systems. | | |
| **Proposed Release (Feb/Jun/Nov/Minor)** | Release required sufficiently in advance of CSS Implementation to provide mature processes for capture of the MAP Id and consequentially a stable dataset for migration to CSS. | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | ☒ 10 Working Days  ☐ 20 Working Days  ☐ 30 Working days  Other: | |
| [**Section A4: Benefits and Justification**](file:///C:\Users\Rebecca.perkins\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\EXD06YFG\Change_Proposal_Template%20v2.0.docx) | | |
| **Benefit Description**  *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?*  *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | | MAP Id provision is a requirement for UK Link to provide to the CSS.  MAP Id is not currently held within the central data services functions within the gas industry. Conversely it is within electricity. MAPs have reported that the rate of asset loss is reduced in electricity as a consequence. |
| **Benefit Realisation**  *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | | Implementation of this change needs to precede the CSS Implementation – currently planned Q4 2020. |
| **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.* | | CSS Implementation. |
| **Section A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | | |
| *Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.* | | |
| **Final DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer | |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | |
| **Section A6: Funding** | | |
| **Funding Classes** | Shipper 100%  ☐ National Grid Transmission XX%  ☐ Distribution Network Operator XX%  ☐ IGT XX% | |
| **Service Line(s)** | DSC Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registration | |
| **ROM or funding details** |  | |
| **Funding Comments** | Follows CSS Consequential funding principles | |
| **Section A7: ChMC Recommendation** | | |
| **Change Status** | Approve – Issue to DSG  ☐ Defer – Issue for review  ☐ Reject  \*ChMC meeting on 10th October | |
| **Industry Consultation** | ☐ 10 Working Days  ☐ 20 Working Days  ☐ 30 Working days  Other: | |
| **Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)** |  | |
| **DSC Consultation** | | |
| **Issued** | ☒ Yes  ☐ No | |
| **Date Issued** | 14/06/19 | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** | 2346.4 - RJ - PO | |
| **Number of Responses** | TBC | |
| **Section A8: DSC Voting Outcome** | | |
| **Solution Voting** | ☐ 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** | XX/XX/XXXX | |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA | |
| **Overall Outcome** | Approved for Release X / Rejected | |

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

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1 | For Approval | 18th September 2018 | Mark Jones | First Draft |
| 2 | With DSG | 16th November | Mark Jones | DSG notes added from meeting on 5th November |
| 3 | With DSG | 22nd October |  | DSG notes added from meeting on 15th October |
| 4 | With DSG | 8th April | Rachel Taggart | DSG notes added from meeting on 1st April 2019 |
| 5 | With DSG | 11th June | Xoserve | DSG notes added from meeting held on 3rd June 2019 |
| 6 | Out for consultation | 14/06/19 | Xoserve | Solution Options added to section D for June Change Pack |

**Template Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 3.0 | Approved | 17/07/18 | Emma Smith | Template approved at ChMC on 11th July |
| 4.0 | Approved | 07/09/18 | Emma Smith | Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1 |

Section D: High Level Solution Options

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | XRN4780 - Part B has in scope the following CDSP system changes.  • Initial population of the MAP Id – including cleansing and migration activities on data received from MAPs  • Ongoing maintenance of the MAP ID within CDSP system (MAP direct updates)  • Extraction of MAP Id data into BW  • Information flows informing MAPs of asset updates and Supplier changes  • Information flows informing Shippers of MAP amendments  As the above affect SPA & RGMA processing within CDSP systems and due to the way these currently work, only one solution option is being put forward to facilitate the changes. As this is HLSO only, the intricacies of how these will work (formats/file flows etc) will be discussed and highlighted during detailed design.  **1)** MAP Updates and Notifications  **HLSO Documentation**  [Click Here](https://www.xoserve.com/media/4394/map-id-hlso-june-2019.pdf) |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | **1)** MAP Updates and Notifications |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | TBC (DSG 17th July 2019) |
| Consultation closeout: | 28/06/2019 |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Energy |
| Name: | Alison Neild |
| Email: | alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com |
| Telephone: | 01618290039 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Gazprom would like to put forward the following changes to the HLSO proposed.  Change: MAP ID updates to be limited to RGMA flow updates only. Reason: The relationship is currently between MAP and MAM and not shipper/supplier. The shipper has no viable way to validate the MAP data on receipt within the RGMA flow. We propose that the process should be for the MAP to make any updates/disputes via the MAM (as per current relationship) with CDSP being updated through RGMA via the shipper.  Benefit: MAM/MAP relationship maintained; negates the need for an additional file flow (CDSP to Shipper).   Change: Bring DES into scope of the solution to hold the new MAP ID  Reason: MAM ID held, so MAP ID should be aligned; data integrity purposes to understand what has been updated for any audit purposes. Benefit: Ability for shipper/supplier to see the MAP ID held by UKLink if required. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Reject | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Reject | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation for XRN4780, this will be discussed at the next ChMC. For context, the reasoning behind direct MAP updates into UKL is to try and ensure some form of data maintenance as RGMA updates (although the right way to specify MAP ID) is not being populated in the vast majority of flows. Shippers also agreed that MAPs will be the source of the MAP ID for the initial bulk data load into UKL (in scope of this change) so having a mechanism to update this directly would be of benefit to the industry. On your other point, MAP ID into DES is within scope of another XRN (XRN4801 ) that is being proposed to be delivered sooner or in conjunction with XRN4780. |

# 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. | BUUK support the need to include MAP ID within UK Link to support Ofgem's Faster Switching Programme. There are however a few areas that need to be looked at in more detail: Firstly, the population of MAP ID via existing RGMA file flows needs to be set out in a clear and transparent way. There currently isn't an explicit MAP ID field in RGMA file flows, this will be derived from other fields. Additionally, there already appears to be an industry issue whereby RGMA files submitted by IGTs and other transporter to Shippers are not being passed on to Suppliers which subsequently do not get passed on to Xoserve. This is currently impacting existing processes, with the consequence here being that the MAP ID will not get passed on to Xoserve. With this method of population are Xoserve anticipating to receive increases in RGMA flows, in which case could this lead to a further decrease in performance of RGMA file submissions? Secondly, it appears that the arrangements for IGT metering and the governance around this have been overlooked. Metering in the UNC was stripped out some years ago and GDNs have since set up their own commercial metering businesses outside of code. However, metering is still within the IGT UNC and thus many IGTs do not have separate metering businesses. The metering relationship under the IGT UNC is with the Shipper, whereas commercial metering businesses is direct with the Supplier. When it comes to invoicing for transportation charges metering charges are also wrapped up in this. A key data item we use to check is the MAP ID to ensure we are charging metering for the correct MPRNs. Without the play back of MAP ID from UK Link, IGTs will not be able to know when, for what every reason, the MAP has been changed, therefore impacting billing. Therefore, BUUK’s view is that MAP ID should be played back on the IDL file for IGTs. This shouldn’t be a requirement for GDNs as they have their own separate commercial metering businesses.   As a result, BUUK are requesting that the play back of MAP ID is made a formal requirement and that Xoserve explore options to include this within the CP. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation for XRN4780, this will be discussed at the next ChMC. Regarding your request to have MAP ID added to iGT delta flows, this can be looked into and discussed at ChMC as there may be wider impacts on other parties (iGT's) that do not also act as a MAP. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence |
| Email: | eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com |
| Telephone: | 07875117771 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We do not support this solution and in particular updates being provided by MAPs directly to CDSP and then to Shippers.   In order for MAPs to provide such updates they would have to be made aware that CDSP holds their meter serial number. If not we would expect that CDSP would reject any change of MAP ID. Even if meter serial number they provide is correct there is no guarantee that this is actually owned by that MAP and not a duplicate unless that data is built into a new flow, but we are not sure how that can be achieved.  With that in mind we feel that RGMA flows, and JOB/UPD flows to CDSP need to be amended to ensure that when a MAM sends details to Suppliers via and ONUPD/ONJOB that MAP ID is always included in that data. This can then be passed by Supplier to their Shipper to be passed to CDSP to update MAP ID. MAP would still be updated by MAM as per RGMA processes.  One other possible option would be to replicate more closely processes followed in electricity for dealing with meter technical details in that: MAM sends ONJOB/ONUPD files not just to Supplier but also to CDSP. Our concern though is that CDSP could reject that flow but Supplier might not be aware. Process could be that MAM only sends to Supplier after CDSP accept flow.   CDSP validation of data on meter technical details flows is another area that needs to be examined as our view is that data items are validated that are not at all critical to enable meter reads to be validated and settlements updated.  We also feel that a number of changes are required to RGMA processes as our MAM has highlighted a number of cases where they are unable to obtain meter technical details from old MAM. In electricity this issue can be raised to Elexon’s performance assurance board but in gas there is no real process for dealing with such issues without raising non-compliance processes immediately.  We feel that processes dealing with MAM, MAP and Supplier processes need to be reassessed and new bodies put in place to aid in conflict resolution where parties are not following RGMA as this has a direct downstream impact on our obligations to keep CDSP updated. In parallel a process for MAP updates and also a process to ensure current MAM has correct meter technical details needs to be looked at otherwise data quality will be compromised due to issues in the market which this change is not seeking to address. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Reject | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation for XRN4780, this will be discussed at the next ChMC. For context, the reasoning behind direct MAP updates into UKL is to try and ensure some form of data maintenance as RGMA updates (although the right way to specify MAP ID) is not being populated in the vast majority of flows. Shippers also agreed that MAPs will be the source of the MAP ID for the initial bulk data load into UKL (in scope of this change) so having a mechanism to update this directly would be of benefit to the industry. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | ScottishPower |
| Name: | Claire Roberts |
| Email: | Clairelouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com |
| Telephone: | 01416145930 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | ScottishPower support the need to include MAP ID within UKLink. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

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

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SSE |
| Name: | Megan Coventry |
| Email: | megan.coventry@sse.com |
| Telephone: | 02392277738 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support the change and proposed HLSO. System and process changes and cross-party testing may be required due to file format, file routing and RGMA changes. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

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

**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)** | **XRN4627** |
| **Associated MOD Number(s)** | **0630R** |
| **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** | Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations |
| **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)*  Require new service lines for maintaining the MAP Identity  System impacts necessary for originator and recipient of this information  ☐ 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** | 27% |

**Document Control**

**Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1 | Draft | 27/04/18 | Anesu Chivenga |  |