DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

# A1: General Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Reference: | XRN 5319 |
| Change Title: | Assessing MPID Reassignment for All Party Types |
| Date Raised: | 28/01/2021 |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | E.ON |
| Name: | Kirsty Dudley |
| Email: | Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com  |
| Telephone: | 07816 172 645 |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Paul Orsler |
| Email: | Paul.Orsler@xoserve.com  |
| Telephone: |  |
| Business Owner: |  |
| Change Status: | [x]  Proposal | [ ]  With DSG | [ ]  Out for Review |
| [ ]  Voting | [ ]  Approved | [ ]  Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Customer Class(es): | [ ]  Shipper | [ ]  Distribution Network Operator |
| [ ]  NG Transmission | [ ]  IGT |
| [x]  All | [ ]  Other <Please provide details here> |
| Justification for Customer Class(es) selection | The change in approach would likely impact all customer groups, although full assessment will confirm/deny this. |

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Problem Statement: | Currently the allocation of Market Participant Identity (MPID) short codes for all party types such as Suppliers, Shippers, are linked to the Company Number issued and associated to the Organisation the Licence granted. In gas, once the unique 3 digit short code is allocated to an MPID under a particular Company Number it cannot be changed between different entities which have been granted licences or another party type, such as Meter Asset Provider (MAP) or Meter Asset Manager (MAM). In the event of a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) or company acquisition the short code cannot be simply ‘lifted and shifted’ but instead flows to refresh the IDs have to be issued or mass movements of portfolios or data refreshes have to occur, adding cost and effort to the industry for something which could be a lot simpler and more efficient if the ‘lift and shift’ approach was able to be utilised. In contrast to this, in electricity a process can be followed to reassign the MPID in these scenarios which is far less complex and better facilitates the market. It is simpler and doesn’t stop organisation innovation. As referenced under Change Proposal XRN5144 (which is presently looking to establish CDSP Impacts related to supporting SoLR arrangements being made under the Retail Energy Code), this approach would materially vary the treatment of organisations in UK Link systems. This approach is set out in the MDD Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document. This currently does not allow short codes to be re-used, regardless of a parties market participant role. Therefore, a change is required to enable this in certain circumstances, such as to give effect to a SoLR direction.  As a consequence, UK Link system design, whilst allowing a Licence and Company Number to have a one to many relationship, doesn’t allow these relationships to be refreshed and moved between legal entities for the multiple Market Participant roles administered within UK Link systems. Whilst the current UK Link System Design adheres to the approach as set out in the MDD Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document, however these arrangements lack the flexibility that is needed within the energy market, with parties having SoLRs, acquisitions and re-shaping their individual businesses. We would therefore like to explore what options are available to resolve this issue, and what the associated Impacts would be to CDSP systems.  |
| Change Description: | This XRN is being raised to explore the impacts to all CDSP systems including, but not limited to UK Link, Gemini, DES, CMS and DDP.The investigation is to assess the implications and approximate costs to replicate the MPID reassignment principal in electricity (although not an exact process replica, it should be still designed to best suit gas). The exploratory review should consider for all party/role types:* An MPID moving between different party types within the same group of companies
* An MPID moving between different party types within different group of companies but driven by SoLR or acquisition activity (anything in addition of 5144 findings)
* Consider separating the validation so the same ID can be recognised as multiple party types
* High-level outlining of suggested amendments to the MDD process documents (or any other documents) which would be required to deliver the solution.

This XRN is to outline the possible options (and associated costs) for an industry decision to be made at the ChMC. The decision should be if any options should be progressed or not.If the process is to remain as-is then suggested wording to MDD process documentation will need to be put forward to CoMC. For the avoidance of doubt, this XRN is exploratory analysis only, any changes will need to be a part B XRN or a new XRN. |
| Proposed Release: | Release: NA |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | [ ]  10 Working Days | [ ]  15 Working Days |
| [ ]  20 Working Days | [ ]  Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | The benefits of this change are:* Understanding of change options
* Understanding of change costs
* Understanding of ‘art of the possible’

Industry collaboratively determining if this is a solution which is to be taken forward |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | As this is an exploratory XRN the realised benefits are based on the information gathered to assist with decision making.  |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | There are to be no actual process changes this XRN is information gathering only. |
| *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.* |

# A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations – Removed (see Section C for DSG recommendations)

# A6: Service Lines and Funding

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing  |  |
| Level of Impact | Major/ Minor/ Unclear/ None |
| If None please give justification |  |
| Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix  |  |
| Level of Impact | Major/ Minor/ Unclear/ None |
| If None please give justification  |  |
| Funding Classes: | Customer Classes/ Funding | Delivery of Change | On-going Budget Amendment  |
| [ ]  Shipper | XX % | XX % |
| [ ]  National Grid Transmission | XX % | XX % |
| [ ]  Distribution Network Operator | XX % | XX % |
| [ ]  IGT | XX % | XX % |
| [ ]  Other <please specify> | XX % | XX % |
| ROM or funding details: |  |
| Funding Comments: |  |

# A7: ChMC Recommendation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | [ ]  Approve | [ ]  Reject | [ ]  Defer |
| Industry Consultation: | [ ]  10 Working Days | [ ]  15 Working Days |
| [ ]  20 Working Days | [ ]  Other [Specify Here] |
| Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve) | XX/XX/XXXX |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| Date Issued: | Click here to enter a date. |
| Comms Ref(s): |  |
| Number of Responses: |  |

# A8: DSC Voting Outcome

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Voting: | [ ]  Shipper | Please select. |
| [ ]  National Grid Transmission | Please select. |
| [ ]  Distribution Network Operator | Please select. |
| [ ]  IGT | Please select. |
| Meeting Date: | Click here to enter a date. |
| Release Date: | Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA |
| Overall Outcome: | [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes | If [Yes] please specify <Release> |

Please send the completed forms to: box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com

Version Control

# Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 3.0 | Superseded | 17/07/2018 | Emma Smith | Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018 |
| 4.0 | Superseded | 07/09/2018 | Emma Smith | Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1 |
| 5.0 | Superseded | 10/12/2018 | Heather Spensley | Template moved to new Word template as part of Corporate Identity changes. |
| 6.0 | Approved | 12/12/2018 | Simon Harris | Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12th December 2018. |
| 6.1 | In Draft | 26/03/2019 | Richard Johnson/ Alison Cross | The following minor changes were made:* Inclusion of an All ‘Impacted Parties’ option in A2
* Justification section added to section A2
* Change Description replaced with Problem Statement in section A3
* Remove ‘X’ in Release information (sections A3, A5, A7, C1 and G8)
* Updated Service Line and UK Link impacts and funding section (A6) to include further detail
* Amended questions 3 and 4 in section B
* Added Service Line/UK link Assessment in section D
* Removed Section A5
 |
| 6.2 | For approval | 14/05/2019 | Alison Cross | Following review at DSC Governance review group re-added Change Description text box |
| 7.0 | Approved | 13/06/2019 | Richard Johnson | DSC Governance Review Group changes to the template approved at Change Management Committee on 12th June 2019 |