

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4789**

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** | Updating Shipper Reporting Packs and glossary |
| **Date Raised** | 10/10/2018 |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | E.ON |
| **Sponsor Name** | Kirsty Dudley |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | Emma Smith |
| **Xoserve Contact Details**  | Emma.Smith@Xoserve.com  |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / With DSG / Out for review / Voting / Approved or Rejected |
| **Section A2: Impacted Parties** |
| **Customer Class(es)** | [x]  Shipper[ ]  National Grid Transmission[ ]  Distribution Network Operator[ ]  IGT |
| **Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change** |
| The Shipper reporting packs have been around for some time and although some changes took place as part of the Nexus delivery the packs and the glossary are not as accurate or informative as they could be. Nexus having been implemented over a year ago it is now time to ensure that reporting is efficient, effective and robust whilst being consistently informative. The Performance Assurance Committee is picking up momentum and to ensure that Shippers have the best MI this change proposal has been raised initially for PAC and the DSG to review to ensure that reporting for both align and Shippers have access to consistent and informative data to ensure they can spot trends, resolve issues. Currently the Shipper reports have sections which relate to </> 73200kWh however PAC often look at things now relating to class rather than threshold of use. With the introduction of the CDSP MI tool the access to data may change but the data requirements should be consistent regardless on if it is emailed or downloaded – this activity is to try and complement other data activities rather than replace them. General Shipper Pack Comments: • The glossary isn’t really a glossary but more a guidance document, it could benefit from a rewrite (once the final report design is approved). • Report dates and reporting periods – the reports don’t include a data period or a creation month so it would be good to add timings into each description in the glossary so parties are clear the periods covered and the month of issue. • The splits are done by threshold not class – should they be class now? Or both? Needs to be clearer in the guidance why it is split a certain way and ensure it correlates to code requirements. • More a nice to have, but, it would be good to link the data and the tabs better e.g. by clicking on the summary table it took me to the data tab.• .Should any data extracts e.g. correction factors / blank MAM IDs be on a single data tab or amalgamated data tab so that the reporting is consistent, currently a different approach is taken for the data items. Things not in the glossary but are currently included in Shipper Packs – should they be added:Data tab: • Shipper Meter Read Performance• Shipper Meter Read Rejections• Industry Meter Read Rejections• Shipper Meter Read FrequencyConsideration points for the reporting packs:1)RGMA Traffic Flow• With changes to SPAA Schedule 22 occurring as of Nov 2018 will this reporting still be in accordance to the requirements or will it become out of date?• Does this mirror the cut off dates which are in the schedule and will also be the new requirements come Nov2) Confirmed no asset• 6 months from when – it isn’t clear what the trigger point of the 6 months is, is it from the 1st of the month, the report date or something else – see general comments about timings 3) No Reads - 2yrs, 3ys and 4yrs• 2, 3 and 4 years from when – it isn’t clear what the trigger point of these years are, is it from the 1st of the month, the report date or something else – it is also broken down into 6 sections but this is not clear when reading the glossary4) Meter Point Status• No comments 5) Meter status• No comments 6) Incorrect Meter Read Factor and Units• Doesn’t appear to be any data associated with this – where is this? should it be added into the glossary description 7) Must reads• No comments 8) Potentially Incorrect Correction Factors• Not clear why this data isn’t in the data tab and has its own data tab – should be consistent and either separate all or amalgamate9) Blank MAMS• The order of the glossary doesn’t match the summary page – blank MAM is at the bottom in the reporting but it is after the correction factors in the glossary 10) USRV• Does this need to be in there anymore? Can it be deleted?11) Dead report• No comments12) Theft analysis• Not clear the period the auto closures cover e.g. June/July – can more detail be added as to when the report is up to13) Count of Supply Points• The glossary description doesn’t include IGTs but these are now also included in the packNot all comments raised may need addressing via IT/reporting changes many we believe can be resolved through updating the guidance information produced.  |
| **Proposed Release (Feb/Jun/Nov/Minor)** | **RX / DD/MM/YYYY – as recommended by DSG** |
| **Proposed Consultation Period**  | [ ]  10 Working Days[ ]  20 Working Days[ ]  30 Working daysOther: as directed by DSG depending on the changes proposed  |
| **Section A4: Benefits and Justification**  |
| **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 benefits of this change are to introduce a more robust supporting document which is understandable for new and existing parties. |
| **Benefit Realisation** *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | From document publication. |
| **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 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**  | [x]  Shipper 100% [ ]  National Grid Transmission XX% [ ]  Distribution Network Operator XX% [ ]  IGT XX%  |
| **Service Line(s)** | Service Area 18: Provision of user reportsand information |
| **ROM or funding details**  |  |
| **Funding Comments**  | This will be Shipper Funded only |
| **Section A7: ChMC Recommendation**  |
| **Change Status** | [ ]  Approve – Issue to DSG[ ]  Defer – Issue for review[ ]  Reject |
| **Industry Consultation** | [ ]  10 Working Days[ ]  20 Working Days[ ]  30 Working daysOther: |
| **Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)** | XX/XX/XXXX |
| **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**

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 0.1 | For Approval | 22/10/2018 | Emma Smith | N/A |

**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 |