

MP749AE – UKL13829 – DN Interruption - Communication 1 of 1

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept /Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
Scottish & Southern Energy	Martin Brandt	27/07/07	Accept Solution	YES	Would be able to support the new flows and new rejection codes for existing flows. However in addition to the information being made available on IAD, we would want a simple report listing all successful bids by MPRN. This could be just made available on Xoserve's website in a downloadable form.	The legal interpretation is still being investigated with Networks. xoserve will continue to develop the IAD solution but will provide an undertaking to continue to pursue additional reporting options.
Shell Gas Direct	Simon Carter	27/07/07	Reject	YES	<p>1. .EPS File: this file should be re-issued whenever any supply point becomes eligible for inclusion in the portfolio of supply points against which a shipper may place a bid. This would account for churned supply points and also supply points against which the AQ data may have been amended moving it into eligible status. These should continue to be sent until the end of the bid window. It is not clear from the information provided that this will be the case. This requirement would allow a shipper to be sure which supply points are eligible.</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments.</p> <p>1. The purpose of the EPS file is for Shippers to verify that all the sites that are considered to be eligible for interruption have been identified. Any sites that are not on the list may be the subject an inaccuracy in data (incorrect AQ etc) and will need to be amended via the existing SPA correction methods prior to the start of the bid window to enable a valid bid to be made.</p> <p><u>File Scheduling</u></p> <p>The EPS file will be issued to shippers on 1st April 2008.</p> <p>PIR File will be issued to shippers 1st May 2007. This will capture any additions since the EPS file.</p> <p>During the period 2nd May – 4th June a .PIR file will be sent on each day that a site become eligible in a shipper's portfolio (AQ correction, confirmed with new shipper etc..). It is 7 days prior to the close of the bid window as a site</p>

MP749AE – UKL13829 – DN Interruption - Communication 1 of 1

					<p>cannot be confirmed in less time than 7 days.</p> <p>2. There is no provision in the design to inform shippers that they are no longer registered at a site and therefore should not make a bid. The shipper would be aware of this information via their internal SPA processes, provision of the information would result in an additional file format.</p> <p>If a shipper were to make a bid against a site that they were not registered for, the system would reject it and the shipper would be notified albeit after the bid was made.</p> <p>3. If the incoming shipper places a bid during the bid window and the confirmation status of the site has reached CO (by the end of the bid window), it will be considered for acceptance in the selection process and the original bid (from the outgoing shipper) should be rejected.</p> <p>4. Yes, in this scenario both the original shipper who placed the bid, and the incoming shipper will be notified of the successful bid.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

MP749AE – UKL13829 – DN Interruption - Communication 1 of 1

					<p>notification of successful bid award?</p> <p>5. Provision of Contract Information: this process is highlighted in the provided schematic, but there is no detail provided about prospective changes to files associated with Change of Supplier process. This information is needed to assess the total impact of the changes associated with the implementation.</p> <p>6. Invoicing: no changes to invoicing are proposed in the suite of provided file format changes. Does this mean that there will be no invoicing changes or that approval of these will be sought closer to the point of implementation?</p> <p>7. What happens to a successful bid if the end consumer on which the bid was submitted ceases to trade? How will any changes be transmitted to the shipper?</p> <p>8. Industry testing: as the auction process is the only means to gain access to interruption capacity for a substantial period and this access is fundamental to the operation of a number of end consumers' businesses it is essential for their continued operation and the</p>	<p>5. Provision of contract information is obtained from the Internet Access To Data service (IAD) as such there are no files changes. The shipper uses in the M number screens to ascertain if an M number has an interruptible contract and in the shipper data access screen for contract details. Only the Shippers who are registered for the site or those who are confirming the site are able to view the specific contract details.</p> <p>6. The invoicing changes will be addressed in a project stage after the current stage has been completed. Invoicing changes will become effective in 2011.</p> <p>7. The contract will stay with the site until the contract end date. If the consumer started trading again then the contract would still be live. In terms of changes it is assumed that the shipper would inform xoserve of the isolation or withdrawal (as per current process).</p> <p>8. An extensive period of testing is planned for this change of which 4 weeks is scheduled for external testing (shipper testing). The first EPS file is due on 1st April 2008, external testing is expected to start at the beginning of February 2008. These timescales are subject to change.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

MP749AE – UKL13829 – DN Interruption - Communication 1 of 1

					credibility of the industry that the auctions progress successfully. Therefore, Shell Gas Direct insist that a period of industry testing of the exchange of files is included in the implementation. We would suggest that a test window be opened 2 months before the issue of the first .EPS file to allow time for testing, resolution of any identified system issues and re-testing of any changed code.	
Npower	Laura Doherty	27/07/07	Reject	YES	<p>In our response to MOD 90, RWE npower raised concerns about the new processes which shippers would have to introduce for a small volume of users. Our review of these file formats has not allayed those concerns.</p> <p>We are disappointed that we have had only two weeks in which to assess UKL13829 at this point. This is insufficient time, within which we can only complete a very high-level assessment.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted, however Ofgem have directed that MOD 90 is to be implemented.</p> <p>xoserve gave a presentation on the impacts of mod proposal 90 at the UK Link Committee on 11th January 2007. The presentation included two possible solution options and formally invited shipper comments on the options and requested a preference. Representation closed out on 26th January 2007 and response of 'no comments' was received from Npower. Furthermore, on 8th February 2007 file definitions that included each file that a shipper were to receive, stating the data item and whether it was mandatory or optional was also circulated. The response to this representation on 23rd February 2007 NPower gave a preference to a manual solution. In defining the solution options Shipper input was sought on a</p>

MP749AE – UKL13829 – DN Interruption - Communication 1 of 1

					<p>regular basis however it was unworkable to involve all shippers.</p> <p>Ofgem have directed that MOD 90 is to be implemented. Networks have instructed xoserve to develop an automated solution in order to mitigate the risk that the process would generate a volume of bid activity across the entire community large enough that adequate manual validation would not be possible in the time available. For any individual shipper, the complexity of their systems development would depend on the extent to which they engage in bidding for interruption.</p> <p>Your comment is noted, however Ofgem have directed that MOD 90 is to be implemented.</p>
				<p>It is expected, however, that the solution proposed by UKL13829 may have significant impacts on internal systems and processes. We are not convinced of the benefits case for the financial expenditure which would naturally result if this proposal went forward. It would have been preferable to have had greater involvement in the development of a solution, as there may have been other, more cost-effective options to consider, rather than being presented with what now appears to be a fait accompli.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the interaction of MOD 90 and MOD 116. Following the recent ruling of the Competition Commission, the future of reforms to the NTS arrangements is uncertain. We believe that this must be resolved before progressing with the implementation of MOD 90.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the need for reforms to the interruptible arrangements and supported the principle of MOD 90, we do not support the proposed creation of this automated system and do not intend to accept UKL13829.</p>	