

UNC 624 Review: Review of arrangements for Retrospective Adjustment of Meter Information, Meter Point/Supply Point and Address data (UNC624R)

Please send responses to: xxxxxx

Response deadline: 24 September 2017

Name:

Organisation:

Role/job title:

Email address:

Telephone number: .

Background

Under Modification 434 Ofgem approved the introduction of Project Nexus, the re-development of the gas central systems. Included within the scope of the new systems was the ability to retrospectively amend asset and supply point data (RAASP functionality) in the settlement process. However as Project Nexus was developed and the design and delivery was worked through, Xoserve advised that the functionality required for the introduction of the RAASP could not be delivery at the same time as the mainstream Nexus solution. Therefore Modification 573 was raised by National Grid Distribution (Cadent) in February 2016 to defer the introduction of the RAASP functionality.

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

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

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

In order to aid consideration of Modification 624R this RFI has been issued to inform the discussion of the costs and benefits of each of the options developed by Xoserve and presented on the

Relevant documents

UNC documents:

- [UNC624 and associated documents.](#)

Implementation options

Under Modification 524R Cadent has proposed that there are three options to the delivery of the RAASP functionality. These are:

1. Instructing the CDSP to implement a full systems solution (Requiring Code Modification to re- set the date identified within UNC TD IIC 23.1);
2. Instructing the CDSP to implement a manual based solution;
3. Seek to remove through Code Modification the relevant provisions of Modification 0434 (excluding Read Replacement).

In addition there is a fourth option of the “base case”, which would see the industry continue with the situation that is currently in play.

Information Requested

The tables below set out the information, which is being requested of UNC Parties, in order that the MOD524R workgroup can consider the costs and benefits of each of the options put forward by the Proposer of MOD624R and take into account any other information that is relevant.

Cost (up to 31 December 2025)

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

Option	1 Full System Solution	2 Manually based solution	3 Removal of RAASP	4 Baseline – process as at 1/6/17 (PNID)
Operational Resource(FTE)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				
Other Costs (£)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				
System Costs – operational (£)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				
System Costs – development (£)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				

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

Materiality and prevalence of RAASP use

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

Option	1 Full system solution	2 Manually based solution	3 Removal of RAASP	4 Baseline - process as at 1/6/17
Expected Rate of Error per year (/1000 sites)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				
Expected constant materiality of errors (£)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				
Expected typical resolution rate (in day)				
<i>Exp Notes</i>				

In addition can you please provide details on the following:

Historic Rate of Errors. Please indicate here the rate of error correction you have encountered prior to the implementation of Project Nexus.

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

Other implications and considerations

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

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

Implementation timescales. Could you advise what timescales you would see as optimum for the options outlined in Modification 524R? In addition could you advise of any conflicting industry or system developments that could impact on your/the industry's timeline for delivery?

Other relevant information

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

Additional Information

