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: | XRN4871 | | | |
| Change Title: | Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime | | | |
| Date Raised: | 11/02/2019 | | | |
| Sponsor Representative Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Energy | | |
| Name: | Steve Mulinganie | | |
| Email: | steve.mulinganie@gazprom-mt.com | | |
| Telephone: | 0799 097 2568 | | |
| Xoserve Representative Details: | Name: | David Addison | | |
| Email: | [David.addison@xoserve.com](mailto:David.addison@xoserve.com) | | |
| Telephone: | 0121 623 2752 /0742 855 9800 | | |
| 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: | [Modification 0665](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0665) has been raised and seeks to amend the current Class 2 Ratchet Charging Arrangement and it allows Transporters designate Supply Points (Network Designated) that should, in addition to mandatory Class 1 Supply Points, be subject to the existing Class 1 Ratchet Charging Arrangement. It is expected to be voted on by UNC Panel in March with final approval by Ofgem in April 2019.  This Change Proposal has been raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this modification. Due to the proposed timescales and the requirement to implement the changes by 01 October 2019, the Change Proposal has been raised ahead of the modification being officially approved.  In summary please see the modification requirements for the CDSP:   * Implementation of an amended Ratchet Charging Arrangement applicable for Daily Metered Supply Meter Points that are not Network Designated. * The Revised Ratchet Charge for Class 2 sites is described in the Modification. * A mechanism is required to flag in UK Link where a Network has designated a Supply Meter Point which should be subject to the existing Class 1 Ratchet Charge * When a Supply Meter Point has been Network Designated the CDSP shall notify the registered Shipper, and the relevant Supply Point will as soon as reasonably practicable be required to be a Class 1 Supply Point * If a Shipper does not reclassify the Supply Point as Class 1 within 20 Supply Point Systems Business Days of the notice of Designation, then the CDSP will reclassify the site as Class 1 after so notifying the relevant Shipper and providing not less than 20 Supply Point Systems Business Days’ notice of the revised classification effective date unless the CDSP has been informed that the Supply Meter Point is unable to be Daily Read in accordance with current code requirements.   For full details, please refer to the modification. | |
| Proposed Release: | Options to be investigated as to the release approach in order to implement this change as soon as possible including a Minor Release in 2019. | |
| Proposed Consultation Period: | 10 Working Days | 20 Working Days |
| 30 Working Days | Other [Specify Here] |

# A4: Benefits and Justification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Benefit Description: | The modification case for change argues that removal of the Ratchet Charge will remove a key barrier to Supply Meter Points electing to be Daily Metered. This will enable better information to be available for allocation processes and allow for the development of innovative products. |
| *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* |
| Benefit Realisation: | Upon implementation. |
| *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* |
| Benefit Dependencies: | The benefit is dependent on the modification being approved in order for the CDSP to delivery this change |
| *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~~ | ~~17 %~~ |
| Distribution Network Operator | 100 % |
| ~~IGT~~ | ~~XX %~~ |
| Other <please specify> | XX % |
| Service Line(s) | DSC Service Area 7: NTS Capacity, LDZ Capacity, Commodity, Reconciliation, Ad-hoc adjustment and balancing invoices  DSC Service Line: ASGT-CS SA7-17 Notification of ratcheted Supply Point Capacity | |
| ROM or funding details: |  | |
| Funding Comments: | 5th March 2019 - The above funding split is based on what is specified by the DSC Service Area on the Budget and Charging Methodology document. An automated solution would not cause any change to the ongoing delivery of the service lines.  15th March 2019 – the DNs agreed at ChMC on 13th March 2019 that they should fund 100% of this change.  28th March 2019 - Xoserve is reviewing the impacted service lines to assess if changes are needed  3rd June 2019 – Xoserve expects that a new service line will be required for this change.  11th July – Xoserve has identified the service line, and it is indicated above in the service line field. | |

# 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: | 09/05/2019 | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 2314 – RJ – ES / 2378.1 - RT – PO | |
| Number of Responses: | Part A - 5 responses – 4 in support of the implementation date and solution option and 1 in support of the implementation date only (2314 – RJ – ES)  Part B - 5 responses in support of the implementation date and solution option. (2378.1 - RT – PO) | |

# A8: DSC Voting Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Approve |
| National Grid Transmission | | | N/A |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Approve |
| IGT | | | Approve |
| Meeting Date: | 12/06/2019 | | | |
| Release Date: | Minor Release Drop 5 (Indicative Date of 17th August 2019) | | | |
| Overall Outcome: | No | Yes | Minor Release Drop 5 (Indicative Date of 17th August 2019) | |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 18/03/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | David Addison (DA) explained that while going through mod process Ofgem said this needs to be in place by winter 2019 and the Reps reiterated this point. Change Managers will be reluctant to change the scoped releases, so we are exploring the option of July MR. To put in MR, DA advised there will be no file format changes however there will inevitably have to be changes in Shippers organisation. This will be due to rejection codes which may not be clear what basis it is rejected on. DA is presenting to DSG early and working internally on solutions in the next 2 weeks due to timescales. DA will send an extraordinary change pack out by Wednesday 20th stating there will be only one solution in each case. DA went through the slides highlighting point 4 on slide 40 being a BAU process. MOD0665 introduces a lesser Ratchet Charge so we would have to come up with how to notify you. Also have a means on controlling a sensitive load on a new class on class 1 read. This flag is a new class 1 requirement. There is Code to use, however no support to give out. CDSP obligated to inform shippers by email. DA stated stating that we are progressing on basis that no external impacts, however is open to change if there are other options DSG can give.  DA went through slide 41-44. Looking to exclude DES and process through consequential. We propose to reject stuff coming in and apply rejection, however customer changes will recognise so this is the changes that may need to be applied to the systems.  Looking through the code for outstanding Offers, 0665 doesn’t explicitly allow us to cancel offers or confirmations, but DA will assess whether this is an option Very short timescale and possible that a Shipper may have gone through the process of offer and would be preferable to reject the offer. DA to confirm in the change pack.  Ratchet charge is currently ZRA and SRA in CAZ invoice. Planning to reuse these charges, but there is a new ratchet charge for class 2 includes a Ratchet charge for ECN. Class 1 doesn’t have this equivalent.  DA summarised and that an Extraordinary Change pack will be out by Wednesday. DSG agreed to a shortened timescale for Reps and to close out comments on 26th/27th March.  **ACTION: DSG to respond to the Extraordinary Change Pack for RN4871 - Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime** | | |
| 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 | | |

Section C: DSG Discussion

# C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 01/04/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | Ellie Rogers (ER) presented this change at the last DSG meeting to get initial views on assumption and went through the background (slide 32). MOD 0665 has now been approved and is to be implemented by Nov 19; so will proposed for July MiR. DSG acknowledged that the options were quite pragmatic and a Change Pack was issued. ER gave the results from the 5 responses received, 3 are in support of the options and 2 didn’t explicitly state support or otherwise but we did not identify any major concerns.  ER went through the assumptions (previously presented at the last DSG) with the Industry representations (slides 34 – 37)   * Visibility of ‘Network Designation’ flag - representation indicated that Users were comfortable with the approach to not amend file formats for this implementation and were comfortable with this being considered as part of CSS file format change * Views sought from DSG - SPA - representation indicated that Users did not flag concerns with this approach. It was suggested by one User that a new rejection code would be sensible.ER opened this up for DSG discussion. JB stated given the timescales not to use a new code and monitor how many affected and change in a future release. This view was supported by DSG. * Views sought from DSG – Inflight - from the industry representation, Users agreed with our approach to allow the Confirmation to progress and not cancel offers. * Views sought from DSG – Invoicing - representation indicated Users were not concerned with the proposed changes. It was stated by one User that changes to the file structure (which is not proposed) would cause an issue and a value/rate change is manageable (which is being proposed).   ER thanked DSG for their feedback and wanted to note that these are the first draft options and approaches and the representation will be in the detailed design process and shared to the wider Industry view in a Change Pack. | | |
| 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 | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 07/05/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | Ellie Rogers (ER) confirmed that modification 0665 has been approved by Ofgem with an implementation date of 1st October 2019. It was highlighted that a minimum scope requires implementation ahead of 1st October in order to comply with the modification.  The minimum scope was stated as the following:   * Network Designated Flag added within UK Link   *This will allow the CDSP to identify within the system the sites which the DNs have assigned as Network Designated and which should be Class 1 and subject to the Class 1 Ratchet Charging Regime*   * SPA Validation changes   *This is to allow Shippers (or CDSP) to move Network Designated sites which could be Class 2, 3 or 4 into Class 1. Also preventing the Network Designated sites being moved out of Class 1.*   * Forced Class Change process   *This is to allow the CDSP to y move Network Designated sites into Class 1 if the time period for Shippers to do so elapses.*  There were 2 options provided within the HLSO for the minimum scope (Part A of this change). Option 1 had an automatic Class Change process and option 2 was a manual process.  As Part A (minimum scope) of this change needs to be implemented by 1st October, Option 1 has been discounted due to a Major Release being required for implementation (earliest point November 2019) which would be too late..  Therefore Option 2 was stated as the only option for Part A as it can be implemented within a Minor Release. ER went through the HLSO for Option 2 (slide 58-60) which was highlighted to have minimum impact for Users with no system impacts expected.  ER asked for views on the proposed solution option. DSG members raised no objections with the proposed option.  It was confirmed that a Solution Option Change Pack would be issued by w/e 10th May 2019 to solicit wider industry views on the solution and proposed implementation.  In terms of Part B for this change, it will require implementation within a Major Release. This is likely to be proposed for June 2020 release, however this is still to be agreed and confirmed.  To confirm, Part B will encompass the following changes:   * Automated Force Class Change * Automated calculation and issue of Class 2 Ratchet invoices   A HLSO for Part B will be undertaken and discussed at DSG before being issued out within a Solution Change Pack for Users review and approval. | | |
| Capture Document / Requirements: | <Insert where appropriate> | | |
| DSG Recommendation: | Approve | Reject | Defer |
| DSG Recommended Release: | Release: Minor | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 17/06/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | DA presented a verbal update for this agenda item. DA stated the Part B change will be a part of June 2020 release involving the changes necessary to invoicing, so in advance of Part B coming in, Part A will be the ECN charge to be part of the ZRA charges which won’t be explicitly pulled out whereas in Part B this will be an item that can be seen in a customer’s invoice. DA suggested he expects the HSLO to be ready discussion at the start of July or Mid July. Furthermore DA stated that the Part B HLSO might be available to be issued as part of July Change Pack. The requirements for Part B at the moment are currently in the process of completing them. PO stated Ellie Rogers was in the process of confirming some of the detail of the HLSO of Part B. DA explained part A is more of a minimum scope for changes to be implemented and the Ratchets will be manually done up to the implementation of Part B. | | |
| 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 | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 01/07/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | ER informed DSG this Change is related to MOD0665 which has been approved by Ofgem and has an implementation date of 01st July 2019. ER stated that due to the proposed timescales and requirements to implement the changes in line with the 01st October 2019, the delivery has been split into 2 parts, A & B.   * Part A will be going to ChMC in July for final approval * Part B which is the enduring solution has gone for HLSO   ER stated that the CDSP is requesting DSG views regarding Part B, where the transporters have indicated they are comfortable with the CDSP cancelling offers where a site has been network designated and the offer is for anything other than class 1. It was highlighted that cancelling offers for this reason is not currently explicit in code but has been indicated as a requirement. ER stated that in order to accommodate this, CDSP requires a mechanism for the CDSP to notify the users that the offer has been cancelled.  ER explained there are 3 current methods which the notification can be sent out by;   * Meter Point Status – MPE file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS) * Where there is a Ratchet - RAT file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS) * Exit zone change- EXZ file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS)   ER asked DSG for their view on which method would be their preference.. ER suggested that option one (MPE hierarchy) seems the most logical mechanism because the other two options are for very specific situations. ER stated there will be no proposed change to the S31 record file it is just the mechanism and hierarchy in which we notify users of the cancellation. ER informed DSG that with these options, it is worth noting that users will just receive the S31 record and will not be notified explicitly that the cancellation has occurred because the site is network designated. The CDSP is proposing not to amend the S31 record. ER asked DSG to note that within Part B there is a requirement for the network designation flag to be visible to users which means users will be able to determine if the site is network designated, however the solution for this has not yet been defined. IB asked ER if this could be sent in an email, or extraordinary Change Pack that articulates these options allowing parties to be able to discuss in their organisations and provide responses regarding this.  Action: The CDSP to send out an email or extraordinary Change Pack that articulates the options regarding the 3 methods of notification, allowing parties and organisations to discuss and provide responses regarding preference of method going forward.  Post meeting update: CDSP technical team have confirmed that the effort to implement any of the options above is the same. With this in mind, the HLSO for Part B will consider the requirement to have a mechanism to notify users of an offer cancellation. During the detailed design phase, we will discuss and decide with the industry which mechanism is preferred.  The HLSO for the solution options will be issued within a Change Pack on Friday 12th July and back to DSG for consideration on 15th July. DSG agreed with this approach. | | |
| 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 | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DSG Date: | 15/07/2019 | | |
| DSG Summary: | Ellie Rogers (ER) stated that part A of this Change was approved at ChMC on 10th July for implementation due to go in around September. ER explained that this HLSO was for Part B of the change which is currently in scope for June 2020 delivery and involves the enduring solution.  ER stated that when looking at the impact assessment for Part B, there was only 1 option which is to ensure that Part A has an enduring solution.  It was highlighted that Part B will involve the changes to the RAT and PRN files as the ECN charge is being added into the Class 2 ratchet calculation.  In addition ER added that for Part A the forced Class change will be done manually by the Operations team however Part B should involve an automated solution that if Shippers have not reclassified a Network Designated site within the agreed timeframe (20 working days) then the site will be automatically reclassified by the CDSP using the SPC file. When a site is reclassified by the CDSP, Users have been asked to indicate how the CDSP should derive the SHQ. It has been agreed by Change Managers for Part A that this should be at the discretion of the Transporter on a case by case basis.  ER stated that for Part B, the Transporters have indicated they are comfortable with the CDSP cancelling offers where a site has been Network Designated and the offer is for anything other than Class 1. Furthermore ER added, in order to accommodate this, the CDSP requires a mechanism to notify the Users that the offer has been cancelled.  Currently there are 3 ways that this notification can be sent:   * Meter Point Status – MPE file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS) * Where there is a Ratchet - RAT file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS) * Exit zone change - EXZ file (within the S31 INVALID OFFER DETAILS   ER stated that the first option seems the most logical as the other two are related to a specific event occurring (ratchet and Exit Zone change). DSG members agreed in principle with this logic but wanted to understand how often the MPE file is currently used.  In addition to this, it is worth noting that Users will just receive the S31 record and will not be notified explicitly that the cancellation has occurred because the site is Network Designated. ER stated the CDSP is proposing not to amend the S31 record. Furthermore ER stated that the CDSP is proposing that for the Network Designation flag is visible to Users within Data Enquiry Service (DES) and this will also be included within Part B.  ER encouraged DSG members to provide some views via the issued Change Pack regarding the mechanism presented in the slides about cancelled offers. AN asked is there a situation currently where an offer is cancelled and the process used is the MPE S31 file. ER stated there is one used and is being internally investigated with IS Ops to gain some understanding regarding how often this is being used. ER added that once some understanding has been gained, ER will update DSG with the statistics.  ER encouraged DSG to provide views and responses via the Solution Change Pack issued 10th July and if there are any questions, to contact her regarding any queries. | | |
| 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 | | |

Section D: High Level Solution Options

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | This is the High Level Solution Options (HLSO) for Part A of XRN4871 only. Part A is the minimum scope Xoserve must implement by 1st October 2019 in order to comply with Modification 0665. The minimum scope encompasses the following elements:   * Network Designated Flag added within UK Link   *This will allow the CDSP to identify within the system the sites which the DNs have assigned as Network Designated and which should be Class 1 and subject to the Class 1 Ratchet Charging Regime*   * SPA Validation changes   *This is to allow Shippers (or CDSP) to move Network Designated sites which could be Class 2, 3 or 4 into Class 1. Also preventing the Network Designated sites being moved out of Class 1.*   * Forced Class Change process   *This is to allow the CDSP to manually move Network Designated sites into Class 1 if the time period for Shippers to do so elapses.*  By implementing the above ahead of 1st October 2019, it allows Xoserve to put in place the arrangements to deliver the scope set out within the Modification.  Two solution options for Part A XRN4871 were included within the HLSO.  Option 1 was however discounted due to the requirement for it to be implemented within a Major Release which would result in the delivery date being missed.  Option 2 can be delivered within a Minor Release and includes the minimum scope required and therefore is the only available solution option for the Part A.  Attached below is the HLSO for Part A XRN4871:    Please note that Part A minimum scope should involve no system changes for Users. It is only changes to Xoserve systems to add the Network Designation Flag and amend the SPA validations.  We are seeking Users views and approval on the proposed solution option for Part A. Please note the reduced representation period to 6 business days as agreed at Change Management Committee on 8th May 2019  If you would like to provide a representation comment and believe you will not be able to do so within the reduced response period, please contact the [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com) box account and let us know and we will look to accommodate this.  If the solution option is agreed, as per the normal change process, a Detailed Design Change Pack will be issued to Users stipulating at lower level the details / impacts of this change. Users will also have a representation period to review and provide any comments on the Detailed Design Change Pack which again will be voted on by Change Managers.  In terms of this change Part B, it will require implementation within a Major Release. This is likely to be proposed for June 2020 release, however this is still to be agreed and confirmed.  To confirm, Part B will encompass the following changes:   * Automated Force Class Change * Automated calculation and issue of Class 2 Ratchet invoices   A HLSO for Part B will be undertaken and discussed at DSG before being issued out within a Solution Change Pack for Users review and approval.  This is expected to be discussed within the next few months. |
| Implementation Date for this Solution Option: | Minor Release pre 1st October 2019 |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | Option 2  This is the only option available and encompasses the minimum scope required which will allow compliance with the Modification. It should have no system impacts on Users. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | Option 2 |
| Consultation closeout: | 17/05/2019 |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SGN | | | |
| Name: | Sally Hardman | | | |
| Email: | sally.hardman@sgn.co.uk | | | |
| Telephone: | 07970 019027  01293 818129 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We would prefer this to be implemented under a single release however due to the requirements of the Modification we understand there are time constraints.  Could Xoserve share the cost impact of delivering this solution via a minor release in July versus implementing the total solution, are there additional costs by initiating the final enduring solution under a major release in June 2020.  Has an assessment of the impacts to external interfaces been undertaken, the change talks about such impacts but doesn’t provide any details.  The solution does not detail how Networks would be made aware of new supply points being registered for the first time?  Will the Network Designation Class 1 flag be available to view in DES by DN’s?  We believe that the above comments need to be considered although they shouldn’t halt the work that Xoserve are doing so that the code obligation is fulfilled in advance of the 1st October. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back in the ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on.  Since Part A and B impact different functional code there are not expected to be any changes necessitated in A that will be amended by B. Whilst some economies of scale would potentially have been realised by implementing A and B together, since Part B will be included in a major release you would expect that B would benefit from these in this regard.  With regards to the external interfaces being assessed, the intention is for the Part A scope to involve no system changes for Users. It should only be changes to Xoserve systems to add the Network Designation Flag and amend the SPA validations. That being said, we would want this ratified by Users and once we receive approval from Change Managers to progress (expected June ChMC), we would look to issue the Detailed Design Change Pack as soon as possible for User consideration and ultimate approval.  In terms of New Supply Points, we are investigating use of the existing delta files that are currently provided to the Networks in order for you to assess such Supply Points for Network Designation.  For Part A, the Network Designation flag would not be available in DES to view, however this can be considered as an option for Part B.  As mentioned, the end to end process and impacts for Part A will be issued out within the Detailed Design Change Pack. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | E.ON | | | |
| Name: | Kirsty Dudley / Lee Stone | | | |
| Email: | [Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com](mailto:Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com) | | | |
| Telephone: | 07816 172 645 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support the preferred solution and proposed implementation dates.  We have assessed the interim solution and believe it will work where the shipper does not change, however we would like clarification on how this solution will ensure that shippers are informed of Network Designated (ND) class 1s under change of shipper scenarios.  We feel this may cause confusion and possibly lead to ambiguity as to which shipper has the responsibility to move ND sites. This is because the outbound shipper doesn’t have an incentive to appeal or move ND sites which could prevent the incumbent shipper from appealing a forced ND despite having defined rationale.  This may also lead to the CDSP carrying out more forced settlement class changes; and may have impacts to the incumbents shippers imbalance and UIG position so clarity would be good for us and other shippers. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back in the ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on.  With regards to your concerns with Change of Shipper scenarios, the intention is for an offline notification to be sent to the Registered User when their site has been Network Designated and it needs to be re-classified.  The changes to the Confirmation process which are being implemented as this change will prevent a Shipper confirming this Supply Point as anything other than Class 1 after the Network Designated Flag has been set.  If a User already has a Confirmation at Requested or Confirmed Status, then a notification will also be issued to such Users notifying them of the need to reclassify the Supply Point.  We expect to stipulate the process and exactly how this solution is going to work within the Detailed Design Change Pack following Change Managers decision to progress with the change (expected June ChMC). |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities | | | |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy | | | |
| Email: | [Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk](mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk) | | | |
| Telephone: | 029 2027 8552 or 07812 973337 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Option 2 is the solution that allows delivery by the required date of 1st October 2019. As a principle we do not like having manual solutions as this gives potential for failures as we have seen with the amendment invoice. We accept that further changes for a system solution need to be developed. Any additional changes to the system solution developed at a later date to enhance the service will need to be funded by Shippers. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments  Your response and preference will be fed back to ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on.  We note your concern with the principle of manual solutions being proposed. As detailed in Section D, the intention is to make the solution automated as soon as possible, with only one Ratchet Year (October –May 2019/20) being proposed to use the manual work around.  For the manual solution, all necessary processes and checks will be implemented to reduce the risk of error.  Regarding funding arrangements for the Part B element of this change, we have noted your view and will make Change Managers aware of this. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Energy | | | |
| Name: | Alison Neild | | | |
| Email: | [Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com](mailto:Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com) | | | |
| Telephone: | 0161 829 0039 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Agree that Option 2 is required to meet the timelines set out by the UNC MOD and Option 1 would not be possible. Therefore support moving forward with **Option 2** as a minor release.  However we do not agree that this in a minor release equates to no impact on shipper systems or processes. Therefore request that the Detailed Design Change Pack is issued as soon as is practicably possible in order to gain clarity of the process, for example confirmation of the following queries:   1. How the current shipper will be informed that a site that is currently not Class 1 has been designated as Class 1 and the 20 day notice period begins 2. How the prospective shipper will be informed of the change, is this expected to be through the rejection code only? What about prospective shippers with open offers/confirmations at the time of change 3. How the DMSP service is triggered for these changes. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back to ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on.  In terms of the ‘no impact’ comment, it is our intention within the Part A scope to avoid any system changes for Users. That being said, we would want this ratified by Users and once we receive approval from Change Managers to progress (expected June ChMC), we would look to issue the Detailed Design Change Pack as soon as possible for User consideration and ultimate approval.  In direct response to your comments, we have provided a high level view:   1. Once we are informed by the Network of the Network Designation, we expect an email notification would go to the [DSC Contract Manager of the] Registered User where their site has been Network Designated and needs to be moved into Class 1 within 20 business days. 2. We will identify Users with Confirmations at RQ and CO Status to notify them about the requirement to undertake the Class Change once the Supply Point is Live. We will notify the relevant Shipper DSC Contract Manager. 3. We would not expect that this is a Shipper obligation to notify the DMSPs that DM Equipment was required.   Please note this will be called out within the Detailed Design Change Pack. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Orsted | | | |
| Name: | Lorna Lewin | | | |
| Email: | lolew@orsted.co.uk | | | |
| Telephone: | 0207 451 1974 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support Option 2 as this will have minor impacts to our internal systems and business processes, whilst meeting the requirements set out in UNC modification 0665. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back to ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on. |

Section D: High Level Solution Options (Part B)

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | The High Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be found here:  [LINK TO THE HLSO](https://www.xoserve.com/media/6924/xrn4871_partb-high-level-solution-option-assessment-solution-review-cp-120719.pdf)  This HLSO is for Part B of the XRN4871 change which looks to deliver the enduring solution.  It outlines one solution option to deliver the requirements of the change.  To summarise, this option seeks to automate the solution to have a two tier Ratchet Regime (for Class 1 as per existing arrangements and Class 2 for the new calculation). It will deliver the Class 2 Ratchet calculation automatically within the UK Link system and populate it on the Capacity Invoice and within the ZCS and CZI supporting files.  It will also make the Network Designation flag visible in DES against MPRNs the Transporters have selected. This will make Users aware that a site is Network Designated and cannot move out of Class 1 as long as the flag remains against the site.  This change will additionally reclassify a Network Designated site via a system generated SPC file (Class Change file) and allow for the cancellation of offers on these sites for anything other than a Class 1.  Part A will deliver the minimum scope for this change and has been approved within Minor Release Drop 5 (September 2019). As detailed within this section, Part B seeks to put in place the enduring solution which is as automated as possible.  Please note, this HLSO details the system changes for Part B only as Part A efforts have already been published and approved by Change Managers.  **The link to the Change Proposal can be** [**found here**](https://www.xoserve.com/media/6898/xrn4871-cp-em.pdf) |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | As there is one option for the delivery of the enduring solution, Xoserve recommends progression with this option.  It will deliver the requirements of XRN4871 and modification 0665 within an enduring solution. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | No preference has been provided by DSG representatives at this stage but the HLSO is on the agenda for discussion at the meeting on 15 July 2019. |
| Consultation closeout: | 26/07/2019 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impact on Service Line(s) and funding (A6) for each Solution Option: | From an initial assessment, we do not believe a new Service Line is required for this change. It is believed that the existing Service Line ASGT-CS SA7-17 Notification of ratcheted Supply Point Capacity is appropriate. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom | | | |
| Name: | Alison Neild | | | |
| Email: | alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com | | | |
| Telephone: | 01618290039 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Supportive of Option 1. Approved  HLSO raises the following solution queries to be resolved during detailed design.  (1) (a) Will the LDZ Exit Capacity Charge (ECN) ONLY be within the RAT and PRN files?  (b) Will the following process from PART A be enduring?  • ECN charge will be incorporated within the ZCA – Customer Ratchet Charge. The ECN rate will therefore not be visible within the file format but included within the invoice charge.  • The charges will NOT be in the ZCS or CZI files, but will be manually calculated the charge and raise it via a Request to Bill (RTB) as an INR Invoice which will be issued via the IX  • Supporting information for Class 2 Ratchet charges will be sent via email and based on a Ratchet Drilldown report the CDSP will use to calculate the Ratchet charges.  (2) Please confirm the that communication to the current shipper at the point where the network designate a site as Class 1 is still via email to the Contract Manager (as per PART A), aided by the new report (being developed in PART B).   1. Would the ND flag on DES be available in community view as well as portfolio view?   (4) File format to be used to inform shippers of cancelled open nominations.  (5) Is the appeal process to remain manual? | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Northern Gas Networks | | | |
| Name: | Helen Chandler | | | |
| Email: | HChandler@Northerngas.co.uk | | | |
| Telephone: | 07580704123 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We agree that Xoserve should proceed with the solution proposed to automate as much as possible for the new two-tier Ratchet Regime, including new reports to identify Network Designated and newly confirmed sites.  Regarding the calculation of a Network Designated site’s SHQ, NGN will be able to provide the CDSP with both the SOQ and SHQ. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: |  |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Orsted | | | |
| Name: | Lorna Lewin | | | |
| Email: | lolew@orsted.co.uk | | | |
| Telephone: | 02074511974 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | we support the proposed solution by Xoserve, but please can you confirm if a PRN still be received each time a site breaches and will it give indication of what the rate should be based on the SOQ? | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | . |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | npower Ltd | | | |
| Name: | Richard Vernon | | | |
| Email: | richard.vernon@npower.com | | | |
| Telephone: | 07825608088 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Fully supportive that designate supply points that fall into Settlement Class 2 should be subject to Class 1 Ratchet charges. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back to ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | ScottishPower | | | |
| Name: | Claire Roberts | | | |
| Email: | Clairelouise.Roberts@ScottishPower.com | | | |
| Telephone: | 01416145930 | | | |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Only 1 solution option proposed. | | | | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | | Reject | | Defer |
| Publication of consultation response: | Publish | | | Private | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for comments.  Your response and preference will be fed back to ChMC meeting ahead of the change being voted on. |

Section F: Approved Solution Option

# F1: Approved Solution Option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| XRN Reference: | XRN4871 (Part A) |
| Solution Details: | Revised Ratchet Regime being applicable to Class SMPs with Manual Intervention (Option 2) |
| Implementation Date: | 17/08/2019 |
| Approved By: | Change Management Committee – approved to enter Minor Release Drop 5; the implementation for MiR Drop 5 is indicative, and not confirmed yet. |
| Date of Approval: | 12/06/2019 |

Section G: Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 2268 - RJ - DA |
| Comm Title: | XRN4871 - Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime |
| Comm Date: | 19/03/2019 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For review |
| Close Out Date: | 27/03/2019 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number: | XRN4871 - Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime |
| Change Class: | Functional Change |
| ChMC Constituency Impacted: | Shipper Users |
| Change Owner: | David Addison  [David.Addison@xoserve.com](mailto:David.Addison@xoserve.com)  0121 623 2752 / Mobile 07428559800 |
| Background and Context: | Modification 0665 – ‘Changes to Ratchet Regime’ has been raised and seeks to amend the current Ratchet Charging Arrangement and it allows Transporters to designate Supply Points (Network Designated) that should, in addition to existing mandatory Class 1 Supply Points, be subject to existing Ratchet Charges. Class 2 Supply Meter Points will be subject to a lesser Ratchet Charge.  Change Proposal XRN4871 has been raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this modification.  Attached for reference:    Due to the proposed timescales and the requirement to implement the changes by 01 October 2019, the Change Proposal has been raised ahead of the modification being officially approved. To confirm, Panel approval is expected in March and an Ofgem decision in April.  This Change Pack seeks to solicit views from the industry regarding the approach for this change. |

# Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional: | Supply Point Administration and Invoicing |
| Non-Functional: | N/A |
| Application: | SAP ISU |
| User: | Shipper |
| Documentation: | N/A |
| Other: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Files | | | | |
| File | Parent Record | Record | Data Attribute | Hierarchy or Format  Agreed |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

# Change Design Description

|  |
| --- |
| Modification 0665 – “Changes to Ratchet Regime” has been raised and seeks to amend the current Ratchet Charging Methodology to create a two tier Charging Regime. The higher charge will be applied to existing mandatory Class 1 Supply Points and also to Supply Meter Points that the Transporters designate ‘as subject to the Class 1 Ratchet Charging Arrangements’ where ‘safeguards around accurate capacity declarations’ are necessary. This ‘Class 1 Ratchet Regime’ reflects the existing charging arrangements in terms of composition of the Ratchet Charges and the Ratchet Multiplier remains as is.  The lesser charge will be applied to Supply Meter Points where the Networks do not consider that these safeguards are necessary. The composition of the Ratchet Charges is slightly amended, and has a lower Ratchet Multiplier.  In summary the requirements for the CDSP are:   * Implementation of an amended Ratchet Charging Arrangement applicable for Daily Metered Supply Meter Points that are not Network Designated. [Class 2 Ratchet Charge]. * A mechanism is required to flag in UK Link where a Network has designated a Supply Meter Point which should be subject to the existing [Class 1] Ratchet Charge. These will then be subject to the ‘Class 1 Requirement’ in UNC. * When a Supply Meter Point has been Network Designated the CDSP shall notify the registered Shipper, and the relevant Supply Point will as soon as reasonably practicable be required to be a Class 1 Supply Point * If a Shipper does not reclassify the Supply Point as Class 1 within 20 Supply Point Systems Business Days of the notice of Designation, then the CDSP will reclassify the site as Class 1 after so notifying the relevant Shipper and providing not less than 20 Supply Point Systems Business Days’ notice of the revised classification effective date unless the CDSP has been informed that the Supply Meter Point is unable to be Daily Read in accordance with current code requirements.   For the full details please see [modification 0665](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0665).  Please note that due to the tight timescales for implementation (before 01 October 2019), we are proposing that any changes to external interfaces including file formats are limited and the all associated notifications will be offline.  We are requesting industry views on the following aspects of the change solution:   * **Visibility of Network Designation to Prospective Users**   + As we are seeking to limit the scale of impacts to Users, and in particular Users who do not operate DM Supply Points, **we are NOT proposing to make this data item available to Shipper Users in SPA files** – e.g. Nomination Response (including Enquiry); Confirmation; etc.   + We would suggest that if there is a requirement to make this data item available in SPA files, that this is considered within the CSS Consequential interface changes – scheduled for 2021   If the industry believes that Prospective Users need to have visibility of the Network Designation, potential options could be:   * + Changes to DES     - This is not recommended as the change may be precluded by the timescales.   + Addition to API services     - This would be the preferred option if visibility was required but would need to be assessed.   + Other options from the industry are welcomed for consideration. * **Rejection of Nomination / Confirmation (including Reconfirmation) / Class Change**   + If a site is Network Designated it must be Class 1, any relevant transactions will need to be rejected, such as:     - Nomination     - Confirmation     - Class Change   + We would propose that w**e use the existing Rejection Code CLS00002 – “Supply meter point should be Class 1”**. This code is used for the above processes already.   + Shippers need to consider if this rejection will cause exceptions within their systems as the site will not meet the current Class 1 requirements.   + Other options from the industry are welcomed for consideration. * **Outstanding Offers and Inflight Change of Shipper / Capacity Revision**   + The industry needs to consider where a Supply Meter Point gets set to Network Designated but has and outstanding offer or an accepted confirmation:      * + Outstanding Offer on a Network Designated site which has a Class other than Class 1   We could:   * Invalidate Offer * Reject the Confirmation where the Shipper attempts to confirm an Offer on a Network Designated Supply Meter Point * Allow Offer to continue, but oblige Shipper to reclassify the SMP   + Accepted Confirmation on a Network Designated site which has a Class other than Class 1   We propose to allow Confirmation to progress, but oblige Shipper to reclassify the SMP   * + Other options from the industry are welcomed for consideration. * **New Ratchet Charging Arrangement**   + The current Ratchet Charge includes the **ZRA – Customer Ratchet Charge** and the **SRA – SOQ Ratchet Charge**   + The new Ratchet Charge for Class 2 sites will also include the **ECN – Exit Capacity LDZ Charge.** This is planned to be incorporated into the ZRA Charge for Class 2 Ratchets only     - This appears on the CAZ Invoice and ZCS Supporting information     - The **RT\_I09\_CAP\_RATCHET\_CHARGE\_DETAIL** record has theRATCHET\_PREMIUM value which we expect will be populated differently between Class 1 and Class 2 Ratchets. This needs to be considered by Shippers.   Whilst this approach does eliminate specific file changes to UK Link Users, it is acknowledged that for Users who are active in the DM SMP market, that these changes MAY require system or process changes to these Users. Users are invited to provide alternative solution options for consideration.  We are asking Users to consider and provide their views on this change and the proposed approach / options. |

# Associated Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Associated Change(s) and Title(s): | Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime |

# DSG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DSG discussion date: | 18/03/2019 |
| Any further information: | The options were discussed, and whilst it is acknowledged that this was done within the meeting and attendees were not afforded preparation time, the options presented were recognised as being pragmatic. DSG members agreed with the approach to issue an extraordinary Change Pack to solicit wider industry views on the proposed approach, noting a shortened response timescale. |

# Implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Release: | July Minor Release |
| Status: | TBC |

Please see the table below for representation comments template; responses to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

Section H: Representation Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User Name: | Kirsty Dudley |
| User Contact: | 07816 172 645  [Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com](mailto:Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com) |
| Representation Status: | N/A |
| Representation Publication: | <Publish> |
| Representation: | Reviewing the proposal our observations are as follows:   * This approach doesn’t impact as many flows as we had anticipated, we want to ensure that all flows have been reviewed to ensure no ‘surprise’ tweaks at a later date as it evolves through the change process * It is sensible to create new rejection codes for this * We raised to the proposer our concerns at 40WDs and we would still prefer 60WD but we are happy to align with the approved mod |
| Target Release Date: | We would prefer a major release however the dates are to be aligned to those approved in in the modification (subject to approval) |
| Xoserve Response: | Thank you for your comments. Please see below our responses:     * In terms of file flows, our intention is to keep the changes to a minimal and make no structural amendments. As the options and assumptions stipulated within this Change Pack are from an initial assessment only, the change must go through detailed design to confirm the final solution and the impacts to Users. * Due to the timescales associated with this change, we are proposing to re-utilise an existing rejection code to minimise the changes for Users since initial analysis suggests we have a code that would sufficiently describe the reason for this rejection. This approach has been ratified by DSG. It was suggested that we consider creating a new rejection code as an enduring solution (this would not be for the first year implementation). * As modification 0665 has been approved by Ofgem, we will deliver the solution as stipulated within the modification and aim for an aligned implementation date. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User Name: | Richard Pomroy, Wales & West Utilities Ltd |
| User Contact: | [Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk](mailto:Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk)  029 2027 8552  07812 973337 |
| Representation Status: | N/A |
| Representation Publication: | Publish |
| Representation: | We note the desire to implement this by 1st October 2019 which was clear from the consultation responses. This will inevitably mean that it is implemented in a way that causes least change to processes. This leads to the possibility that further change proposals will be raised to amend the solution at a later date.  This change is funded by DNs and NTS. Our view is that DNs and NTS  should not be required to fund future changes that incur costs due to reworking the solution if those changes could have been implemented in the initial implementation had a different implementation date been proposed.  These costs should be funded by Shippers as they are the party benefiting from an early implementation date. |
| Target Release Date: | See above comments on the risk of additional avoidable costs being incurred by implementing a minimum change solution for October 2019 compared to a more complete package in a later release. |
| Xoserve Response: | Thank you for your comments regarding the funded arrangements for any future associated changes.  We have noted this and will make Change Managers aware of this view. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User Name: | Louise Hellyer, Andrew Green |
| User Contact: | Louise Hellyer  [Louise.hellyer@totalgp.com](mailto:Louise.hellyer@totalgp.com)  01737 275638 |
| Representation Status: | Support |
| Representation Publication: | Publish |
| Representation: | *Visibility of Network Designation to Prospective Users*   * We are comfortable that the sites are not flagged in SPA files; assuming the list of sites is reasonably small. If the number were to grow significantly then a different approach may be needed. There is also some concern that this approach is out of synch with the method given for interruptible sites, but is a pragmatic approach to get this progressed. * Following that we would therefore support the inclusion of the information within the later CSS to align it more with how interruptible sites are captured and to give better longevity. * One small concern is around recipients, it would be important to ensure that the list is maintained and therefore a “no Change” email could be sent in situations where the report should be issued but that the shipper had no actions to be taken. We need to avoid a new site being added in Oct20 and not being picked up as the email was sent to an old recipient. This could also happened for Sites that no longer qualify. * To understand the customer communications would there be anything being sent to them from the Network to understand the requirement for the siteworks to get a datalogger installed (in the current world AMR would not be adequate for a SPC1 site)?   *Rejection of Nomination / Confirmation (including Reconfirmation) / Class Change*   * Although this rejection code suggested is not ideal and could generate some internal confusion we do not believe it will cause system issues. We also believe that the potential confusion can be managed reasonably easily internally.   *Outstanding Offers and Inflight Change of Shipper / Capacity Revision*   * Our preference would be for outstanding and inflight actions to continue to complete and then require processing. We believe that if this is not the case the customer could be adversely affected as they may not register for supply on the start of their contract opening them up to potential out of contract rates at their current supplier. This could also be the case of charges related to capacity revisions and being subject to incorrect rates for longer than required.   *New Ratchet Charging Arrangement*   * With invoicing the proposed method where the file format is not changed is fine. The key is no change in structure; how the value/rate is made up is something that we can work with internally. |
| Target Release Date: | We are comfortable with the target release date. |
| Xoserve Response: | Thank you for your comments. Please see below our responses:  *Visibility of Network Designation to Prospective Users*   * Thank you for confirming you are comfortable with the Network Designated visibility. * In terms of your concern, we will look to develop a suitable communications process which should provide the relevant parties with the required details. At this stage we are unable to confirm exactly how this will work but we will take into consideration your comments when this is looked at in detail. * As a Class 1 site under current UNC Code rules it would be the responsibility of the Transporter to install Daily Read Equipment and as part of the install process, it is assumed that the Transporters will trigger this reinstallation accordingly. We will ensure this is included within the process development.     *Rejection of Nomination / Confirmation (including Reconfirmation) / Class Change*   * Thank you for confirming that utilising an existing rejection code is manageable. Please note, the rejection code detailed within the Change Pack (**CLS00002 – “Supply meter point should be Class 1”),** was a suggestion and may not be the one re-utilised. This will be confirmed within the detailed design phase and communicated with a final Change Pack but following initial analysis it suggests we have a code that would sufficiently describe the reason for this rejection. * DSG have suggested that we consider creating a new rejection code as an enduring solution (this would not be for the first year implementation).   *Outstanding Offers and Inflight Change of Shipper / Capacity Revision*   * Thank you for confirming your preference for outstanding and inflight offers to progress.   *New Ratchet Charging Arrangement*   * Thank you for confirming you are comfortable with changes to the values/rates within file formats as long as there are no structural amendments. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User Name: | Megan Coventry |
| User Contact: | Megan Coventry  [Megan.coventry@sse.com](mailto:Megan.coventry@sse.com)  02392277738  (Name, Email, Telephone) |
| Representation Status: | Support |
| Representation Publication: | Publish |
| Representation: | We support this change to deliver the system requirements toward implementation of modification 0665 ‘Changes to Ratchet regime’. |
| Target Release Date: | We support implementation as part of the July Minor release. |
| Xoserve Response | Thank you for comments and confirming your support. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| User Name: | Npower |
| User Contact: | Amie Charalambous  Gas.Codes@npower.com  07917271763 |
| Representation Status: | Approve |
| Representation Publication: | Publish |
| Representation: | We are supportive of this change. |
| Target Release Date: | Support target release date |
| Xoserve Response | Thank you for your comments and confirming your support. |

Section G: Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 2346.8 – ER – DA |
| Comm Title: | XRN4871 - Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime – Part A Detailed Design Change Pack |
| Comm Date: | 14/06/2019 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For review |
| Close Out Date: | 28/06/2019 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number: | XRN4871 - Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime – Part A Detailed Design Change Pack |
| Change Class: | Functional Change |
| ChMC Constituency Impacted: | Shipper Users |
| Change Owner: | David Addison  [David.Addison@xoserve.com](mailto:David.Addison@xoserve.com)  0121 623 2752 / Mobile 07428559800 |
| Background and Context: | Modification 0665 – ‘Changes to Ratchet Regime’ has been raised and seeks to amend the current Ratchet Charging Arrangement and it allows Transporters to designate Supply Points (Network Designated sites) that should, in addition to existing mandatory Class 1 Supply Points, be subject to existing Ratchet Charges. Class 2 Supply Meter Points will be subject to a lesser Ratchet Charge.  Change Proposal XRN4871 has been raised to deliver the system requirements set out within this modification.  Due to the proposed timescales and the requirement to implement the changes by the start of the 2019 Ratchet period (October), the delivery of the change has been split in two. Part A is the minimum scope Xoserve must implement by 1st October 2019 in order to comply with Modification 0665 and Part B is the enduring solution proposed for June 2020 release.  For reference, attached is the initial Change Pack issued (inclusive of industry responses) which details our proposed approach for this change:    Please note that no changes implemented within Part A will be repeated with the implementation of Part B. Part B will be the enduring solution and replace any manual workarounds implemented within Part A.  Following the receipt of approval for the proposed solution of Part A at the June ChMC, this Change Pack seeks industry approval of the detailed change design for implementation within Minor Release Drop 5. |

# Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional: | Supply Point Administration and Invoicing |
| Non-Functional: | N/A |
| Application: | SAP ISU |
| User: | Shipper, Transporters |
| Documentation: | N/A |
| Other: | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Files | | | | |
| File | Parent Record | Record | Data Attribute | Hierarchy or Format  Agreed |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

# Change Design Description

|  |
| --- |
| Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime seeks to amend the current Ratchet Charging Methodology to create a two tier Charging Regime. It introduces a new Ratchet Charging Arrangement for Class 2 Supply Meter Points and retains the existing Ratchet Charging Arrangement but applies that only to Class 1 Supply Meter Points ,  It requires Transporters to identify Supply Points that should, in addition to mandatory Class 1 Supply Points, be subject to the existing Ratchet Charging Arrangement and therefore need to be reclassified as Class 1 by the Registered User.    The existing charge will continue to be applied to mandatory Class 1 Supply Meter Points and also to Supply Meter Points that the Transporters designate ‘as subject to the Class 1 Ratchet Charging Arrangements’ where ‘safeguards around accurate capacity declarations’ are necessary. This ‘Class 1 Ratchet Regime’ reflects the existing charging arrangements in terms of composition of the Ratchet Charges and the Ratchet Multiplier remains as is. A lesser charge will be applied to Class 2 Supply Meter Points and where the Transporters do not consider that these safeguards are necessary. The composition of the Class 2 Ratchet Charge is different and has a lower Ratchet Multiplier.  For the full modification details please go to the Joint Office link: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0665>  This detailed design Change Pack stipulates how the process will work following the implementation of Part A which involves the following system changes:   * SAP ISU: Network Designated Flag added within UK Link   *This will allow the CDSP to identify within the system the sites which the Transporters have assigned as Network Designated (ND) and which should be Class 1 and subject to the Class 1 Ratchet Charging Regime. Please note – within Part A, the ND flag will not be visible to Users.*   * SPA Validation changes   *NOM, CNF and SPC to check the ND Flag whenever there is request for class change. If the MPRN has ND Flag marked; the Shipper will be obligated to move the site to Class 1 only. If requesting for any other class; request will be rejected with existing rejection code CLS00002 - Supply meter point should be Class 1. This is to allow Shippers (or CDSP) to move ND sites which could be Class 2, 3 or 4 into Class 1. Also preventing the ND sites being moved out of Class 1.*  *Please note, our assessment is that these are central system changes only and should have no system impacts for Users. This assumption was ratified within the preliminary design and solution change packs however we are requesting Users to confirm this following the review of the detailed design change pack.*  Alongside the above central system changes, the following manual processes require implementing:   * Offline receipt of the designated sites selected by Transporters via email * Offline method to notify Registered and Prospective Users (Shippers) of the designated sites within their portfolio. This will be done via email * Offline process to notify the DMSP(s) of the designated sites (one email notification when the site is designated and one once the appeals window is closed). * Manual production of the SPC file (forced Class Change) where the CDSP has to move designated sites into Class 1 where the User has failed to do so within the defined timings. * Offline method to notify Registered and Prospective Users of their site being forced into Class 1 by the CDSP * Offline receipt of an appeal being raised by Shipper and method to notify the Transporter of this. The Shippers and Transporters will interface through the CDSP. This will be done via email. * Manual creation of the Class 2 Ratchet Charges. This will be done by removing the Class 2 Ratchet charges off the current invoices and calculate these offline using the new Class 2 Charging Regime and Request To Bill (RTB) invoice them.   Below details how we would expect the process to work:   1. **Network Designated sites being set**    1. Transporters notify  * For 2018/2019 Ratchet year, Transporters can designate sites on any day in the 6 month period commencing from the modification implementation. From 2019/2020 Ratchet year onwards, Transporters can designate sites from 01 June up until 20 business days before 01 October. * Transporters will notify the CDSP of their designated sites via email using the attached template:      * 1. **CDSP notify the Shipper User(s)**      + The CDSP will notify the Registered and Prospective Shipper User that their site has been Network Designated and confirm that the 20 business day window has started for the site(s) to be moved into Class 1.      + The notification will be sent via email to the Shipper Contract Manager   2. **CDSP apply the designation flag** * Upon receipt of the template, the CDSP will apply the Network Designation flag within UK Link. **Please note – the Network Designation flag will be applied as soon as the change has been implemented within Minor Release Drop 5 [expected August 2019]** * Once the designation flag is applied, Users can submit an SPC to reclassify the site.   1. **CDSP notify the DMSP**      + Separate to any formal notification by Transporters to DMSPs to install Daily Read Equipment the CDSP shall provide progress notifications to the DMSPs      + One notification will be issued upon initial receipt of designated sites from Transporters. The second notification will be issued confirming the site is designated and will be moving into Class 1, this is via an existing system notification – the GCC file which is sent on a Class Change via the CNF or SPC once the request has been accepted.   2. **Appeals being raised** * Shipper Users must email the CDSP using the template provided (attached above), to appeal any Network Designated site. * This must be done within 20 business days of CDSP notification of the site being designated. * The template must be populated with a reason for the appeal. * Once received by the CDSP, this will be sent onto the Transporter for a response. The Transporter will confirm their decision via email to the CDSP who will advise the Shipper Contract Manager. * If the appeal is rejected, the Network Designated flag will remain and the Shipper will have 20 business days from this point to move the site to Class 1. * If the appeal is accepted, the Network Designated flag will be removed and no further action will be required.   1. **Network Designated sites being reclassified** * Shippers are responsible for reclassifying the site to Class 1 once the Network Designation flag has been applied. * This can be done via the SPC - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENT REQUEST file or through the reconfirmation process (NOM and CNF). * Please note that existing SPC functionality will prevail which means only one change is permitted within the file. Therefore if the SPC is used to reclassify the site, no other changes can be made within the file i.e. changes to DMSOQ or DMSHQ. * If a Class 2 site is reclassified to Class 1 via an SPC, the current loads should remain - any changes to the DMSOQ will result in a rejection. * If a Class 3 or 4 site is reclassified via the SPC, the DMSOQ should be based on the NDM SOQ and the SHQ will need to be assigned. * For Shippers who would like to revisit the current site loads when the site is reclassified, they should use the reconfirmation process. * We would like to remind Users that the capacity reduction window starts on 01 October and therefore if Users would like to assess their capacity at the same time as reclassifying a designated site, this would need to be done via the reconfirmation process with an effective date within the capacity reduction period. Where increase to capacity is requested this may result in referral and this should be factored in when shippers are nominating and confirming the sites. * If this reclassification does not occur, the CDSP will manually create the SPC - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENT REQUEST file which will reclassify the site to Class 1. For NDM sites, Xoserve will utilise the NDMSOQ as the DMSOQ. CDSP will need to derive the SHQ. Normal SHQ range (i.e. where the site shall not refer specifically due to the SHQ), is between 4 and 15.9. The SHQ will be calculated by dividing the sites SOQ by a value to be agreed by the industry which will need to be a value within this range (4 to 15.9). **Users are requested to provide their views within the consultation response on what this value should be**. * Shippers will be notified of the reclassification through the SCR - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENTS RESPONSE and the CDSP will also write to the Shipper Contract Manager and confirm this has occurred.   ***Please note that for a reclassification of a site via the SPC file, it will take 5 business days from the point of file processing for the class change to take affect within UK Link systems.***   * Once the site has been reclassified and is within Class 1, the Network Designation flag will remain against the site and will prevent any further reclassifications to anything other than Class 1. The following rejection code will be used if a Shipper looks to reclassify a Network Designated site: CLS00002 - Supply meter point should be class 1.   1. **Treatment of existing Offers and Confirmation**      + If there is an inflight Confirmation on a site which subsequently gets Network Designated, the CDSP will let this resolve (accept, reject or expire) and following this start the notification process for the site to be reclassified to Class 1.   ***Please note the CDSP will not cancel inflight Confirmations as part of this change.***   * + - If there is an inflight Offer on a site which subsequently gets Network Designated, the CDSP will not cancel this Offer, it will be left to expire or alternatively when the site is Confirmed, the Confirmation will be rejected with rejection code CLS00002 - Supply meter point should be class 1.  1. **Ratchet Charges**    1. For Class 1 sites (including those that are Network Designated and have moved into Class 1), the current Ratchet charge will apply. This remains unchanged - the same rates and calculations will apply as currently within code (TPD Section G.4.7.7)    2. For Class 2 sites, (including those Network Designated sites that have not moved into Class 1 yet), the new Ratchet charge will apply. This has a different rate and will include the ECN – Exit Capacity LDZ Charge which is not currently included within the Class 1 charge (new charge can be found within TPD Section G.4.7.8)   ***Please note, as it was agreed that no file format changes would be incorporated within Part A delivery, the ECN charge will be incorporated within the ZCA – Customer Ratchet Charge. The ECN rate will therefore not be visible within the file format but included within the invoice charge.***   * 1. An offline spreadsheet will be used to calculate the Class 2 Ratchet charges.   ***Please note that for Part A, there are no proposed amendments to the RAT or PRN files.***   1. **Invoicing the Ratchet Charges**    1. Currently the Ratchet charges are automatically generated within the UK Link system and populated on the Capacity Invoice (CAZ) and within the ZCS and CZI supporting files.    2. For the new Class 2 charge, the CDSP will manually calculate the charge and raise it via a Request to Bill (RTB) as an INR Invoice which will be issued via the IX.   ***Please note the charges will therefore not be included within the Capacity Invoice or within the ZCS and CZI files.***   * 1. The supporting information for Class 2 Ratchet charges will be sent via email and based on a Ratchet Drilldown report the CDSP will use to calculate the Ratchet charges.   2. For Part A, there are two options for the Class 1 Ratchet charges:      + Options 1 – Remain as is and continue to automatically generate the Class 1 charges and issue this within the Capacity Invoice. This will mean Shippers receive Class 1 and Class 2 Ratchet charges within separate invoices.      + Option 2 – Remove the Class 1 Ratchet charges from the Capacity Invoice and RTB the amount with the Class 2 charges so both Ratchet charges are within one invoice.   ***Please note, for Part B, the Class 2 Ratchet charges will be generated from the system and included within the Capacity Invoice.***   1. New Supply Meter Points 2. For new Supply Meter Points, Transporters have 30 business days after the Supply Point Registration Date to select the site as Network Designated and the notification process will commence.   Please note that Part A (detailed above) is the minimum scope to enable us to comply with Modification 0665. Part B which is proposed for June 2020 Release will look to implement the enduring solution for this change. |

# Associated Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Associated Change(s) and Title(s): | Modification 0665 – Changes to Ratchet Regime |

# DSG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DSG discussion date: | 18/03/2019 |
| Any further information: | The options were discussed, and whilst it is acknowledged that this was done within the meeting and attendees were not afforded preparation time, the options presented were recognised as being pragmatic. DSG members agreed with the approach to issue an extraordinary Change Pack to solicit wider industry views on the proposed approach, noting a shortened response timescale. |

# Implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Release: | Minor Release Drop 5 [August 2019] |
| Status: | For Approval |

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Energy | |
| Name: | Alison Neild | |
| Email: | alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com | |
| Telephone: | 01618290039 | |
| Representation Status: | In support of the PART A solution being implemented on 17/8/19.   Preferred Options  Normal SHQ range (i.e. where the site shall not refer specifically due to the SHQ), is between 4 and 15.9. The SHQ will be calculated by dividing the sites SOQ by a value to be agreed by the industry which will need to be a value within this range (4 to 15.9). Our preference is 4.  Class 1 Ratchet charges. Our preference is Option 1 - Remain as is | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | Please can you provide clarity on the following points:  (1) Please confirm we have understood the timelines for the notification correctly as follows (has been taken from combination of the MOD and CP)  • Initial setting - 29th March 2019 (MOD approval) to 3rd September 2019. • Enduring New supply - 30 Business Days from Supply Point registration date • Enduring Existing supply (material consumption/capacity change) 1st June – 20 Business days before 1st October each year. (2) When will shippers start to receive notifications as per the initial settings above? Will this be in one go, by transporter, or drip fed as they are known. (3) In terms of the DMSP element to the process. Please can it be confirmed  • How customer contact data will be gained to arrange any necessary site visits.  • What if this cannot be achieved in 20 business days due to availability, kit installation timelines, customer refuses etc. Particularly if the site is currently class 4 and may not have daily read capability. • When does the DMSP start their process? Is this on receipt of the first notification or the second? As the second notification (being the SPC file) needs only a 5 working day window. (4) Please could you provide an indication of expected volume of sites that would need to be designated Class 1, which are currently Class 2, 3 or 4. Is there already a view of which sites these are? If so, some pre-preparation could begin now  (5) Are IGT sites included? (6) Is there a cost incurred to the shipper if the class change is a forced re-classification? (7) Where a designated site is currently Class 3 and 4 will the ratchet charge 12 month soft landing still prevail? (8) Please confirm there is no change to the PRN/RAT files and process for Class 2 sites | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments and support.  We have taken note of your preference in terms of the invoicing option and the proposed value to calculate the SHQ. This will be discussed at ChMC in June.   In terms of your outstanding queries, please see below the Xoserve reponses:   (1) Please confirm we have understood the timelines for the notification correctly as follows (has been taken from combination of the MOD and CP)  • Initial setting - 29th March 2019 (MOD approval) to 3rd September 2019. Our understanding of the modification legal text is that the Transporters will have 6 month's from the modification implementation date to designate any Class 2, 3 or 4 sites as network designated.  • Enduring New supply - 30 Business Days from Supply Point registration date Yes, this is as per our understanding • Enduring Existing supply (material consumption/capacity change) 1st June – 20 Business days before 1st October each year. Yes, this is as per our understanding (2) When will shippers start to receive notifications as per the initial settings above? Will this be in one go, by transporter, or drip fed as they are known. Once Xoserve start to receive the sites which the Transporters have identified as network designated we will notify the the relevant Shipper Users. The template detailed within the Change Pack will be used to display the MPRNs which have been designated. This same template should be used by Shippers if any appeals wish to be raised.  (3) In terms of the DMSP element to the process. Please can it be confirmed  • How customer contact data will be gained to arrange any necessary site visits.  This should be managed as per the normal process when a site changes to Class 1 between Shippers, DMSPs and Transporters. • What if this cannot be achieved in 20 business days due to availability, kit installation timelines, customer refuses etc. Particularly if the site is currently class 4 and may not have daily read capability. • When does the DMSP start their process? Is this on receipt of the first notification or the second? As the second notification (being the SPC file) needs only a 5 working day window. The CDSP notifications to the DMSP are seperate to the formal notification by Transporters to DMSPs to install Daily Read Equipment. The first notification detailed in the Change Pack is an early awareness and the second notification is as per current processes whereby the DMSP receives a file (GCC) when there is a site Class change. The DMSPs will start their processes following confirmation from the Transporters (as per current process).  (4) Please could you provide an indication of expected volume of sites that would need to be designated Class 1, which are currently Class 2, 3 or 4. Is there already a view of which sites these are? If so, some pre-preparation could begin now  As it is up to the Transporters to select sites within their network as designated, at this stage, Xoserve are unaware of the expected volumes. Once we receive visablity of the sites, we will notify the relevant Shipper Users.  (5) Are IGT sites included? No, IGT sites are not included within this change.  (6) Is there a cost incurred to the shipper if the class change is a forced re-classification? There is no individual cost incurred by Shippers where a forced re-classification occurs. The solution effort for the CDSP to manually re-classify a site via the SPC file was incorporated into the HLSO cost and will be delivered as part of the change.  (7) Where a designated site is currently Class 3 and 4 will the ratchet charge 12 month soft landing still prevail? Yes this is correct, the 12 month soft landing will prevail for any Class 3 or 4 site which is network designated and moves into Class 1.  (8) Please confirm there is no change to the PRN/RAT files and process for Class 2 sites For Part , there are no proposed amendments to the RAT or PRN files. |

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Total Gas & Power | |
| Name: | Louise Hellyer | |
| Email: | louise.hellyer@totalgp.com | |
| Telephone: | 01737275638 | |
| Representation Status: | Support | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | As a ratio for SQH/SOQ we would suggest between 8 and 10 as a standard.  Due to timeframes of processing we should be aware that there could be situations where the request to move to 1 could have rejected and timed out not allowing the shipper to try to resolve this. Some interaction and pragmatic considerations may at times be needed in that situation.  Regarding invoices during part A , our preference would be to have all the invoices on one file (Option 2), for this the excel backing data would need to be inline with the I09 record file format. | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments and support.  We have taken note of your preference in terms of the invoicing option and the proposed value to calculate the SHQ. This will be discussed at ChMC in June.  In terms of your comment related to the different circumstances that could occur, we agree that consideration needs to be given in these cases and we intend to notify and communicate with the relevant Users as soon as possible. |

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Wales & West Utilities | |
| Name: | Richard Pomroy | |
| Email: | Richard.Pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk | |
| Telephone: | 07812973337 | |
| Representation Status: | Publish | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | Regarding  f Network Designated sites being reclassified  8 If this reclassification does not occur, the CDSP will manually create the SPC - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENT REQUEST file which will reclassify the site to Class 1. For NDM sites, Xoserve will utilise the NDMSOQ as the DMSOQ. CDSP will need to derive the SHQ. Normal SHQ range (i.e. where the site shall not refer specifically due to the SHQ), is between 4 and 15.9. The SHQ will be calculated by dividing the sites SOQ by a value to be agreed by the industry which will need to be a value within this range (4 to 15.9). Users are requested to provide their views within the consultation response on what this value should be.   WWU’s view is that the ratio between 4 and 15.9 for determining the SHQ should be set by the network on a case by case basis. This process would only be used in the case that the Shipper failed in its obligation to re-classify the Supply Meter Point as Class 1 so would only be need as an exception. It is very difficult to decide on a default for this as the characteristics of the load could vary tremendously. If the value is set at 4 then it would seem to provide an opportunity for a Class 1 site to ratchet and have the SOQ ratchet to 16x the SHQ which, notwithstanding the financial impact, rather negates the purpose of moving the site to Class 1 which only occurs because of the potential impact on the network were the site to exceed its SOQ. | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments.  We have taken note of your preference in terms of the invoicing option and the proposed method to calculate the SHQ. This will need to be discussed and finalised at ChMC in June. |

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

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SSE | |
| Name: | Megan Coventry | |
| Email: | megan.coventry@sse.com | |
| Telephone: | 02392277738 | |
| Representation Status: | Support | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | No comments. | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you. |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Northern Gas Networks | |
| Name: | Helen Chandler | |
| Email: | HChandler@Notherngas.co.uk | |
| Telephone: | 07580 704 123 | |
| Representation Status: | Publish | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | **Users to confirm there are no system impacts to them from introducing the Network Designation flag.**  NGN has not identified any system changes required for the introduction of the Network Designation flag, however, we will need to introduce a new Network Designation process to identify suitable MPRNs and submit the required template to the CDSP.  **What should the value be (from between 4 - 15.9) that is used to divide a site’s SOQ by in order to get its SHQ?**  The determination of SHQ is site specific, so we do not believe it would be appropriate to assign a default value for this calculation. Engagement with the Network would be vital, especially for sites which have an existing Network Exit Agreement (NExA).  **In the interim - should (Opt 1) C1 ratchet charges remain as they are (meaning 2 invoices issued) or (Opt 2) should they be removed from the capacity invoice and included with the C2 ratchet charges within an RTB request (both charges within 1 invoice)?**  We believe that option 1 is the more appropriate option as the enduring solution (Part B) will have the Class 2 ratchet charges included within the Capacity Invoice. We see no benefit in changing the existing mechanism for the Class 1 ratchet charges if it is only to return to the original process in the future. Confirm Target | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments; we’ll ensure they are considered at Change Management Committee in July |

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): | | | MOD0665 |
| 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 Group | |
| All UK Gas Market Participants | | | | Xoserve Only | |
| One Market Group | | | | One Market Participant | |
| Primary Impacted DSC Service Area: | Service Area 7: NTS Capacity / LDZ Capacity / Commodity / Reconciliation / Ad-Hoc Adjustment and Energy Balancing Invoices | | | | | |
| 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 | Multiple DSC service lines impacted | | | | |
| 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: | 27% |