DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured

# A1: General Details

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Reference: | XRN4865 | | | |
| Change Title: | Amendment to Treatment and Reporting of CYCL Reads | | | |
| Date Raised: | 19/02/2019 | | | |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | Xoserve | | |
| Name: | Steve Rist | | |
| Email: | [Steve.Rist@xoserve.com](mailto:Steve.Rist@xoserve.com) | | |
| Telephone: | 07841488631 | | |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | Chandni Khanna | | |
| Email: | [Chandni.Khanna@xoserve.com](mailto:Chandni.Khanna@xoserve.com) | | |
| Telephone: | 0121 623 2859 | | |
| Change Status: | Proposal | | With DSG | Out for Review |
| Voting | | Approved | Rejected |

# A2: Impacted Parties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Customer Class(es): | Shipper | Distribution Network Operator |
| NG Transmission | IGT |
| Other | <If [Other] please provide details here> |

# A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Change Description: | An issue has been identified with the estimated read created for the confirmation effective date (CED) for class 3 and 4 meter points in the case where the asset is installed for a date prior to the confirmation effective date. The estimated read which is currently stored in the system as a CYCL read is reported to the shippers in the MBR file. Below are the issues identified on this read:  1. The CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly treated as an actual read for any subsequent read validations, even though it is an estimate. Since the CYCL read which is an estimated read is being used for read validations, it is resulting in subsequent reads being incorrectly rejected if they are lower than the CYCL read.  2. The read type in the MBR file for the CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly reported as N (normal) instead of E (estimate).  3. The read reason code description in the MBR file format does not state that CYCL read can relate to a Back Billing estimated read for Confirmation effective date. Although it was agreed as a part of an industry workaround to send such estimated reads as CYCL reads in the MBR file, there was no change done to the file format description which is now not consistent with what is being reported in the file.  Once XRN4534 (Amendment to RGMA validations) is implemented as part of Future Release 3 Track 2B in March 2019, the instances of generation of such estimated CYCL reads will increase. Due to the consequential impact to read rejections and inconsistent reporting of reads in MBR file, this change needs to be implemented as soon as possible. Customers are aware of the issue and tickets have been raised regarding this. | |
| Proposed Release: | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or **Adhoc 01/11/2019** | |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | 10 Working Days | 20 Working Days |
| 30 Working Days | Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | The change will stop subsequent customer reads from getting rejected incorrectly and AQ from not being calculated. It will also correct the reporting of these reads via the MBR file to the customer. It will be bring consistency to the file format. |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | Immediately upon delivery |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | N/A |
| *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.* |

# A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Final DSG Recommendation: | *Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.* | | |
| Approve | Reject | Defer |
| DSG Recommended Release: | Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | | |

# A6: Funding

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Funding Classes: | Shipper | XX % |
| National Grid Transmission | XX % |
| Distribution Network Operator | XX % |
| IGT | XX % |
| Other (Xoserve) | 100 % |
| Service Line(s) |  | |
| ROM or funding details: |  | |
| Funding Comments: | This change will be funded internally by the Xoserve improvement budget.  22/03/2019 – this change is expected to have no impact to the DSC service lines. | |

# A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13th March 2019

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | Approve (to proceed to DSG) | Reject | | Defer |
| Industry Consultation: | 10 Working Days | | 20 Working Days | |
| 30 Working Days | | Other [Specify Here] | |
| Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve) | XX/XX/XXXX | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DSC Consultation Issue: | Yes | No |
| Date Issued: | Click here to enter a date. | |
| Comms Ref(s): |  | |
| Number of Responses: |  | |

# A8: DSC Voting Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Please select. |
| National Grid Transmission | | | Please select. |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Please select. |
| IGT | | | Please select. |
| Meeting Date: | Click here to enter a date. | | | |
| Release Date: | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA | | | |
| Overall Outcome: | No | Yes | If [Yes] please specify <Release> | |

Section C: DSG Discussion

# C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 18/03/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | Simon Harris (SH) presented this Change Proposal to DSG. SH explained that it relates to an issue has been identified with the way UK Link systems are treating estimated reads-specifically where they have been created for the confirmation effective date (CED) for class 3 and 4 meter points in the case where the asset is installed for a date prior to the confirmation effective date. SH gave an overview of the change details.  SH talked DSG through Appendix One, which indicates that this Change Proposal has a prioritisation score of 49%. PO confirmed DSG are happy with the scoring. | | |
| Capture Document / Requirements: | <Insert where appropriate> | | |
| DSG Recommendation: | Approve | Reject | Defer |
| DSG Recommended Release: | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | | |

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

Appendix 1

# Change Prioritisation Variables

Xoserve uses the following variables set for each and every change within the Xoserve Change Register, to derive the indicative benefit prioritisation score, which will be used in conjunction with the perceived delivery effort to aid conversations at the DSC ChMC and DSC Delivery Sub Groups to prioritise changes into all future minor and major releases.

## Change Details

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Driver Type: | CMA Order | | | MOD / Ofgem | | |
| EU Legislation | | | License Condition | | |
| BEIS | | | ChMC endorsed Change Proposal | | |
| SPAA Change Proposal | | | Additional / 3rd Party Service Request | | |
| Other | | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | |
| Customer group(s) impacted if the change is not delivered: | Shipper | | IGT | | | Network |
| Xoserve | | NG Transmission | | | NTS |
| Other | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | | |
| Associated Change Ref Number(s): | N/A | | Associated MOD Number(s): | | | N/A |
| Perceived delivery effort (days): | 0-30 | | | 30-60 | | |
| 60-100 | | | 100+ | | |
| Does the change involve the processing of personal data? | ‘Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier’ - includes MPRNS. | | | Yes (if selected please answer the next question) | | |
| No | | |
| A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios: | New Technology | | | Theft of Gas | | |
| Mass Data | | | Xoserve Employee Data | | |
| Vulnerable Customer Data | | | Fundamental changes to Xoserve | | |
| Other | | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | |
| (If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Information Security Team (Kevin Eltoft-Prest) to complete the DPIA. | | | | | |
| Change Beneficiary:  *How many market participant or segments stand to benefit this change?* | Multiple Market Participants | | | | Multiple Market Groups | |
| All UK Gas Market Participants | | | | Xoserve Only | |
| One Market Group | | | | One Market Participant | |
| Primary Impacted DSC Service Area: | Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations | | | | | |
| Number of Service Areas Impacted: | One | | | | Two to Five | |
| Five to Twenty | | | | All | |
| Improvement Scale? | High | | Medium | | | Low |
| Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered? | Safety of Supply at risk | | | | | |
| Customer(s) incurring financial loss | | | | | |
| Customer Switching at risk | | | | | |
| Are any of the following required if the change is delivered? | Customer System Changes Required | | | | | |
| Customer Testing Likely Required | | | | | |
| Customer Training Required | | | | | |
| Primary Application impacted: | BW | | ISU | | | CMS |
| AMT | | EFT | | | IX |
| Gemini | | Birst | | | API |
| Other | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | | |
| Business Process Impacted: | AQ | | SPA | | | RGMA |
| Reads | | Portal | | | Invoicing |
| Other | | <If [Other] please provide details here> | | | |
| Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change? | Yes | <If [Yes] please provide details here> | | | | |
| No |

## Workaround Details

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Workaround in operation? | Yes | If [No] please do not continue completing the [Workaround Details] section | | |
| No |
| Who is accountable for the workaround? | Xoserve | | External Customer | Both |
| What is the Frequency of the workaround? |  | | | |
| What is the lifespan for the workaround? |  | | | |
| What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround? |  | | | |
| What is the Complexity of the workaround? | Low | *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)* | | |
| Medium | *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)* | | |
| High | *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)* | | |

## Prioritisation Score

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Prioritisation Score: | 49% |

Version Control

# Document

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 1 | Proposal | 19/02/2019 | Xoserve | CP Raised. This was originally a CR. Funding section populated. |
| 2 | Proposal | 13/03/2019 | Xoserve | Appendix added |
| 3 | With DSG | 15/03/2019 | Xoserve | Updated with the ChMC outcome from 13th March 2019 |
| 4 | With DSG | 22/03/2019 | Xoserve | Updated funding section |
| 5 | With DSG | 22/03/2019 | Xoserve | Updated and notes added from DSG 18th March 2019 |

# Template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| 3.0 | Superseded | 17/07/2018 | Emma Smith | Template approved at ChMC on 11th July 2018. |
| 4.0 | Superseded | 07/09/2018 | Emma Smith | Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1. |
| 5.0 | Superseded | 10/12/2018 | Heather Spensley | Template moved to new Word template as part of Corporate Identity changes. |
| 6.0 | Approved | 12/12/2018 | Simon Harris | Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12th December 2018. |