***Change Proposal***

Class 4 Transfer Reads not visible to shippers in DES

**CDSP Reference: XRN4576**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document Stage | Version | Date | Author | Status |
| Change Management Committee Outcome | 0.1 | 09/01/2018 | Alison Cross | Draft |
| EQR |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| BER |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| CCR |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
| Change Management Committee Outcome |  |  |  | Choose an item. |

# *Section 1: Proposed Change*

Please complete section 1 and 2 and specify within section 2 the output that is required from the CDSP

|  |
| --- |
| **Originator Details** |
| **Submitted By** | Shipper Representatives at Defect and Release Group (via Alison Cross) | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2198 |
| **Email Address** | Alison.cross@xoserve.com |
| **Customer Representative** | Alison Cross | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2198 |
| **Email Address** | Alison.cross@xoserve.com |
| **Subject Matter Expert/Network Lead** | Karen Marklew - Xoserve | **Contact Number** | 0121 623 2860 |
| **Email Address** | karen.j.marklew@xoserve.com |
| **Customer Class** | [x]  Shipper[ ]  National Grid Transmission[ ]  Distribution Network Operator[ ]  iGT |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is this considered to be a Priority Service Change?** | [ ] Yes (Mod Related)[ ] Yes (Legislation Change Related)[x] No |
| **Is this change considered to relate to a ‘restricted class’ of customers?**Consider if the particular change is only likely to impact those who fall under a particular customer classIf it impacts all customer classes (i.e. Transmission, Distribution & Shippers) then choose ‘No’. | [x] Yes (please mark the customer class(es) to whom this is restricted):- Shippers[ ] No |
| **Is it anticipated that the change would have an adverse impact on customers of any other customer classes?**Please refer to appendix one for the definition of an ‘adverse impact’ | [ ] Yes (please give details)[x] No |
| ***General Service Changes Only (please ensure that either A or B below is completed)*** |
| 1. Customer view of impacted service area(s)

For a definition of the Service Areas, please see the ‘Charge Base Apportionment Table’ within the [Budget and Charging Methodology](http://www.xoserve.com/wp-content/uploads/BUDGET-AND-CHARGING-METHODOLOGY.pdf). Please indicate the service area(s) that are understood to be impacted by the change. Please enter ‘unknown’ if relevant. Where the change is likely to impact more than one service area please indicate the percentage split of the impact across the impacted service areas. For example if it is split equally across two service areas then enter 50% in the ‘split’ against each service area. |
| Unknown |
| 1. If the change is anticipated to require the creation of a new service area and service line please give further details stating proposed name of new service area and title of service line:
 |
| NA |
| ***Specific Service Changes Only:*** |
| Please detail the proposed methodology (or amendment to the existing methodology) for determining Specific Service Change Charges.  |
| Shippers will fund this change |
| Please detail the proposed basis (that is, Charging Measure and Charging Period) for determining Specific Service Change Charges in respect of the Specific Service. |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Service Level of Quote/Estimate Robustness Requested** | **CDSP Change Service Required** [ ] Firm Quote for Analysis[x] Firm Quote for both Analysis and Delivery  |
| **Has a ROM been provided in support of this change?** | [ ] Yes (If yes please attach the ROM response)[x] No |
| *Section 2: Change Proposal* |
| **Change Details** | Originally logged as Defect 573 on HPQC – Defect now closed. **Issue Statement**Per the Nexus rules, Xoserve currently accept reads from D-5 to D+5 as the transfer read for the transfer date D. But if the read date is spanning from D-5 to D-1, this read is not visible to the incoming shipper via Data Enquiry Service (DES) as this period is not in its ownership, and vice versa, if it is D+1 to D+5 the outgoing shipper cannot see the read.In SAP IS-U Xoserve store the read against the transfer date in the read screen. There is no issue with billing; reconciliation is using correct dates etc. Supporting information displays the actual read date and the transfer date is reflected in the variance date.  The issue is purely a presentation in DES and supporting information.**Current process**Shipper obligation to provide reading and where accepted the read is issued to both parties on the URN file, where a reading is not provided an estimated read will be generated and issued on the MBR file. **DRG Decision**At DRG in Dec 2017 Xoserve proposed making the workarounds (below) enduring and closing Defect 573. This was not agreed by shipper representatives and the below feedback provided: * Shippers would not support any file format changes.
* Shippers would not support the workarounds being enduring.
* Shippers would still like ability to view the D-5 – D+5 reads in DES

As this is not actually a defect (the process is working correctly/ this functionality in DES was not available in Legacy) the defect was closed and this Change proposal has been raised to look at the options to provide the visibility of the reads without incurring file format changes. The CR will follow the DSC Change management process.**For information: Workarounds**There are already 2 workaround options, both of which have been available since the defect was raised in July.First is to call the Contact Centre to request the read detail.Second is to refer to reports already available, which includes the Historic Supply Meter Point Asset and Read information report.  |
| **Reason(s) for proposed service change** | To allow shippers to view transfer reads on DES.  |
| **Full title of related UNC Mod** | N/A |
| **Benefits of change** | To remove need for workarounds to be used by Shippers when trying to find out transfer reads.  |
| **Proposed Release Date**  | TBC |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Xoserve Portfolio Office | .box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section 8: Evaluation Quotation Report (EQR)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Senior Project Manager |  | Contact Number |  |
| Email Address |  |
| Project Manager  |  | Contact Number |  |
| Email Address |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the proposed change on:1. CDSP Service Description
2. CDSP Systems
 |  |
| Approximate timescale for delivery of ‘business evaluation report’  |  |
| Estimated cost of business evaluation report preparationThis can be expressed as a range of costs i.e. *‘at least £xx,xxx but probably not more than £xx,xxx’*. |  |
| Does the CDSP agree with the ‘Restricted class change’ assessment (where provided)?Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | [ ] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
| Does Xoserve consider that there is an adverse impact as a result of deliver of this change on any other service? Please refer to detail provided in the Change Proposal | [ ] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
| **General service changes** |
| Does the CDSP agree with the assessment made in the Change Proposal regarding impacted service areas?This should refer to whether the proposing party considers the service change to relate to an existing service area or whether is constitutes a new service area. | [ ] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
|  |
| **Specific service changes** |
| Does the CDSP agree with the proposal made in the Change Proposal regarding specific change charges?This should refer to the proposed methodology (or amendment to existing methodology) for determining the specific service charges and the proposed basis for determining the specific service change charges. | [ ] Yes[ ] No (please give detail below) |
| Please provide a draft amendment of the Specific Service Change Charge Annex setting out the methodology for determining Specific Service Change Charges proposed in the Change Proposal |  |
| EQR validity period: |  |

Please send the document to the following:

# *Section 10: Business Evaluation Report (BER)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Change Implementation Detail** |
| 1.) Detail changes required to the CDSP Service Description |
|  |
| 2.) Detail modifications required to UK Link |
|  |
| 3.) Detail changes required to appendix 5b of the UK Link Manual |
|  |
| 4.) Detail impact on operating procedures and resources of the CDSP |
|  |
| 5.) Implementation Plan |
|  |
| 6.) Estimated implementation costs |
|  |
| 6a.) How will the charging for the costs be allocated to different customer classes? (General Service Changes only) |
| Please mark % against each customer class:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | National Grid Transmission |
|  | Distribution Network Operators and IGT’s |
|  | DN Operator |
|  | IGT’s |
|  | Shippers |
| 100% |  |

 |
| 7.) Estimated impact of the service change on service charges |
|  |
| 8.) Please detail any pre-requisite activities that must be completed by the customer prior to receiving or being able to request the service. |
|  |
| ***Implementation Options*** |
| Please provide details on any alternative solution/implementation options:This should include:(i) a description of each Implementation Option;(ii) the advantages and disadvantages of each option(iii) the CDSP preferred Implementation Option |
|  |
| Restricted Class Changes onlyIs there any change in the view of the CDSP on whether there would be an ‘Adverse Impact’ on customers outside the relevant customer class(es)? |
| [ ] Yes (please give detail below)[ ] No |
| Dependencies: |
|  |
| Constraints: |
|  |
| Benefits: |
|  |
| Impacts: |
|  |
| Risks: |
|  |
| Assumptions: |
|  |
| Information Security: |
|  |
| Out of scope: |
|  |
| Please provide any additional information relevant to the proposed service change: |
|  |

Please send the document to the following:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Recipient*** | ***Email*** |
| Change Management Committee Secretary | dsccomms@gasgovernance.co.uk |

# *Section : Change Proposal: Committee Outcome Summary*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The Change Proposal is approved. An EQR is requested |  |
| Approved Change Proposal version |  |
| The change proposal shall not proceed |  |
| The committee votes to postpone its decision on the Change Proposal until a later meeting |  | Date of later meeting |  |
| The committee requires the proposer to make updates to the Change Proposal: |  |
| Updates required: |

# *Section 14: Document Template Version History*

The purpose of this section is to keep a record of the changes to the overall version template and the individual sections within. It will be updated by the CDSP following approval of the template update by the Change Management Committee.

**Version History:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 | Approved |  | CDSP | Version Approved by Change Committee |
| 1.1 | Draft  |  | CDSP |  |

**--- END OF DOCUMENT ---**

# *Appendix One: Glossary*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** |
| Adverse Impact | A Service Change has or would have an Adverse Impact on Customers of a particular Customer Class if:(a) Implementing the Service Change would involve a modification of UK Link which would conflict with the provision of existing Services for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class;(b) the Service Change would involve the CDSP disclosing Confidential Information relating to such Customers to Customers of another Customer Class or to Third Parties;(c) Implementing the Service Change would conflict to a material extent with the Implementation of another Service Change (for which such Customer Class is a Relevant Customer Class) with an earlier Proposal Date and which remains Current, unless the Service Change is a Priority Service Change which (under the Priority Principles) takes priority over the other Proposed Service Change; or(d) Implementing the Service Change would have an Adverse Interface Impact for such Customers. |
| General Service | A service provided under the DSC to Customers or Customers of a Customer Class on a uniform basis. |
| Non-Priority Service Change | A Service Change which is not a Priority Service Change |
| Priority Service Change | A Modification Service Change; orA Service Change in respect of a Service which allows or facilitates compliance by a Customer or Customers with Law or with any document designated for the purposes of Section 173 of the Energy Act 2004 (including any such Law or document or change thereto which has been announced but not yet made). |
| Relevant Customer class | A Customer Class is a **Relevant Customer Class** in relation to a Service or a Service Change where Service Charges made or to be made in respect of such Service, or the Service subject to such Service Change, are or will be payable by Customers of that Customer Class |
| Restricted Class Change | Where, in relation to a Service Change, not all Customer Classes are Relevant Customer Classes, the Service Change is a **Restricted Class Change**; |
| Service Change | A change to a Service provided under the DSC (not being an Additional Service), including:(i) the addition of a new Service or removal of an existing Service; and(ii) in the case of an existing Service, a change in any feature of the Service specified in the CDSP Service Description,and any related change to the CDSP Service Description |
| Specific Service | A service (other than Additional Services) available under the DSC to all Customer or Customers of a Customer Class but provided to a particular Customer only upon the order of the Customer. |

# *Appendix Two: Consultation Responses*

As per the request at the Change Management Committee meeting on the 7th February 2018 this change was issued for consultation across the industry. The consultation closed on the 23rd February 2018. The comments received will form the basis of discussion at the Change Management Committee on 7th March 2018 to approve or reject the change.

The following two comments were received:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **User** | **Name** | **Date** | User Comments | Xoserve Comments |
| E.ON UK | Kirsty Dudley | 15/02/18 | It would be desirable to demonstrate this information in DES however the proposal doesn’t have a suggested implementation date or a real cost/benefit for the change. We recommend deferring it until a later date when a cost/benefit has been proven. Or if it cannot be proven then the proposal is to be withdrawn.  | Thank you for your comments. The cost vs benefit will be considered within ChMC when the costs are available within the BER.  |
| EDF | Elly Laurence | 22/02/18 | We support the principal of this change | Thank you for your comments.  |
| Npower | Maitrayee Bhowmick-Jewkes | 26/02/18 | We support this.  | Thank you for your comments.  |