

UNC 0624 Request: Review of arrangements for Retrospective Adjustment of Meter Information, Meter Point/Supply Point and Address data (UNC 0624R)

Deleted: view

Please send responses to: xxxxxx

Response deadline: 24 September 2017

Name:
Organisation:
Role/job title:
Email address:
Telephone number: .

Background

Under Modification 0434 Ofgem approved the introduction of Project Nexus, the re-development of the gas central systems. Included within the scope of the new systems was the ability to retrospectively amend asset and supply point data (RAASP functionality) in the settlement process. However as Project Nexus was developed and the design and delivery was worked through, Xoserve advised that the functionality required for the introduction of RAASP could not be delivered at the same time as the mainstream Nexus solution. Therefore Modification 0573 was raised by National Grid Distribution (Cadent) in February 2016 to defer the introduction of the RAASP functionality.

Deleted: the

Deleted: y

Ofgem accepted the proposal for RAASP deferral, resetting the date for implementation of RAASP delivery.

Deleted: date

Deleted: for

Since the successful introduction of the mainstream functionality of Project Nexus on 1st June 2017, UNC Request 0624R was raised by Cadent with the following objective:

Deleted: Modification

“To conduct a review of the elements of UNC Modification 0434 ‘Project Nexus – Retrospective Adjustment’ relating to the retrospective adjustment of Meter Information, Meter Point/Supply Point and Address data. This will be informed by undertaking a cost benefit assessment of the elements of the Modification which have not been implemented.”

In order to aid consideration of UNC Request 0624R this RFI has been issued to inform the discussion of the costs and benefits of each of the options developed by Xoserve and presented on the

Deleted: Modification

Relevant documents

UNC documents:

- [UNC624 and associated documents.](#)

Implementation options

Under [UNC Request 0624R](#) Cadent has proposed that there are five options to the delivery of the RAASP functionality. These are:

- [Option 1](#) [Update latest](#).....
- [Option 2](#) [Update latest](#).....
- [Option 3](#) [Original RAASP option](#)
- [Option 4](#) [Generate Shipper](#).....
- [Option 5](#) [Business as usual](#)

Information Requested

The tables below set out the information, which is being requested of UNC Parties, in order that the [UNC Request 0624R](#) workgroup can consider the costs and benefits of each of the options put forward by the [CDSP](#), and take into account any other information that is relevant.

Comment [NG1]: This section needs to reflect Xoserves 5 options (recently amended and published)

Deleted: Modification

Deleted: 5

Deleted: three

Deleted: <#>Instructing the CDSP to implement a full systems solution (Requiring Code .
In addition there is a fourth option of the "base case", which would see the industry continue with the situation that is currently in play. .

Deleted: In addition there is a fourth option of the "base would see the industry continue with the situation that is currently in play. .

Deleted: MOD

Deleted: 5

Deleted: Proposer of MOD624R

Cost (up to 31 December 2025)

Comment [NG2]: What is the relevance of 2025?

Please include here all annual costs that will be saved (as a positive) or incurred (negative) by the implementation of the various options, using the current processes operated as of 1 June 2017 as the baseline. Please annualise the costs.

It may be preferable that two separate tables are provided which cover the 5 identified options. The first table will relate to the implementation phase and will need to include the costs to the business for each option. The second table will relate to the enduring process and will require the costs of operating under each process. The costs of each option can then be assessed with each other (inc the 'as is' manual process)

The headings are also confusing as there appears to be some duplication. For consistency it may be better renaming as per Xoserve presentation.

Implementation costs

Deleted: .

Please include here all annual costs that will be	<u>Option 1</u>	<u>Option 2</u>	<u>Option 3</u>	<u>Option 4</u>	<u>Option 5</u>
Operational Resource(FTE)					
<i>Exp Notes</i>					
Other Costs (£)					
<i>Exp Notes</i>					
System Costs – operational (£)					
<i>Exp Notes</i>					
System Costs – development (£)					
<i>Exp Notes</i>					

- Deleted:** 1 Full System Solution
- Deleted:** 2 Manually based solution
- Deleted:** 3 Removal of RAASP
- Deleted:** 4 Baseline – process as at 1/6/17 (PNID)

Enduring Costs

Please include here all annual	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Operational Resource(FTE)					
Exp Notes					
Other Costs (£)					
Exp Notes					
System Costs – operational (£)					
Exp Notes					
System Costs – development (£)					
Exp Notes					

- Operational Resource** The number of staff (FTE) that you believe will be required to engage directly with resolving RAASP requests, if using the proposed option (please do not attempt to quantify the cost, but if possible indicate the level of seniority of the staff in Explanatory Notes). Incidental staff costs for dealing with customer queries, etc should also be covered here, but not IT support FTE costs, which should be covered under system operational costs.
- System costs -operational.** The daily system upkeep costs of any system programme that would be used to support each option [please include expected IT staff resource costs]. Please quantify in £/yr.
- System costs - development.** Any one-off costs that would be incurred to develop a system solution for each option. Please spread this cost over the five year period as an annual cost.

Comment [NG3]: Why is this relevant? In a CBA I understood it is the total cost of each option compared to the benefits (which should also be expressed as a monetary value) that is important? The number of staff would be reflected in the costs against each option?

Materiality and prevalence of RAASP use

In this section please provide information on the amount of usage that you expect to make of the functionality and how long you would expect the process to take under the various options presented.

[This table also requires the 5 options mentioned regarding the tables above. It could also benefit from being split into 2 tables – a year 1 table outlining expected Corrective Updates in the first year and a second table, year 2+ updates outlining expected enduring Corrective updates. This could address the issue of Corrective updates currently being 'held back' by parties to be initiated in year 1.](#)

Year 1

Option	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Expected Rate of Error (/1000 sites)					
Exp Notes					
Expected constant materiality of errors (£)					
Exp Notes					
Expected typical resolution rate (in day)					
Exp Notes					

Deleted: Option

... [1]

Year 2+

<u>Option</u>	<u>Option 1</u>	<u>Option 2</u>	<u>Option 3</u>	<u>Option 4</u>	<u>Option 5</u>
<u>Expected Rate of Error per year (/1000 sites)</u>					
<u>Exp Notes</u>					
<u>Expected constant materiality of errors (£)</u>					
<u>Exp Notes</u>					
<u>Expected typical resolution rate (in day)</u>					
<u>Exp Notes</u>					

In addition can you please provide details on the following:

Historic Rate of Corrective Updates. Please indicate here the rate of corrective updates you have encountered prior to the implementation of Project Nexus.

Post-Nexus Corrective Updates Rates. Can you advise what corrective updates rates you have seen post-Nexus and whether or not there is any indication there is a greater or lesser error rate since the new Nexus functionality was implemented. Please also advise if you have been storing error corrections awaiting the introduction of the RAASP solution and if possible also advise the number of error instances and the anticipated value of the error that you will be seeking to correct should the full functionality become available.

Deleted: .

Deleted: Errors

Deleted: error

Deleted: ion

Deleted: [2]

Deleted: Error

Deleted: errors

Other implications and considerations

There are a number of other aspects that workgroup believe that it would be beneficial to consider in relation to evaluating the options. These are around what organisations have already done around preparing for a RAASP solution and when is the optimum time to deliver RAASP functionality, be that through an automated solution or a manual process.

Comment [NG4]: This document outlines costs which will link in with Xoserve identified costs of providing each option. **What appears missing within this RFI is the list of benefits and monetary values of such?**

Deleted: -

Impact of Nexus RAASP development. As UNC Modification 0434 does mandate the implementation of a RAASP solution, please provide as much detail as possible on the work done by your organisation to prepare for RAASP implementation. If possible please quantify the costs incurred.

Implementation timescales. Could you advise what timescales you would see as optimum for the options outlined in [UNC Request 0624R](#)? In addition could you advise of any conflicting industry or system developments that could impact on your/the industry's timeline for delivery?

Deleted: Modification

Deleted: 5

Other relevant information

Please provide any other information that you believe that the workgroup should consider.

Additional Information.

Option	1 Full system solution	2 Manually based solution	3 Remo RAASP
Expected Rate of Error per year (/1000 sites)			
<i>Exp Notes</i>			
Expected constant materiality of errors (£)			
<i>Exp Notes</i>			
Expected typical resolution rate (in day)			
<i>Exp Notes</i>			