

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Xoserve Reference Number: XRN4670**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Title** | Reject a replacement read, where the read provided is identical to that already held in UK Link for the same read date | |
| **Date Raised** | 2nd July 2018 | |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | Xoserve | |
| **Sponsor Name** | Emma Smith | |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | Emma.Smith@xoserve.com | |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | Emma Smith | |
| **Xoserve Contact Details** | Emma.Smith@xoserve.com | |
| **Change Status** | Proposal /With DSG/ Out for Consultation / Voting / **Approved** or Rejected | |
| **Section A1: Impacted Parties** | | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  IGT | |
| **[Section A2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "WHAT – What is the required change? WHY – Why is the change needed? WHEN – Detail when the solution should be started/implemented.  )** | | |
| Originally raised as an Xoserve internal change request, however following assessment it is believed there will be an external impact to solution the issue. Please see attached.  Issue:  Shippers are currently submitting replacement readings, with a reading which is identical to the current read recorded on UK Link, for the same read date. Current validation does not consider this scenario. The acceptance of these readings is impacting system performance, the generation of Exceptions and the requirement for manual intervention (i.e. exception workaround by Business and IS Ops). Analysis of the MN09 Exceptions received since 1st June is attached - the Exception is generated where the volume to be replaced is zero, however a number of other exceptions can also be generated. Change includes classes 3 and 4, as system users are unable to replace an actual class 1 or 2 accepted reading. A new rejection code may also be required to support this process.  The solution to be implemented at the earliest possible date to remove the ongoing recording of unnecessary updates and remove manual workaround effort for exceptions.  Impact on system performance and data storage, including archiving of unnecessary data. Creation of unnecessary Exceptions, not limited to MN09 | | |
| **Proposed Release** | June 2019 | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | 10WD | |
| **[Section A3: Benefits and Justification](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "Benefit Description: What, if any, are the intangible and tangible benefits of the change?Benefit Realisation:When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised? Benefit Dependencies:Detail any dependencies that are outside the scope.)** | | |
| **Benefit Description**  *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?*  *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | | Creates exceptions which can take up to 10 minutes to resolve, would remove exception process |
| **Benefit Realisation**  *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | | Immediately following implementation |
| **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 A4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | | |
| Please refer to section D. | | |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Reject “duplicate” replacement reads and provide an existing rejection code/reason (Option2) | |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | June 2019 | |
| **Section A5: DSC Consultation** | | |
| **Issued** | Yes | |
| **Date(s) Issued** | 14/09/2018 – reissued on 17/09/2018 | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** | 2074.3 – RJ – RH / 2076.2 – RJ – RH (reissued version) | |
| **Number of Responses** | 5 (4 approve, 1 reject with alternative) | |
| **Section A6: Funding** | | |
| **Funding Classes** | ☐ Shipper XX%  ☐ National Grid Transmission XX%  ☐ Distribution Network Operator XX%  ☐ IGT XX% | |
| **Service Line(s)** |  | |
| **ROM or funding details** |  | |
| **Funding Comments** | This will be funded by Xoserve as process improvement | |
| **Section A7: DSC Voting Outcome** | | |
| **Solution Voting** | Shipper Approve  National Grid Transmission NA  Distribution Network Operator NA  IGT NA | |
| **Meeting Date** | 10/10/2018 | |
| **Release Date** | June 2019 Release | |
| **Overall Outcome** | This change was approved to be Xoserve funded. Solution Option 2 was approved; it is scope for the June 2019 Release. | |

**Please send the completed forms to:** [**box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**](mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com)

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 |  | 02/07/18 | E Smith | Completed CP template |
| 2.0 | Included in the September Change Pack | 14/09/18 | E Smith | Issued for review, within the September Change Pack, of the System Solution Impact Assessment |
| 3.0 | Updated IA results | 17/09/18 | E Smith | Updated IA Results in Section D; reissued to the industry. |
| 4.0 | Reps | 20/09/18 | E Smith | Reps added and DSG comments added from meeting on 17th September |
| 5.0 | Representation Matrix | 01/10/18 | E Smith | Representation Matrix sent on 1st October |
| 6.0 | Section F added | 12/10/18 | E Smith | Section F added following ChMC approval on 10th October |

**Template Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 2.0 | Approved | 01/05/18 | Emma Smith | Layout and cosmetic changes made following internal review |

**Section D: DSC Change Proposal High Level Solution Options**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section D1: Solution Options** | |
| **High Level summary options** | |
| The Impact Assessments for all solution options are included within the following slide pack:    We’re asking the industry for their preferred solution option, based on the information acquired from the impact assessments. Please populate section E with your response. | |
| **Implementation date for this solution option** | June 2019 |
| **Xoserve preferred option; including rationale** | Reject “duplicate” replacement reads and provide an existing rejection code/reason. We believe this is the most cost-effective solution with minimal system impacts. |
| **DSG preferred solution option; including rationale** | Reject “duplicate” replacement reads and provide an existing rejection code/reason. |
| **Consultation close out date** | 28th September 2018 |

**Section E: DSC Change Proposal: Industry Response Solution Options Review**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Lorna Lewin** | |
| **User Contact Details** | [**LOLEW@orsted.co.uk**](mailto:LOLEW@orsted.co.uk) **0207 451 1974** | |
| **Section E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| We support the preferred option to reject duplicate replacement reads and provide a rejection reason code of MRE00436. | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Section E1: Xoserve’ s Response to Organisations Comments** | | Thank you for your comments. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Eleanor Laurence** | |
| **User Contact Details** | [**Eleanor.Laurence@edfenergy.com**](mailto:Eleanor.Laurence@edfenergy.com) **/ 07875 117771** | |
| **Section E2: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| Our preferred option is Option 2 – Reject read using existing rejection reason  Following analysis of the small amount of data provided to our organisation we can confirm that any of these sent were user error and therefore rejection should be the way forward.  This option is the simplest and cheapest build option for industry participants and due to the low numbers of sites involved we feel that this should be the approach. We fully support ensuring that we keep industry change to a minimum and where an existing process can be re-used it should be that approach we take. | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Section E2: Xoserve’ s Response to Organisations Comments** | | Thank you for your comments. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Npower** | |
| **User Contact Details** | [**Gas.codes@npower.com**](mailto:Gas.codes@npower.com) | |
| **Section E3: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| We support Option 2 Reject “duplicate” replacement reads and provide an existing rejection code/reason. This will protect shippers from having to make expensive system changes. | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Section E3: Xoserve’ s Response to Organisations Comments** | | Thank you for your comments. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **SSE Energy Supply** | |
| **User Contact Details** | **Mark Jones** | |
| **Section E4: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| SSE has a strong preference for Option A. This is because this option clearly identifies to users where a duplicate read has been submitted and rejected as a unique error code is generated. Whilst it is the option which probably means more work for most due to the introduction of a new error code, we believe that this option will, from a business process view, be the most optimum and the upfront effort of adding a new error code will be more than offset by the improvement in the business processes around these rejections.  Within the change there is no mention of the scenario where the same read is submitted with a different TTZ count. We expect that this read would not be rejected, but would be processed as normal due to the difference in energy allocation that this new read would create. | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Reject |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Reject |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Section E4: Xoserve’ s Response to Organisations Comments** | | Thank you for your comments. These will be passed to ChMC for consideration. Regarding the possibility of the same read & read date but a different TTZ count, this is not classed as a duplicate replacement so would not be rejected but processed accordingly (as the issue is around a Reconciliation Quantity of zero, a different TTZ count would create a non-zero Reconciliation Quantity). We will however, ensure this is clear in the capture documents that are passed to projects for delivery and the Solution Impact Assessment documents to be discuss at ChMC. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | **Scottish Power** | |
| **User Contact Details** | **Claire Roberts –** [**ClaireLouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com**](mailto:ClaireLouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com) | |
| **Section E5: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| Scottish power’s preferred option would be number 2 – reject duplicate replacement read and provide an existing rejection code/reason. This is a low cost option and means no changes to our systems**.** | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Section E5: Xoserve’ s Response to Organisations Comments** | | Thank you for your comments. |

**Section F: DSC Change Proposal: Approved Solution Option**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section F1: Solution Option for XRN4670** | |
| This change was approved to be Xoserve funded. Solution Option 2 was approved; it is scope for the June 2019 Release. Reject “duplicate” replacement reads and provide an existing rejection code/reason | |
| **Implementation date** | June 2019 Release |
| **Approved by** | Change Management Committee |
| **Date of approval** | 10/10/2018 |