From: **.Box.UKLINK.Manual** uklink@xoserve.com 📎
Subject: 1517 – ML - SN - Representation Matrices for January 2016 Change Pack Part 2 of 2
Date: 11 February 2016 16:59
To:

Communication Ref	**1517 – ML - SN**
Subject	**Representation Matrices for January 2016 Change Pack Part 2 of 2**
Date	**11/02/2016**

Dear colleague,

Further to the Change Pack, 1506 - LH - SN **–** UK Link Change Pack January 2016 Part 2 of 2 issued on 22/01/2016, representation or comments have been received for the following communications:

Communication Ref: 1506.2 – LH - SN
Subject: Solution Development Group Terms of Reference
Closeout Date: 05/02/2016

These representations were taken into account and the Terms of Reference have since been updated and published within Joint Office. At UK Link Committee meeting, on 11/02/2016 the members approved the Terms of Reference and a communication will be issued to notify the members of the changes within the document no later than 12/02/2016.

Communication Ref: 1506.3 – LH - SN
Subject: Comprehensive Invoices and Charge Types
Closeout Date: 05/02/2016

This was for information only.

Communication Ref: 1506.4 – LH - SN
Subject: Revised RTO Dataset and additional RTO information
Closeout Date: 05/02/2016

Following representations, Xoserve intends to seek approval from the UK Link Committee on 24/02/2016

The following communications issued for comment or representation within the January 2016 Change Pack solicited **no** responses

Communication Ref: 1506.1 – LH - SN
Subject: CMS Market Trials File Testing
Closeout Date: 05/02/2016

If you have any questions related to this communication, please contact me via uklink@xoserve.com

Kind regards
Steve

Steve Nunnington – **Development Manager**
Steve.j.nunnington@xoserve.com | 0121 623 2563

Address: Xoserve Limited, 31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT
Company Website: http://www.xoserve.com

This e-mail, and any attachments, are intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain confidential and/ or

1506.2.doc   1506.3.doc   1506.4.doc

Shipper	Name	Date	In Support / Not In Support	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
EDF Energy	Bryan Hale	05/02/2016		Y	Is it right to exclude defects or issues identified between Xoserve and one organisation are discussed in this session. How can we ensure these issues are also understood by the wider group so that full impact can be assessed?	Xoserve will decide with the appropriate organisation whether we think the change only applies to them. Usually this will mean that the organisation in question has not built the solution in the correct manner. Where an organisation is concerned that Xoserve has incorrectly classified a change as applying to a single organisation only they can appeal this decision at the SDG. If we raise every defect that every organisation has raised with Xoserve as part of the process we would need an extended meeting for each SDG. We need to rely on the organisation involved if they believe Xoserve's assessment to be incorrect. Quite happy to include this version of the groups objectives. We can discuss at UKLC on Thursday.
					I personally feel the objective could be worded better? E.g. • **The SDG will support the UK Link approvals process during the development of the UK Link Replacement Programme. The group will provide opportunity for the industry to contribute to**	I agree that the TOR needs to be tightened up to avoid scope creep. Perhaps we could amend the TOR to state that AOB must be raised with Xoserve 24 hours prior to the meeting. The Background section was designed to show

| | | | | | | solution development for changes identified as part of this UK Link Programme. The main objective of the group is to help Xoserve understand change requirements and have input in to what is an appropriate solution for those changes. | what are the pre-requisites of the meeting. However happy to re-vamp the style of the document if everyone agrees but I think this is cosmetic rather than material.

We will take out duplicates as appropriate. |
| | | | | | | Can you please provide further detail on how AOB will be managed in this meeting. The likelihood is that there will be lots of AOB items due to the nature of this meeting, so it needs to be ensured that the appropriate balance between allowing parties to discuss issues and restricting the meeting to the main agenda (and end time) is struck. We feel the current AOB statement within the ToR is insufficient.

We feel the document could be better structured:

- Some of the points in the background section seem to be pre-requisites to the SDG. Is it worth clarifying the steps that will be taken and documentation provided in advance of (inputs), during | Xoserve are trying to look at this from stakeholder and Xoserve perspective. There are two issues. Firstly as you point out organisations haven't built a solution in line with the Xoserve specification but secondly Xoserve have provided a flawed solution which needs to be amended by everyone including Xoserve or the process will not work. Before Thursday's meeting we will draft up a definition of just what a Must Have Change entails. The majority if not all of these changes will be fallouts emerging from Market Trials therefore if Stakeholders do not agree with the Xoserve assessment of Must Have they can appeal this decision at SDG and ultimately UKLC or UNCC should this prove necessary. |

					(this forms the main body of the ToR) and after (outputs) the SDG? - There is some repeated information in this document such as but not limited to… meetings being documented, the fact meetings are face to face with TC and that they are alternate Mondays and that Xoserve will chair. There continues to be a lot of debate about must have change. Should a statement be produced that defines the criteria for a must have change. In regards to some changes that are being regarded as Should Have changes, our view is that if a change is not made and this leads to an organisations design being out of line with Xoserves solution then this should be a "Must Have" change.	

Shipper	Name	Date	In Support / Not In Support	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
EDF Energy	Bryan Hale	05/02/2016		Y	Can you confirm the timescales for the implementation of these new charge types. This may have some system impact in regards to managing the contingency process.	These new charge types have already been implemented as per the 28 day's notice period provided via the CSS billing box. New invoicing charge types fall out of the remit of approval at UKLC however Users have the right to appeal within the 28 days after issue. No comments were received from the industry hence the implementation of the new charge types.

Shipper	Name	Date	In Support / Not In Support	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
British Gas	Oorlagh Chapman		British Gas accept the change		British Gas accept the change, subject to following corrections for consideration: • As per the RTO hierarchy, the APPNT transaction is optional whereas in the file examples the APPNT transaction is colour coded as mandatory (shaded in green). Shouldn't this be colour coded as yellow to highlight optional / conditional mandatory?	The APPNT dataset should be shown as conditional as the date can be obtained from the reading dataset, or in some instances is not required. Please note, the APPNT dataset is required in instances of a Meter Point Correction Factor Update as this is the only way that the effective date may be derived.
					• The change pack reference is 1506.4, however the actual documentation has reference to 1506.5. Please amend reference accordingly.	Agreed, the reference should be 1506.4
					• Level 3 hierarchy for ASSET should be 1 up to 10. Not a mandatory 10. Similarly for REGISTER – Up to two.	Agreed. The ASSET register must be provided, but it is not mandatory to provide 10 ASSET segments. REGST segment is also up to 2

						segments.
EDF Energy	Bryan Hale	05/02/2016		Y	1. Despite the response to our reps relating to the Accelerated Change Pack 3 – ref 1496, we still have concerns about the inclusion of Non Measurable Assets in this process. - If we are to include these in the RTO file this will require additional effort to design, build and test	Thank you for your comments. We require details of what non measuring assets were in situ at the time of the Retrospective Amendment so that we are able to correctly reflect these against the Supply Meter Point. We are not able to presume which assets attached at site are correctly / incorrectly attached so we need this confirmation. Where an asset is not reported we will remove this asset. If non-measuring asset is reported in retro update but is not associated with meter point as of retrospective effective date, the retro request stands rejected.
					- We understand if we are to include the non measurable asset with the retro update this would link that unmeasurable	We would expect the non measurable asset to be reported if this is in situ on the effective date of

					asset to a meter/converter different to that it was linked to before and lead to that non measurable asset holding an inaccurate effective date. This could impact other processes such as the ability for Suppliers to best assess the delivery date of an IHD to a customer.	the Retrospective Amendment. If this is not reported the asset will be removed. SK – To ensure that non-reportable assets are retained and not removed by retrospective update, the shipper has to report them failing which, the non-measuring asset will be removed.
					2. We are concerned about the retro process being automated in a way where by it requires a two step process in some scenarios to replace the current asset. We feel this could have the following impacts: - In regards to the RGMA updates that are required this will cause failure of SPAA Schedule 22 in regards to provision of metering data within 6 days of installation	This process is expected to be an exceptional process, and is likely to highlight updates that haven't been undertaken within the timescales specified in Schedule 22. How to reflect these Retrospective Amendments into Schedule 22 Reporting merits discussion in SPAA Expert Group. If the original processes are working in a controlled manner these volumes should be low.
					- Smart and other BAU metering work may be impacted by the retrospective process in	While awaiting the reinstatement of metering information (where the

					regards to other processes taking place at the same time as metering data is being removed and re-instated.	retro asset removed the current asset) this might cause rejection of UPD and JOB flows. Further there is a risk that the application of meter information notifications and update notification will occur at the same time causing write conflicts, but it is expected that the batch timing of the Retrospective Amendments will be outside of other updates, but it is conceivable that more recent updates will be impacted by Retrospective Amendments if these are not controlled by the User.
					- CoS - potential for us to gain sites that are halfway through a retrospective update, especially if organisations have a delay between RTO and RGMA updates. This would impact quality of metering and cause us issues at change of supply.	This is possible. It is expected that RTO is an exceptional process, and the scenario outlined would be that the Retrospective Amendment related to a meter prior to that currently fitted at the Supply Meter Point, therefore requiring a

						subsequent RGMA flow to update the latest asset details. In such circumstances it is possible that this Supply Meter Point transfers to another User. This should not impact material numbers of Supply Meter Points.
					3. We have concerns that an automated solution is being used for a process that should not be a regular occurance. We regard retrospective updates as an exception process and not a way to manage metering data. There is already the opportunity to manage metering data through RGMA data flows and with correct data management we feel the retrospective update should be rarely required. Considering this we would like to see evidence that this process will be used to an extent that automation is required, otherwise we would prefer a CMS based solution.	We agree that this should be an exceptional process and provided that controls are correctly applied the data should be applied correctly and in a timely manner. We published assumptions that [up to] 10% of metering transactions would result in Retrospective Amendments. We had two respondents who felt that this number is under stated. Given the deferral there may be an opportunity to assess volumetrics.
					4. We notice that Correction Factor has been removed from all	We have stated that the update to a Meter Point

					scenarios as this is a Meter Point data item. Can you confirm in which data flow this can be updated by the Shipper?	Correction Factor can be undertaken by submitting an UPDTE in the Retrospective Amendment. Additionally, no other asset amendments can be accompanied with Correction Factor updates. Retrospective update will be rejected if effective date does not align with an actual meter read date in the system.
					5. In the RTO Dataset File Example spreadsheet we feel the non-measurable segments should be conditional, so yellow not green.	Noted. Where a non-measuring asset is present this should be reported hence you are correct that this should be shown as conditional.
					6. It needs to be made clear that Serial Number is required for measuring assets but is optional and unused for non-measurable assets	Noted. UK Link does not record serial numbers of non-measuring assets, so confirm that your understanding is correct. We will update the sheet to reflect this condition.
					7. Based on the documentation and previous debates we believe that	Where the removal is in your ownership the

					the read is not required for removed assets and will be estimated and that the data flows will fail if there is no RTO provided. We feel this data is required in all instances and that guidance should be provided on how pre SSD updates are managed. We will find it difficult to complete retrospective updates for a previous supply without doing read validation.	removal reading (and round the clock value) is expected. It will only be estimated if the removal was prior to your ownership. If you have access to this reading this may be provided, but a round the clock value is also needed. The ability to update the Asset detail prior to your ownership is understood to be a requirement. This can also be subsequently replaced by "UPDRD" flow is actual removal read is available. It is mandatory for shipper to provide removal read if the retro removal is in current shipper's ownership.
					8. We feel UPDRD does not promote good management and control of data and that you should be validating the asset data along with the read. It goes against the principles of good data control to allow the UPDRD to be introduced allowing parties to update a read without confirming the asset that read is linked to. This links to point 3 above. Strict validation will ensure that this process	The UPDRD is intended to provide an opportunity to update the asset reading only. I understand that this was an explicit requirement. The serial number of the measuring asset(s) are required when a reading is provided. This might be utilised in case of an

						is not abused and only used for valid updates where metering data is known.	original RGMA ONUPD flow where no read is provided and system has estimated the read. The shipper can then replace this read.

9.   We don't understand the inclusion of this in the read/appt rules…

Meter Point Correction Factor UPDTE	Not relevant to conditionality		Y- must align to existing Reading on UK Link Systems	Not expected. Ignore if provided.	Required

This is intended to convey that the effective date (which is obtained via the APPNT dataset) must align to an existing reading recorded on UK Link to ensure re-reconciliation takes place based on updated correction factor to calculate updated volumes/energy in the affected period. Users cannot provide the reading as part of the transaction.

10.   It would be helpful to include Converter in the UPDTE example. We appreciate you may not want to include all scenarios, but we feel doing this work now will provide a full understanding and not leave us in a similar position we have been left in with RGMA where we have a real challenge identifying which data items should be included in all scenarios.

This can be added. If the converter asset is being updated then all asset detail needs to be provided, where it is only reported then minimal data – i.e. converter serial number is expected. Meter and Converter

					11. We feel the Appointment data set should be conditional based on the provision of read effective date, i.e. this should be yellow.	Readings (corrected and uncorrected) are necessary. Noted. The Appointment dataset is required in the instance of the Meter Point Correct Factor Update. In other instances the effective date may be obtained from the READG dataset. We will update the sheet to reflect this condition.