

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4676**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Change Title** | Reconciliation issues with reads recorded between D-1 to D-5. | |
| **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.  )** | | |
| Change originated an internal Xoserve change request, however the solution is likely to have an external impact on shippers.  Issue:  An issue with cyclic reads being present for the same day as an FINT read (outgoing shipper transfer read) has been identified. The system is currently applying an incorrect/duplicate energy and charges against the one day reconciliation between cyclic and FINT. We have over 30k instances where this has happened. | | |
| **Proposed Release** | **June 2019** | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | **10WD / 30WD / XXWD (not required)** | |
| **[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?* | | The system will automatically deal with both reads and reconcile correctly |
| **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 C. | | |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve | |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | June 2019 | |
| **Section A5: DSC Consultation** | | |
| **Issued** | Yes | |
| **Date(s) Issued** | 23/08/2018 | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** | 2055.1-RJ-SH | |
| **Number of Responses** | 2 | |
| **Section A6: Funding** | | |
| **Funding Classes** | ☐ Shipper 0%  ☐ National Grid Transmission 0%  ☐ Distribution Network Operator 0%  ☐ iGT 0% | |
| **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 / 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:** [**box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com**](mailto:box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com)

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 1.0 | Solution Review | 23/08/2018 | Xoserve | Submitted in an extraordinary change pack on 23rd August 2018 |
| 2.0 | Solution Review | 10/09/2018 | Xoserve | Responses and Xoserve replies added |

**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 B: DSC Change Proposal: Consultation**

**(to be removed if no consultation is required; or alternatively collated post consultation)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** |  | |
| **User Contact Details** |  | |
| **Section B1: ChMC Industry Consultation (based on above change proposal)** | | |
| 1. Do you think the change proposed poses a material risk/cost to your organisation and / or the market?  Please can you provide the rationale for your response | | |
|  | | |
| 1. Do you think the change proposed will benefit your organisation and / or the market? Please provide any quantifiable outputs as well as any assumptions. | | |
|  | | |
| 1. Considering any functional changes as a result of this change, would your organisation support this to be implemented within a minor release as proposed? Based on your answer how long a lead time would your organisation require to implement this change (for example minimum of 4 months, minimum of 6 months) | | |
|  | | |
| 1. As currently drafted the Change Proposal impacts on service area [X]. The funding for this area is [X% Shipper funding, X% NTS, X% DNS X% IGTs]. Do you agree with the principles of this funding? | | |
|  | | |
| **Change Proposal in principle** | | Approve / Reject / Defer |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish / Private / None |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | **20/08/2018** |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| <https://www.xoserve.com/wp-content/uploads/DSC-DSG-20082018v2.0-Final.pdf>  SH presented slides 54 to 62. Slide 56 gives context on the associated issue. SH presented this change to acquire DSG’s feedback on the solution options, which are visible on slide 57. Six solution options were presented at previous DSG with 3 being put forward for impact assessment. SH presented the respective early indication of the impact assessments for each solution option; this can be found on slide 58.  Due to the impact assessment outputs only 1 option was viable, however SH proposed an alternative on option 5. NP asked what would happen in case of a dispute. SH stated that if the cyclic read is set, the incoming Shipper will replace the read following agreement across the two involved parties. Further information on this can be found on slides 59 to 60.  SH presented slides 61 and 62. Slide 61 illustrates the cyclic read process if no read is provided by the incoming Shipper. Slide 62 illustrates the same process, but considering if a read is provided by the incoming Shipper.  BC wanted to understand how this would coincide with the gradual rollout of Smart Meters.  **Action: - 0823: Simon Harris/David Addison to evaluate the relationship of 4676 (Reconciliation issues with reads recorded between D-1 to D-5) with Smart Metering.**  JB asked if the opening read process, for Class 3 and 4 meter points, would be any different. SH said no, but said he will take an action to investigate.  **Action: - 0824: Simon Harris/David Addison to acquire clarification on the opening read process for Class 3 and 4 Meter Points (4676 (Reconciliation issues with reads recorded between D-1 to D-5)**  JR asked if the inactive reading, as part of solution option 5b, would be visible on DES. SH assumes yes, but will obtain clarification.  **Action: - 0834: Simon Harris to clarify if inactive read is shown on DES.**  Simon’s proposed solution (5b) was supported by DSG and approved to send for impact assessment.  SH asked DSG members, due to their only being 2 solution options, if they would like to re-consider any previously dismissed options. No comments were received on this, proposed option 1 be impact assessed to provide the industry multiple options. No objection was received.  Solution options for 4676 will be issued for solution review within an extraordinary change pack to facilitate a ChMC September approval to allocate the change to the June 2019 Release. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY |

**Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section D1: Solution Options** | |
| **High Level summary options** | |
| **Solution Option 1:** **Reject readings received between (D-1 to D-5) of CO confirmation using current Rejection Code (SPO00016) or New Rejection Code.**  **Overview: Any non-opening readings submitted by the outgoing Shipper via UMR are to be rejected between D-1 and D-5 (D being Shipper Transfer Effective Date) and notification sent via URS file containing rejection code**  **Impact Assessment:**  **System/Processes Impacted:**  **- SAP ISU (UMR Read Process)**  **- Marketflow (File Gateway) configuration for new Rejection Code**  **Complexity: Medium**  ***DSG Voted to disregard this solution option.***  **Solution Option 4: Make the read supplied by Outgoing Shipper ‘invalid’ and undo any reconciliation (assess from an UNC perspective).**  **Overview:**  **In this option, in case the Outgoing Shipper submitting a read between D-1 to D-5 at it being loaded/ reconciled /billed, is to be reversed if the Incoming Shipper submits a read that has been used as the Shipper Transfer Reading. The same is needed in the case of UKL estimating the Shipper Transfer Reading (where the Incoming Shipper does not submit an opening reading). The reconciliation triggered by the Outgoing Shipper Reading will be reversed in both cases and the read set as inactive.**  **Impact Assessment:**  **System/Processes Impacted:**  **- SAP ISU (UMR Read Process)**  **- SAP ISU (Reconciliation Process)**  **- SAP ISU (SPA Process)**  **- SAP ISU (Estimation Process)**  **Complexity: High**  **High Level Cost Estimate:** **£60,000 – £70,000**  **Solution Option 5: Allow 2 reads for a single day on UK Link but have differing read types.**  **Overview: Configure UKL to allow the submission and processing of 2 reads on the same date.**  **Impact Assessment:**  **System/Processes Impacted: This approach isn’t technical feasible as per SAP ISU functionality.**  **Complexity: N/A**  **Solution Option 5b: Allow Outgoing Shipper read to be accepted into UKL and make it inactive, but use it in the Estimation Process if Incoming Shipper does not submit an Opening Reading.**  **Overview: In this option, the system will accept the Outgoing Shipper read sent in between D-5 to D-1 of a Shipper Transfer Date, but this will be stored as an inactive reading. This means that the read is not utilized for either reconciliation or AQ calculation purposes, however, this read will be utilised for the estimation purposes (if the incoming shipper has not sent in an opening read). Accepting the Outgoing Shipper Reading and setting it as inactive in UKL would not then restrict the Incoming Shipper from submitting an opening reading within D-5 to D-1 (as they are within their right to do so). If Incoming Shipper does not submit an opening reading within the read window then UKL will (as part of BAU) estimate a read for Shipper Transfer Date, however this solution will utilise the Outgoing Shipper Read within the estimation process to derive a more accurate estimate.**  **Impact Assessment:**  **System/Processes Impacted:**  **- SAP ISU (UMR Read Process)**  **- SAP ISU (Estimation Read Process)**  **Complexity: Medium**  **High Level Cost Estimate:** **£60,000 – £70,000** | |
| **Implementation date for this solution option** | June-19 |
| **Xoserve preferred option; including rationale** | 5b - This change will ensure that readings are still accepted into UKL from the outgoing Shipper with a more accurate estimate reading (if the incoming Shipper does not submit a reading). IA sees no direct impact on external users as system changes are to internal code/processes. Reconciliation process is unaffected and reads are not rejected. |
| **DSG preferred solution option; including rationale** | 5b - DSG supported solution option 5b due to the following…  - Outgoing Shipper can submit a reading into UKL (not being rejected)  - Incoming Shipper can still submit an opening reading into UKL (as per UNC)  - Shipper Transfer Estimation process would be more accurate (where system estimates)  - Reconciliation process is unaffected (no reversal of previous reconciliations)  - Removes the root cause of the issue being seen |
| **Consultation close out date** | 07/09/2018 |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | Eleanor Laurence | |
| **User Contact Details** | [Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com](mailto:Eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com) / 07875 117771 | |
| **Section E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| Whilst solution 5b looks like our preferred solution option – we would question 2 things:   * Should old supplier’s inactive read not be used as the actual transfer read if no incoming supplier read received (rather than a basis for an estimate)? * On solution design you mention transfer read window being D-5 to D+5. For clarity – incoming supplier has up to D+10 to submit opening read (with read date being D-5 to D+5). This doesn’t seem to be accurately reflected on solution design proposal on DSG slides/documentation | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve with comments |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve with comments |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Xoserve’s response to Organisation’s comments** | | Thank you for your comments. Your first bullet point would conflict with UNC as the old supplier is not responsible for providing reads that would be used for the transfer reading. This is only done by the incoming Shipper. Regarding the second point, the transfer read window specified in the design should refer to read date, you are correct that the window for submitting reads is greater, but the read date should be within the D-5 to D+5 window for it to be used as the transfer reading. |

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Name** | Maitrayee Bhowmick-Jewkes | |
| **User Contact Details** | [Maitrayee.Bhowmick-Jewkes@npower.com](mailto:Maitrayee.Bhowmick-Jewkes@npower.com) | |
| **Section E2: Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.** | | |
| Following review of all of the options, Npower agree that we are in support of option 5b that was DSG’s preferred solution. This would also mean that no internal change would are expected for npower.  However, we had the following query and look forward to receiving the clarification sought:   * *Please confirm that as a result of read loaded inactive – it will not be considered as the last read held by GT and therefore not used in MRV calculations on subsequent reads* | | |
| **Implementation date for this option** | | Approve |
| **Xoserve preferred solution option** | | Approve with comments |
| **DSG preferred solution option** | | Approve with comments |
| **Publication of consultation response** | | Publish |
| **Xoserve’s response to Organisation’s comments** | | Thank you for your comments. No, the reading from the Outgoing Shipper that will be loaded as inactive will not be used in any read tolerance/validation checks when a Shipper attempts to submit a new cyclic actual reading. The only process the inactive read will be used for is the Shipper Transfer Estimation and even then only in the case of the Incoming Shipper not submitting an opening read. |

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