

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN 4687**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Change Title** | PSR updates for large domestic sites |
| **Date Raised** | 01/06/2018 |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | E.ON  |
| **Sponsor Name** | Kirsty Dudley |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | Ellie Rogers |
| **Xoserve Contact Details**  | Ellie.rogers@xoserve.com |
| **Change Status** | **Proposal** / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected |
| **Section A1: Impacted Parties** |
| **Customer Class(es)** | [x]  Shipper[ ]  National Grid Transmission[x]  Distribution Network Operator[x]  iGT |
| **Section A2: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change** |
| Suppliers and Transporters have licence obligations to record and share domestic customer vulnerability. This is maintained through a Priority Service Register (PSR). This is fulfilled through the Supplier (via the Shipper) submitting this information to the CDSP to be recorded and issued to the relevant GT. This information is then filtered through to the electricity DNO who holds the overall central PSR registry. Vulnerability validation has always been based on AQ rather than property classification as majority of domestic customers have an AQ<73,200. There are however customers’ who have an AQ >73,200. The current validation relating to Supply Meter Points with an AQ >73.200kWh are rejected and not recorded centrally. The rejection of this information means the Supplier has the customer vulnerability recorded, however, the Transporter nor the electricity DNO do, which also the central register does not contain all vulnerability information. The issue has also been raised at the SPAA Expert Group via [Issues Paper 11](https://spaa.co.uk/SitePages/SIF/SIFDetails.aspx?UID=13&Source=https://spaa.co.uk/SitePages/SIF/SIFCurrent.aspx) and a request for information has been issued to understand the impacts. To ensure that customers with an >73,200AQ are also included in the PSR which the GTs and DNOs hold a UK Link solution is required – however, at this stage the true impact is unknown because the rejection volume doesn’t account for Shippers who don’t send updates knowing they’ll be rejected, In anticipation of the outcome and from an initial consideration, the following options have been proposed:1. **Do nothing**

*Pros: No change required**Cons: PSR updates would continue to be rejected and vulnerability for these sites would not be recorded centrally.* 1. **Change the validation from AQ to Market Sector Code (D / I)**

**(*vulnerable information accepted based on the MSC not AQ)****Pros: Validation still in place and updates can only be provided for Domestic sites as per the licence condition**Cons: Dependent on the accuracy of the MSC, if recorded incorrectly, sites that are genuinely domestic maybe rejected* *Change in validation required* 1. **Change the validation threshold from 73,200 kWh to 732,000 kWh**

*Pros: Although separate processes, this will bridge the gap between the Priority Service and Priority Consumer threshold**Cons: Change in validation required*1. **Remove the validation**

***(vulnerable information accepted regardless of the MSC or AQ)****Pros: All vulnerable information will be recorded centrally**Cons: Removal of validation completely which could result in vulnerable information being recorded against non-domestic sites* 1. **Offline solution**

*Pros: Vulnerable information submitted**Cons: Potentially only an interim solution and not as ‘clean’* |
| **Proposed Release** | **Feb or June 2019** |
| **Proposed Consultation Period**  | **10WD** |
| **Section A3: Benefits and Justification**  |
| **Benefit Description***What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?* *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | This change will allow customer vulnerability submitted by the Suppliers via their Shipper to be recorded centrally and relayed to the relevant Distribution Network and ensuring customer safeguarding and SLC adherence |
| **Benefit Realisation** *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | As soon as the validation is changed.  |
| **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.* | SPAA Change 16/370A – Refining the Needs Codes Information is in scope of Release 2 due for implementation in June-18. This change in validation will support this CP.  |
| **Section A4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations**  |
|  |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer  |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |
| **Section A5: DSC Consultation**  |
| **Issued** | Yes / No |
| **Date(s) Issued** |  |
| **Comms Ref(s)** |  |
| **Number of Responses** |  |
| **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**  |  |
| **Section A7: DSC Voting Outcome** |
| **Solution Voting**  | ☐ Shipper Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain☐ National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain ☐ Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain☐ iGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  |
| **Meeting Date**  | XX/XX/XXXX |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA |
| **Overall Outcome**  | Approved for Release X / Rejected  |

**Please send the completed forms to:** **mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**
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