High Level Solution Options Change Pack

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 3177 – VO – PO |
| Comm Title: | XRN5605 - Amendments to the must read process (IGT159V) - Solution Change Pack |
| Comm Date: | 22/05/2023 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For Representation |
| Close Out Date: | 06/06/2023 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number: | [XRN5605](https://www.xoserve.com/change/customer-change-register/xrn-5605-amendments-to-the-must-read-process-igt159v/) |
| \*ChMC Constituency Impacted: | Shipper, All Classes  Independent Gas Transporters  \*Assumed impacted parties of the proposed change, all parties are encouraged to review |
| Change Owner: | [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com) |
| Background and Context: | IGT Modification 159 – Amendments to the must read process has been raised to update the IGT must read process to ensure it is fit for purpose. This includes making the following changes:   * Placing a timeframe on the must read being provided by the IGT to ensure is aligns with the current validation window. * Allowing Shippers a mechanism to exclude SMPs from the IGT must read process which have a known meter issue preventing reads being obtained. * Excluding SMART, AMR and DCC Active SMPs from being included in the IGT must read process. * Where there is a Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) or Change Of Shipper (CoS) event, allow a 4 month pause in the relevant SMP(s) entering the IGT must read process. * Ensuring Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) are provided the relevant information about the IGT must read process.   Details of IGT 159V can be found [here](https://www.igt-unc.co.uk/igt159-amendments-to-the-must-read-process/)  The attached High Level Solution Option (HLSO) document defines the options, for customer review and representation, to deliver the objectives of the Change Proposal. |

# Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | The below HLSO document contains the details of the options being presented to customers to deliver XRN5605 - Amendments to the must read process (IGT159V). These solution options are then summarised within this pack for context and to further support the customer review and representation process.    As per the HLSO document, there are 3 solution options presented for review – with a sub option available under Option 1 (described as 1a and 1b).  Each of these options delivers the defined customer requirements but present differing ways in which customers can interact with the CDSP and, as such, differing delivery timescales.  Under all options the following features can be delivered:   * Enhancement to the must read process to cater for Supply Meter Points (SMP) under the following scenarios (as defined within the modification):   + Smart device on site   + Meters flagged as having an issue   + Change of Shipper (also Change of Supplier not within the modification rules)   + A Supply of Last Resort (SoLR)event * Where a meter issue flag is raised whilst an open must read contact is present for the associated Supply Meter Point (SMP), this will be displayed in the Contact Management System (CMS) * Reporting, via DDP to the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC), on SMPs excluded/paused from the must read process for the new reasons specified within the modification * Enhancements to DDP to update existing must read reporting and add new reporting views:   + New Shipper meter issues report for IGT sites in the Shipper’s portfolio.   + New SMP details page for IGTs     - These views are expected to allow for the extract of 50k data records   The differences within the options are specifically around how changes to the meter issue flag are communicated between the submitting party, the CDPS and the non-submitting party. These differences are summarised below:  **Option 1 - XRN5605 uses CMS (split into sub-options 1a and 1b)**  Under this option, it is proposed that Shipper Users and IGTs would log changes to the meter issue flag via a new contact within [new] CMS, this could be done for single SMPs through the CMS user interface or in bulk via the Bulk Contact Logging (BCL) file. The flag would be passed through the CDSP estate to support the must read pre-notification and notification processes and reporting, including new DDP dashboards to provide all parties with a clear view of flags that have been set or un-set.  Sub option 1a is presented here and proposes to issue notifications via the IX interchange to Shipper Users and IGTs to inform that meter flags have been set or un-set. As this option utilises the IX a defined file format would be required and, as such, an extended lead time may be required for implementation.  Sub option 1b, which uses DDP to provide a visual notification in a self-serve manner, would not require the implementation lead time due to IX file/record formats, however both 1a and 1b require changes to the BCL file to support the bulk logging of contacts. Should an extended lead time be required by customers to make the required changes to this file then delivery approach options could be presented to update the BCL file later than the main implementation, should customers want an earlier implementation of the core functionality.  **Option 2 – XRN5605 uses Industry Flows**  This option proposes to introduce new file/record formats into the UK Link Manual for Shipper Users and IGTs to utilise to advise the CDSP of changes to the meter issue flag on SMPs. This solution would also support the notification back to both parties that a meter issue flag has been set/un-set.  As per option 1a, as this requires new file/record formats to be created in the UK Link Manual then customers may require a longer lead time in order to implement. The target implementation date would have to account for this lead time.  **Option 3 – XRN5605 uses Industry Flows with sFTP**  The approach proposed by option 3 is similar to that within option 2 with the main difference being that a new sFTP connection would be utilised rather than the IX. This allows for some more flexibility within the file formats to be used in the process.  In line with statements above, even though there is more flexibility in managing these file formats, customers may still require a period of time to assess and develop a complementary solution.  In addition, sFTP services would need to be set up for all Shipper Users and IGTs in order for them to utilise the service. This would require engagement from all concerned in order to ensure the services are configured and connection established. In future, for new market entrants, there may be an additional cost for the service to be set up and this would be included as part of the onboarding process.  **General**  Requirements:   * Modification IGT159V states that SMPs that go through a Change Of Shipper or Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) event will be paused from entering the must read process for 80 Supply Point System Business Days but does not account for a Change of Supplier only event. The solutions cater for this and it is proposed the same rule is applied. * Currently the legal appointment date of a SoLR is not recorded within central systems and all central updates are managed through the standard registration processes. As such the solutions propose utilising the registration date to drive a pause in the must read requirement.   Customer feedback and representation is encouraged on these requirement related points ahead of the design phase.  There is one discounted option detailed within the HLSO and this was to use Portal to submit updates to the meter issue flag. This has been discounted as it would see additional applications and processes become integrated within the must read process, increasing complexity and, potentially, future maintenance costs. The option is included for visibility and customer review.  In all options, for the delivery of the DDP related changes, there is a cost range of £0 - £50k where the changes are delivered within an existing Sprint and Release. This range is to account for the unknown detailed requirements of PAC related reporting.  It should also be noted that if the work required to deliver the DDP changes cannot be accounted for within an existing, planned, Sprint alongside other customer priorities then additional sprint scope may be required which will incur further costs, these are available within the HLSO document.  **Implementation Timeline**  Option 1b would allow for implementation during November 2023, as has been presented to Change Management Committee (ChMC) with consideration given to the delivery of any changes to the BCL file.  Based on the assumption that customers would require a longer lead time where new file/record formats and/or new connection methods are proposed then options 1a, 2 and 3 would not meet a November 2023 delivery timeline and require further scope discussions. |
| Proposed Implementation Date: | Option 1b – Nov-23  Option 1a, 2 and 3 – For discussion |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | All options deliver on the defined customer requirements and do this in differing ways and as such customers should consider which best suits their needs. It should be noted that option 1b provides a CMS centric solution and is, potentially, deliverable more quickly than the remaining options. |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | To be presented and discussed at DSG on May 22nd. |

# Service Lines and Funding – for each option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing | Service Area 4 – Meter Read/Asset processing  Service Area 22 - Specific Services. |
| Level of Impact | ~~Major/ Minor/ Unclear/~~ None |
| Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix | Data permissions require review to support reporting to the PAC |

Industry Response Solution Options Review

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | BUUK Infrastructure |
| Name: | Kundai Matiringe |
| Email: | Kundai.matiringe@bu-uk.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 07976545102 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Comment 1, Option 1 - using CMS is the only option we would consider - Surely this was already part of the Must Read and CMS re build as we use CMS to currently notify of any meter issues. How will the CMS costs be reflected within the subscription model? DDP is not a suitable solution and must be removed. We are concerned that there was no mention of how a refreshed monthly must read 'pot' will be facilitated. A monthly pot will reduce any unnecessary reads and costs to end consumers.  Comment 2, Option 2 is unsuitable, costly and not needed as CMS works well.  Comment 3, Option 3 would mean setting up another channel for receiving data (SFTP), not ideal, as this would sit outside the current SSP file processing, it would also be costly.  Comment 4, Option 2/3 are out as internal system changes are not cost reflective, particularly as change not a benefit to IGTs. o How is this change linked to Service Lines – no service line for IGTs and Must Reads? o How is the new cleansed pot of reads being updated? This will result in a much larger MR ‘pot’ each month. What do Xoserve do with the data received?  Shippers should be included on the MJO/MJI file - this would mean billing is more accurate at the point of a must read generation. | |
| Implementation Date: | approved | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | defer | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | defer | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Comment 1 - Xoserve response - We can confirm that the scope of CMS Rebuild incorporated a number of known pain points and improvements to the current Must Read process - these included the need for a refreshed 'pot' of must reads to be made available to IGTs on a monthly basis. IGT159V introduces additional scope which can be delivered via any of the proposed solution options that are presented - with associated high level costs and delivery options being included within this change pack for customers to consider and make a decision upon via DSC Change Management Committee.  Comment 2 - Xoserve response - thank you for your comments – these will be provided in to ChMC to support a decision on the Solution Option.  Comment 3 - Xoserve response - thank you for your comments – these will be provided in to ChMC to support a decision on the Solution Option.   Comment 4 - Xoserve response - any changes to the proposed Service Lines would look to be raised at a later date once full understanding of the detailed design are confirmed - expected to be approx. August 2023. To confirm, the known Must Read pain points and process improvements that were understood and discussed at the CMS Focus Groups are included within the scope of CMS Rebuild project and will be introduced alongside the scope of IGT159V. |

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Indigo Pipelines Ltd |
| Name: | Cher Harris |
| Email: | cher.harris@ss.com |
| Telephone: | 07747559101 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We do not support any solution that introduces new files for IGTs (including the BCL file which we do not currently use) as this will introduce additional cost for us but for no benefit. We already provide site notes about meter issues in the current MJI file, so we believe the current file is adequate to meet the Shippers’ requirement. CDSP should already be passing these comments on to the Shipper and this information could then be used by the Shipper to request CDSP exclude these meters. We do not need to be notified that a meter has been excluded, we should only receive relevant required must reads (in the MJO file). We also have no desire for new IGT DDP dashboards relating to Must Reads. As such, we do not support any of the options outlined above and feel all 3 options are overly complex and costly solutions for the relatively straightforward requirements of IGT Mod 0159. | |
| Implementation Date: | approved | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | reject | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | reject | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your comments.  The existing MJI file interface does not cater for Shippers or IGTs in recording a known meter issue and providing this information to the opposite party. To do, as outlined under IGT159V 'A specific process for excluding sites with known issues preventing a read from being obtained' has been created. This specific process requires a new mechanism to be introduced to allow both parties to raise and remove known meter issues - independent of the Must Read process. This in turn allows for the known meter issue information to be recorded, notified to the opposite party, and used in the Must Read process in accordance of the rules set out in IGT159V.  IGT159V specifies that the CDSP shall notify the Pipeline Operator and Pipeline User of known meter issues where these have been identified. Additionally, to ensure IGTs have the most up to date infromation when coordinating must read activity, any known meter issues that are raised against in-flight must reads will be flagged to IGTs in there respective must read portfolios.   Solution Option 1b proposes to use DDP as the mechanism to notify the corresponding party (Shipper or IGT) of the presence of a meter issue - whereas Options 1a, 2 and 3 are introducing new interfaces to allow for the known meter issue details to be notified to the corresponding party - This allows appropriate provisions to be in place, ensuring obligations set out in IGT UNC Section E, paragraph 11.5 - 11.6 inclusive, can be complied with.  It should be noted that these notifications are independent to the must read process and can be used in whichever way parties deem appropriate - the mechanism to record the meter issue is itself being used to automatically update must read processes - by excluding sites that would otherwise triggered must read activity from being generated and alerting IGTs to the presence of a meter issue for any in-flight must read sites.  In order for a solution to be progressed through to implementation, DSC Customers will be asked to make a decision on a preferred solution option at June ChMC. |

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SEFE Energy |
| Name: | Lisa Saycell |
| Email: | lisa.saycell@sefe-energy.com |
| Telephone: | 07860408770 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Support Option 1b | |
| Implementation Date: | approved | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | approved | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | OVO |
| Name: | david morley |
| Email: | david.morley@ovo.com |
| Telephone: | 0 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | 1b - the solution will provide sufficient functionality to enable IGT159V and do so on the closest date (Nov). | |
| Implementation Date: | defer | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | defer | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | defer | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

# 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. | We are in support of option 1b for the reason this flag is for the MUST read process only IGT's/Shippers use.  Option 2 would have been our preference if the meter fault flag was used in wider processes, however I am aware in UNC there is already such a flag. | |
| Implementation Date: | approved | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | approved | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

Change Management Committee Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | Approve | Reject | | | Defer |
| Approved Solution Option | Deferred until the E-ChMC on 16/06/23 | | | | |
| Industry Consultation: | 10 Working Days | | 15 Working Days | | |
| 20 Working Days | | Other [Specify Here] | | |
| Date Issued: | 22/05/2023 | | | | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 3177.1 - VO - PO | | | | |
| Number of Responses: | 7 | | | | |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Please select. | |
| National Grid Transmission | | | Please select. | |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Please select. | |
| IGT | | | Please select. | |
| Meeting Date: | 09/06/2023 | | | | |
| Proposed Release Date: | Adhoc | | | | |

Approved Solution Option

# Approved Solution Option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Details: | N/A |
| Implementation Date: | 01/01/0001 |
| Approved By: |  |
| Date of Approval: | 01/01/0001 |

**Version Control**

**Document**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
| V1 | Deferred | 14/05/2023 | Kate Lancaster | Updated following ChMC deferral |

**Template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks | Approved By |
| 1.0 | Approved | 09/03/2022 | Rachel Taggart | Initial Review Change Pack transferred to own document | Change Management Committee on 09/03/2022 |
| 1.1 | Approved | 25/04/2023 | Rachel Taggart | Updated with new font branding | Emma Smith |