

## **TRANSCO REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

"Formation of Network Code Review Group to consider the output of the Customer Transfer Programme"  
Version 1.0

### **Review Group**

#### **Review Proposal 0734 "Formation of Network Code Review Group to consider the output of the Customer Transfer Programme"**

#### **Supply Point & Billing Workstream's Report to 17/02/05 Modification Panel**

### **1.0 Summary**

1.1 Powergen (the proposer) raised Modification Proposal 0734 "*Formation of Network Code Review Group to consider the output of the Customer Transfer Programme*" on 9 December 2004. This advocated the formation of a group to consider the Network Code implications of developments being identified by the Customer Transfer Programme (CTP).

1.2 The Proposal was tabled at the December 2004 meeting of the Modification Panel which failed to determine that the Proposal should proceed to Review. Transco therefore referred discussion of the Network Code implications of developments being identified by the Customer Transfer Programme (CTP) to the Supply Point & Billing Workstream.

1.3 The CTP output was discussed on 3 separate occasions in early 2005 with agenda items focussing on the impacts of the CTP changes on the Network Code and a high level consideration of the impacts of these on Transco's and shippers computer systems.

1.4 Workstream members concluded that two Modification Proposals should be raised requiring the following changes to Transco's Network Code:

- The introduction of a new 'Opening Meter Reading read type', termed the 'Old Supplier Estimated Reading'.
- The introduction of a new 'cyclic' Meter Reading type, being an early 'point of sale' (POS) meter reading.

1.5 The above contractual changes require supporting changes to Transco's UK-Link system

### **2.0 Introduction**

2.1 Review Proposal 0734 "*Formation of Network Code Review Group to consider the output of the Customer Transfer Programme*" identifies its purpose as being to:

- Determine the Network Code and UK-Link implications of the output of the Customer Transfer Programme (CTP) and where options exist, identify firm proposals for further progression.
- Obtain feedback and engagement from all relevant industry participants and assess impacts upon CTP draft changes.
- To provide the industry with the forum to review and evaluate the CTP output.
- Ensure that any dependencies between Network Code Changes and associated industry legislation are managed.

2.2 The following timetable details the main process events:

Review Proposal raised	09 Dec 2004
Modification Proposal referred to Supply Point and Billing Workstream	16 Dec 2004
Workstream discussion	11 Jan 2005
1st Ad-hoc Workstream meeting	27 Jan 2005
2nd Ad-hoc Workstream meeting	07 Feb 2005

2.3 It should be noted that simultaneous discussions on non-Network Code CTP related issues took place within a Supply Point Administration Agreement (SPAA) forum. Some of the deliberations within that group were reported to the Workstream and were helpful in enabling Workstream members to identify the most appropriate contractual and systems solutions.

2.4 The Modification Panel requested that a report of the work and recommendations of the Review Group be made to the February 2005 Modification Panel meeting.

### **3.0 Options for change**

3.1 A number of possible changes requiring modification of the Network Code were identified by the CTP team. These are described as follows

#### **3.1.1 CTP Document 8 - Identify New Supplier**

The old shipper/supplier needs to be made aware of which party to send a proposed new supplier flow to (holding core data and an estimated read for D – transfer date). The new supplier to supplier flow is identified in one of the SPAA related changes and has been proposed for ‘domestic’ premises only. It is therefore necessary for the identity of the new supplier to be added on a request for transfer of ownership (confirmation). At present it is identified that shippers receive this information at D-7. A requirement is identified for receipt at the point of confirmation response (e.g. D-14 or earlier).

#### **3.1.2 CTP Document 9 - Identify Old Supplier Estimated Reading**

One of the areas of frustration for customers is identified as opening and closing meter reads not matching. One of the reasons for this is if there is no data

available - for example in the case of a frequent 'switcher'. The CTP programme team identified that the old supplier could calculate an estimated (notional) read for D to support such circumstances (where they can).

The confirming supplier might then choose to use this estimate as an opening read rather than wait for Transco's estimate (which implies that no meter reader or customer read is available). The Network Code does not currently permit receipt by Transco of such a read at present. System changes may also be required to be able to identify such reads when stored on Transco's Sites & Meters (S&M) database. It is envisaged that these reads would be sent to Transco by the new shipper before the Transco estimate read is applied at D+10.

### 3.1.3 CTP Document 22 – Identify Point of Sale Read

Suppliers sometimes collect a read at point of sale (POS read). In some circumstances they would wish to load this read to S&M for use by Transco in generating a more accurate notional opening read. If so loaded then it may need to be identified as a POS read on Transco's UK-Link system. There are two ways that this read could be loaded:

Option 1 – The 'new' shipper sends POS read to the old shipper, who validates the read and sends it to Transco using usual read files.

Option 2 – The 'new' shipper would send the POS read to Transco even though they would not be the Registered User at the time the read was taken.

### 3.1.4 Either:

#### CTP Document 15 – Identify old supplier

For option 1 above, the 'new' shipper needs to know which 'old' shipper to send the POS read to. A requirement is identified to mandate the currently optional population of the previous supplier identity at the point of confirmation response. This information will be made available via Transco's web site once its new internet system is in place.

Or:

#### CTP Document 21 - Non User Submits Read to Transco

For option 2 above, contractual and systems change would be necessary to permit this.

Solution options are either the 'incoming' shippers submits the POS read to Transco prior to Registration (when it would not 'own' the Supply Point) or following such Registration (when the shipper would be submitting a Meter Reading dated at a time when it was not registered).

## 4.0 Preferred solutions

4.1 Workstream members identified that modification of the Network Code is required to:

4.1.1 Implement CTP Document 9 – ‘Old Supplier Estimated Reading’.

Network code impact: Changes required to Section M3.1.4 (new Valid Meter Reading).

Systems impact: No requirement to identify new read type. Reinterpret existing change request (Modification 0689) for estimated prepayment ‘gas card’ notional reads. Identify new UK-Link ‘flag’ as ‘generic’ notional opening read.

Note: Network Code changes could be implemented with immediate effect with systems enhancements to follow.

4.1.2 Implement CTP Documents 21 and 22 – ‘Point of Sale (POS) Reading’ (Note: Incoming shipper would only submit POS read once it becomes the Registered User).

Network Code impact: Changes required to Section M3.3 (Provision to Transco) for Smaller Supply Points only.

Change to Network Code Validation Rules (V5.0) Section 5.3 ‘Non-Cyclic Meter Readings’ such that ‘Round the Clock’ (RTC) may be applied by Transco to ‘cyclic’ reads.

Systems impact:

1. Requirement to identify POS read.
2. Accept POS reads for Smaller Supply Points only.
3. No requirement to notify Previous Registered User of POS read.  
Note: Transco tabled its opinion that such a notification was required. The need for this was strongly opposed by the majority of shipper attendees.
4. POS read validated using AQ at read date.
5. Transco applies RTC test for POS read.
6. POS read treated as ‘non opening read’ (cyclic) and as such is subject to existing validation for that type of read.

Note: Network Code changes could not be implemented until systems enhancements were expedited.

The Workstream concluded that all other solution options identified in section 3.0 need not be pursued.

Transco issued a general caveat that it was concerned with regard to the pace at which high level systems analysis had been driven prior to conclusion of discussion within the Workstream. This meant that there were risks that all scenarios and impacts may not have been identified associated with the complex ‘change of shipper’ process. Transco’s opinion is that if the requirements for

change as described within this report are developed, the greater systems analysis required may identify hitherto unknown risks and impacts which could compromise the nature of the solutions and timescales for implementation.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

5.1 The consensus of the Supply Point & Billing Workstream is that discussions associated with Review Proposal 0734 are complete and recommend that this report be accepted by members of the Modification Panel.