

**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](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.  )** | | |
| 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](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?* | | 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** |  | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** |  | |
| **Number of Responses** |  | |
| **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 |

**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 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** | **15/10/2018** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| The description of the change, and the change prioritisation score of 27%, was presented to DSG (slide 65). DA explained that there is a requirement for the CDSP to provide the MAP id data item to the CSS system. This requirement is included within the CSS Business Case.  The full requirements for this change have not been established yet, but the high level requirement is to the populate MAP id data item in the UK Link system. DA raised a consideration to think about how the MAP id date item should be maintained. DA stated that is also important to consider who would want to know when the MAP id has been updated, and how do we notify the MAPs of a change.  BH initiated a discussion regarding whether this change overlaps with CSS. DA stated elements of this change could be implemented within the remit of CSS. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | **15/10/2018** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| The description of the change, and the change prioritisation score of 27%, was presented to DSG (slide 65). DA explained that there is a requirement for the CDSP to provide the MAP id data item to the CSS system. This requirement is included within the CSS Business Case.  The full requirements for this change have not been established yet, but the high level requirement is to the populate MAP id data item in the UK Link system. DA raised a consideration to think about how the MAP id date item should be maintained. DA stated that is also important to consider who would want to know when the MAP id has been updated, and how do we notify the MAPs of a change.  BH initiated a discussion regarding whether this change overlaps with CSS. DA stated elements of this change could be implemented within the remit of CSS. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | **05/10/2018** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| DA provided a verbal update to DSG. DA started by explaining that a Change Proposal was raised, which included a range of questions, to add the MAP ID data item to UK Link Systems.  The questions included in the Change Proposal include the following:  • Who provides initial data load for migration?  • Who is responsible for providing MAP Id in ongoing operation?  • When do we expect to receive information on amended MAP Id?  • Who needs to be informed when a MAP Id changes?  DA explained that currently the MAP Id is maintained in the MAM to Supplier Job flows; specifically the data is passed in the MKPRT dataset in JOB and UPD transactions.  EL wanted to understand how the IGT MAP ID flows would be mandated. DA agreed to take an action away to look into this.  DA described the following preliminary findings to DSG, which are being used as basis for the development of solution options:  • UK Link systems required to hold METER asset provider information only.  • MAPs master ownership based on ASSET serial number  • Typically industry flows would use Meter Point Reference Number  o Mastering’ of data against MPRN is more commonplace  • MAP Id to be provided by MAPs against ASSET data  • Utilise RGMA flows to create the ASSET to MPRN linkage  • Notify MAPs on ASSET to MPRN (and location) association  DA explained that from an ownership perspective, MAPs own the asset. DA questioned whether Xoserve should consider an option to receive a flow directly from MAPs for the provision of the MAP ID.  DA mentioned that RGMA flows provide a link between the asset, the Meter Point and the MAP information. If Xoserve contemplated receiving flows directly from MAPs, Xoserve would be able to identify inconsistencies between RGMA flow and the new MAP flows; the benefit of this would be that Xoserve would be able to identify the MAP where there is a dispute over the asset owner.  DA indicated that the option described in the above paragraph would require MAPs to maintain a master ship of the asset information. JB asked if Xoserve would validate the RGMA against what is held in UK Link, which would be sent by the MAP. DA said yes, and Xoserve would probably need to send a flow to a MAP where there is a contradictory of the asset owner, which would enable the respective MAP to investigate. Detailed scenarios would need to be defined to set out potential flows of information.  Blanka Caen (BC) from Centrica stated that this is a complex area because it would involve MAP transfers. BC elaborated by saying that when a Supplier acquires a meter, they would take the existing meter away, and install a new meter; BC described this process as convoluted, and questioned why there is a CSS requirement to have the MAP ID when the MAP can change, and then questioned how the MAP ID would be used.  DA answered BC’s question by stating that CSS would notify the MAP of a new Supplier at the change in Supplier event. The MAP can then track the registration of the meter in question, and therefore their portfolios as a whole. DA stated that this is one of the fundamental principles outlined in the CSS business case: MAPs want to track the suppliers associated with meter assets. DA elaborated by stating that currently there is no recording of MAP information in gas central systems.  The MAP could master the asset relationship; this would ensure that the data is maintained more effectively. The link between the asset and the Meter Point would remain the responsibility of the Shipper unless they wished to delegate this.  JB observed that this seemed logical, but asked if there is gap in the process if an asset is traded, but the Shipper ‘can’t do the job’. Simon Harris (SH) explained that there needs to be a mechanism for when there is a trade of asset, the MAP can update the information in the CSS system, and send an RGMA flow to Xoserve: a MAP to MAP flow may be required when there is an asset trade.  At this point in the discussion, LW observed that there are several solution options for this change. LW asked if there is a next step to expand on the scenarios and identify solutions; LW asked when the scenarios and solution options will be presented at DSG again. DA said that this will come back to DSG, but not at the next meeting. In the meantime, DA asked DSG to take an action away to review the requirements and solution options for this change. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | Action 1104: In relation to XRN4780 (Inclusion of Meter Asset Provider in the UK Link System – CSS Consequential Change), David Addison to find out how IGT MAP id flows would be mandated  Action 1105: In relation to XRN4780 (Inclusion of Meter Asset Provider in the UK Link System – CSS Consequential Change), DSG to review the requirements and to support Xoserve in the development of solution options.  . |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | N/A |



**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 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 2 | With DSG | 19/10/18 | Xoserve | DSG notes from 15th October added to Section C |