

CB938LP – UKL1172 Action – DME Notification & Transfer Read Processing

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
Npower	Stephanie Shepherd	23/12/09	-	Yes	<p>The following comments were received prior to Option 5 proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The explanation of the COS scenario's as detailed in the email by Lewis Plummer are clear, and we cannot foresee any issue with handling the data, either as a gaining, or losing Shipper. Having reviewed the four options for identifying a DME site, we support 1 and 2, over 3 and 4. • 1 and 2 would enable the use of current files, and require minimal change to implement. • 3 and 4 have possible cost implications to Shippers. 4 would potentially make site data available for specific targeting and we would see this option as a last resort. • We do not feel that a workshop is necessary at this point, but welcome the clarity/confirmation. 	<p>Thank you for your comments, in light of these xoserve have completed further analysis and identified Option 5 for consideration.</p>

CB938LP – UKL1172 Action – DME Notification & Transfer Read Processing

SSE	Martin Brandt	24/12/09	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposals seem relatively clear, but I do not think if a Shipper is not going to take part in the DME process that they should have any IT impact and certainly should not have to fund the changes to the central systems.	Thank you for your comments, Option 5 is utilising an existing field within the TRF file that could currently be populated with Datalogger details, based on this xoserve do not believe that there would be requirements for shippers to make updates to their systems to accept this file.
-----	---------------	----------	---	--	---	--

CB938LP – UKL1172 Action – DME Notification & Transfer Read Processing

Edf	Ashley Collins	27/1/10	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regards to CB/938/LP - UKL1172 Action - DME Notification + Transfer Read Processing EDF Energy would only want and support the use of option 1. Regardless of whether a shipper chooses to utilise the new DME status, option 1 is the earliest out of the five options in which a shipper can be notified of a customer status. A shipper can then notify it's customer at contract stage before any registration process begins, meaning if the customer wishes to remain as DME and the shipper isn't offering that type of service, the customer wont have to wait to go through the whole registration, withdrawal and even possibly loss processes which is a less than ideal customer experience. This also means both the shipper and transporter agent aren't burdened with additional workloads and the sending of unnecessary flows. 	<p>Thank you for your comments, when completing an Enquiry via the NOM file the S75 record returned in the NMR file would be populated with the GNT 'DME' if the site was currently DM Elective.</p> <p>Ensuring that the DATALOGGER_SERIAL_NUMBER is populated for DME sites within the TRF response will also cater for shippers that do not wish to use the Enquiry file.</p> <p>In addition to the utilisation of the Enquiry file to determine if a site was previously DMM/V/DME, xoserve are proposing to develop Option 5 in order to satisfy shipper requirements where notification should be 'pushed'. As this information will be provided within a current field in the TRF file and would be populated for existing sites transferring DM – NDM xoserve cannot foresee any impacts to shippers if this option is implemented in addition to the use of the</p>
-----	----------------	---------	---	--	--	--

CB938LP – UKL1172 Action – DME Notification & Transfer Read Processing

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of the timings surrounding the sending of opening readings, we don't believe this should be changed from the current process i.e. if a shipper opts to change the site from DME to NDM upon change of supply we would expect to see the opening read received as per normal NDM timings not expect to receive the reading at D+1 – failure to receive the reading within the correct window is likely to be rejected by our system 	<p>Enquiry file.</p> <p>As detailed in the MOD report there is a requirement for the incoming shipper to provide a replacement read by D+5 in order to fulfil the D+5 closeout period to provide an Actual read (R0069c).</p> <p>xoserve will be holding a Shipper Transfer Read workshop to discuss the process in detail and provide an opportunity to raise any queries surrounding the process. The proposed date will be communicated at February's UK Link Committee meeting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

CB938LP – UKL1172 Action – DME Notification & Transfer Read Processing

SSE	Martin Brandt	29/1/10	Reject		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can confirm that SSE does not favour the Option 5 solution. It would require code changes whether you were wanting to support and getting this information at this stage is too late. Our preference is the Enquiry file. 	<p>Thanks for your comments, as detailed in the response to EDF, when completing an Enquiry via the NOM file the S75 record returned in the NMR file would be populated with the GNT 'DME' if the site was currently DM Elective.</p> <p>In addition to the utilisation of the Enquiry file by shippers, xoserve are proposing to develop the Option 5 solution to provide an alternative solution for shippers not wishing to use the Enquiry file to obtain the information.</p>
-----	---------------	---------	--------	--	---	--