

**DSC Change Proposal**

**Change Reference Number: XRN4645**

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour

Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section A1: General Details** | | |
| **Change Title** | The rejection of incrementing reads submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA flows) | |
| **Date Raised** | 03/04/2018 | |
| **Sponsor Organisation** | Xoserve | |
| **Sponsor Name** | Sat Kalsi | |
| **Sponsor Contact Details** | [sat.kalsi@xoserve.com](mailto:sat.kalsi@xoserve.com) | |
| **Xoserve Contact Name** | David Addison | |
| **Xoserve Contact Details** | [david.addison@xoserve.com](mailto:david.addison@xoserve.com)  0121 623 2752 / Mobile 07428559800 | |
| **Change Status** | Proposal / **With DSG** / Out for Consultation / Voting / Approved or Rejected | |
| **Section A2: Impacted Parties** | | |
| **Customer Class(es)** | Shipper  National Grid Transmission  Distribution Network Operator  IGT | |
| **[Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "WHAT – What is the required change? WHY – Why is the change needed? WHEN – Detail when the solution should be started/implemented.  )** | | |
| An issue has been identified where following Project Nexus Implementation Date (PNID). Xoserve has received in excess of 3500 RGMA transactions where the User has provided a Meter Information Notification (JOB transaction) or Meter Information Update Notification (UPD transaction) to reverse an isolation of a Capped or Clamped Supply Meter Point but that the reading provided in the transaction has incremented from the reading provided at isolation.  When a User indicates that the Supply Meter Point is isolated, they are indicating that it is not capable of flowing gas (UNC Section G 3.4), and therefore an incrementing reading is not expected following such isolation. Other reading processes reject any incrementing readings.  Where a User submits an RGMA transaction to reverse the isolation the initial JOB or UPD transaction is currently being processed, and the UK Link system is being updated with the Metering Information contained within the transaction. However, given that the User has informed the CDSP that the Supply Meter Point is not capable of flowing gas this has been excluded from allocation processes, and therefore any attempt to reconcile the Supply Meter Point creates an error within the invoicing process. As such these items are being currently excluded from the Amendment invoice.  This is causing issues with the daily volume and energy calculated for reconciliation  A proportionate solution needs to be developed to support the ability for Users to retain the ability to notify where a Meter is not capable of passing gas (UNC Section G3.4) but reduce the risk to downstream processes and the wider industry. | | |
| **Proposed Release** | **RX / DD/MM/YYYY** | |
| **Proposed Consultation Period** | 10 Working Days  20 Working Days  30 Working days  Other: | |
| **[Section A4: Benefits and Justification](C:\\Users\\Rebecca.perkins\\AppData\\Local\\Microsoft\\Windows\\Temporary Internet Files\\Content.Outlook\\EXD06YFG\\Change_Proposal_Template v2.0.docx" \o "Benefit Description: What, if any, are the intangible and tangible benefits of the change?Benefit Realisation:When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised? Benefit Dependencies:Detail any dependencies that are outside the scope.)** | | |
| **Benefit Description**  *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?*  *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?* | |  |
| **Benefit Realisation**  *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?* | |  |
| **Benefit Dependencies**  *Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change, this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the projects has not got direct control of.* | |  |
| **Section A5: Final Delivery Sub Group Recommendations** | | |
| *Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.* | | |
| **Final DSG Recommendation** | Approve / Reject / Defer | |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY | |
| **Section A6: Funding** | | |
| **Funding Classes** | Shipper XX%  National Grid Transmission XX%  Distribution Network Operator XX%  IGT XX% | |
| **Service Line(s)** |  | |
| **ROM or funding details** |  | |
| **Funding Comments** |  | |
| **Section A7: CHMC Recommendation** | | |
| **Change Status** | Approve – Issue to DSG  Defer – Issue to Consultation  Reject | |
| **Industry Consultation** | 10 Working Days  20 Working Days  30 Working days  Other: | |
| **Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)** | XX/XX/XXXX | |
| **DSC Consultation** | | |
| **Issued** | Yes  No | |
| **Date Issued** |  | |
| **Comms Ref(s)** |  | |
| **Number of Responses** |  | |
| **Section A8: DSC Voting Outcome** | | |
| **Solution Voting** | Shipper Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain  IGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain | |
| **Meeting Date** | XX/XX/XXXX | |
| **Release Date** | Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA | |
| **Overall Outcome** | Approved for Release X / Rejected | |

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | 16th July 2018 / 6th August 2018 |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| 16th July 2018    Quick update provided by DA – slides 58 to 59. Exceptions still being received @ 4-5k  No vote provided against Class A – didn’t have problem with solution but issues being implemented outside of major release.  Would have to overcome principles re reconciliation against a read sent in to us.  Are there any views in DSG?  LW commented that it would be a complex build and complex testing – one is higher scale option than the other.  DA stated he has asked for an updated version of the materiality of this issue – how much gas is this impacting.  6th August 2018  [Click here](https://www.xoserve.com/index.php/dsc-delivery-sub-group/) to access the DSG Material on Xoserve.com  DA presented this agenda item to DSG.  DA stated that he didn’t have any statistics to present; the acquisition of the statistics was in progress on 6th August. These statistics will show where we have materiality. In less than 10% of the instances, the materiality is less than 100 kWh. The average is 3,700 kWh. DA stated that the likelihood of these sites commissioning gas is small. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | TBC |

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | 20/08/2018 |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| [Click here](https://www.xoserve.com/index.php/dsc-delivery-sub-group/) to find the presentation pack.  SH presented slides 47 to 49. The purpose of this section was to inform DSG members of an action from previous DSG regarding the materiality of consumption during the isolation period. SH presented the preliminary data findings on slide 48. On average, there are 8 valid reading during the isolated period. 10% of Supply Points included in the investigation have a consumption figure of less than 100kWh.  SH presented the two solution options on slide 49:   * Original solution proposal was to reject the RGMA transaction, indicating that an incrementing reading was included in the transaction * Accept the transaction as it was expected that this was small volumes of gas associated with commissioning (data findings indicate that this is not the case in most instances)   SH asked DSG for their views on the above solution options in light of the data findings. Elly Laurence (EL) stated that the best solution would not involve rejecting accurate readings. JB questioned whether reconciliation principles would need to be amended. LW said that this is more material than what was originally envisaged; it has been sent to the UIG team for investigation. LW suggested exploring automation of reads being received, continuing to reject reads in the short term, and generate reports.  At the moment, this issue generates exceptions which require manual monitoring. BC asked how many sites are affected. Simon said 9,000. SH stated that Dave Addison (not present) is working on process options as well as technical actions.  EL asked if these instances are associated with a particular Shipper or across the industry. Rachel Hinsley (RH) said that it’s evenly spread across the industry. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | TBC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | 20/08/2018 |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| [Click here](https://www.xoserve.com/index.php/dsc-delivery-sub-group/) to find the presentation pack.  David Addison (DA) presented this section to DSG. This section attracted significant DSG discussion; therefore, greater detail will be included in the minutes. To summarise, DA presented several preliminary data findings, on slide 29, to support DSG discussion regarding the possible solution options on slides 30 to 31. DSG agreed that given the data findings, they were satisfied that was not commissioning gas. After much discussion, Xoserve agreed to take an action away to identify scenarios regarding the data of the current population to articulate necessary tasks to resolve data prospectively. This will enable Shippers to assess the solution options. Shipper attendees at DSG agreed to investigate their portfolios to identify a quantity of their sites which are isolated but receiving reads.  **Action 0850: - DSG (Shippers) to identify the quantity of sites, within their portfolios, that are impacted by the issue associated with XRN4645: The rejection of incrementing read submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA Flows)**  **Action 0851: - David Addison to identify scenarios associated with each of the solution options associated with XRN4645: The rejection of incrementing read submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA Flows). These solution options can be found on slides 30 to 31** | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | TBC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations** | |
| **DSG Date** | 04/03/2019 |
| **DSG Summary** | |
| David Addison (DA) had hoped to come back with scenarios. However the scenario’s given were beyond the scope of XRN4645 and missing solution options. DA didn’t want to come with a view of problems without having proposed solutions. Apologies for having to defer for another couple of weeks. | |
| **Capture Document / Requirements** | INSERT |
| **DSG Recommendation** | N/A |
| **DSG Recommended Release** | TBC |

**Document Version History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | **Author(s)** | **Summary of Changes** |
| 2.0 | Draft | 10/08/18 | Xoserve | DSG comments from the meeting on 6th August added to section C |
| 3.0 | Draft | 24/08/18 | Xoserve | DSG comments from the meeting on 20th August added to section C |
| 4.0 | Draft | 20/09/18 | Xoserve | DSG comments from the meeting on 17th September added to section C |
| 5.0 | Draft | 04/10/18 | Xoserve | Change Request add to a Change Proposal |
| 6.0 | Draft | 11/03/19 | Xoserve | DSG comments from the meeting on 4th March added to section C |