



# DSC Delivery Sub Group

Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> August at 10:30am  
Microsoft Teams Meeting

## Meeting Minutes

Industry Attendees		
NAME	ORGANISATION	INITIALS
Helen Bevan	Scottish Power	HB
Daniel Kearney	Utilita Energy	DK
Eleanor Laurence	EDF Energy	EL
Niall McPherson	Shell Energy	NM
Patricia Parker	Utiligroup	PP
Ikram Bashir	N Power	IB

Xoserve Attendees	
Paul Orsler (Chair)	PO
Megan Troth	CS
Jaimee LeResche	JLR
Kate Lancaster	KL
Joanne Williams	JW
Kathryn Adeseye	KA
Florentina Avram	FA

Slides available [here](#).

## **1. General Meeting Administration**

### **1a. Welcome and Introductions**

### **1b. Previous DSG Meeting Minutes and Action Updates**

Paul Orsler (PO) introduced the meeting and the minutes from the previous meeting were accepted and approved by DSG.

## **2. Changes in Capture**

### **2a. New Change Proposals – Initial Overview of the Change – None for this meeting**

### **2b. Change Proposal Initial View Representations – None for this meeting**

### **2c. Undergoing Solution Options Impact Assessment Review**

#### **2c.i. – XRN 5379 - (Modification 0710/ IGT Modification 148) - Class 1 Read Service Procurement Exercise**

Kate Lancaster (KL) introduced the change and stated that the change pack is currently out for this. KL presented the slides (available in the slide deck) to attendees and that we are looking for views on the initial requirements. KL introduced these requirements to the attendees (full details available in the slide deck).

KL asked the group if there were any additional views on the requirements presented and encouraged customers to provide their input via the change pack route. PO stated that we are using the change pack as one route to gather views but this is also being communicated at customer forums.

### **2d. Solution Options Impact Assessment Review Completed**

#### **2d.i. – XRN 4900 - Biomethane Sites with Reduced Propane Injection**

PO presented the slides and introduced the change. PO also stated that this is currently out for solution consultation and customers can provide their view via the change pack process. PO gave an overview of the single solution option that has been provided which is detailed in the slide deck. Helen Bevan asked which classes this option related too, PO confirmed this just relates to Class 1 and 2 sites, and where these Biomethane injections can only currently use Class 1 and 2 sites.

EL asked, as this is similar to the HyDeploy Trial, and in that trial there was no consideration to support different calorific values, and this was dealt with through voluntary payments, therefore why is this change being carried out as a trial process

to support site specific calorific values, rather than using a similar process to what HyDeploy is using. PO stated that the difference with HyDeploy was that there was several hundred meter points on the HyDeploy trial, most of which are domestic properties (Class 3 and 4) with different meter reading history arrangements, and HyDeploy trial is a committed amount of time running for 12 months, at the end of which the sites will no longer receive hydrogen and will move back to natural gas, which is why the AQ backstops were put in place to protect the AQ from becoming inflated, however with the biomethane sites (and as the increase of renewable energy appetite grows), we are looking at a more enduring solution that can support these pilots over the next few years. PO also explained that several of the candidate sites on the Biomethane trial have been live for a while and if the Networks were in a position to remove the obligation on enriching the gas with propane, as long as the energy source is sustainable, there wouldn't necessarily be a need to revert back to the legacy arrangements, therefore things such as voluntary compensation payments become less palatable over time as this change hopes to ensure customers are charged accurately first time. EL asked how many sites there are in this category – PO explained that he cannot give too much away with regards to commercial sites, however there are a couple of sites where biomethane is a by-product of a consumption site, and is feeding a handful of downstream meter points that are Classes 1 and 2, therefore there doesn't seem to be a large amount, as the biomethane isn't directly feeding the wider network, therefore supports site specific energy calculation processes, and there will be a few select sites to pilot this to begin with. EL also asked that this links into the impact of site specific CVs to the Supplier/Shipper to these particular sites that are in this project, as the Supplier would have to use the site specific CVs in their energy calculations for billing, and it doesn't mention much in the change pack regarding the impact to Shippers and Suppliers and how the file transfers will work for billing for these sites. EL also added that they assume the site specific CVs will be document in the SC9 file as this file continues to be used as normal, however this is a big assumption. PO stated this wouldn't specifically be the case as the SC9 file is used for LDZ Flow-weighted average CVs, and for several reasons several types of sites would not be included in the flow-weighted average calculations. PO stated that EL point is valid, and that there is an engagement piece to be done for these types of energy going into the network and being supplier to end consumers, and we are currently at the discovery stage for this and it is to be further understood. EL reinstated that their key point is the impacts to Shippers and Suppliers needs to be considered and clearly communicated, as it is currently missing from the Change Pack.

#### ***2d.ii. – XRN 5231 - Provision of a FWACV Service***

PO gave an overview of the change proposal and the single solution option given. PO explained that, as this is a new service, it has been difficult to analyse how this will impact our systems and processes, so the solution option given is based around how we think the new service will work. Further lower level details of the solution option can be found in the slide deck. PO explained we are not yet at a stage where we can understand high level costs, and this will be confirmed once detailed design has been established. No concerns from DSG on this change at this stage. EL stated

that NG host an interface that provide calorific value data that will need to be retained, PO stated we are proposing to retain this service as is (the data needs to be continually provided in some way).

***2d.iii. – XRN 4978 - Notification of Rolling AQ value (following transfer of ownership between M-5 and M)***

KA stated that the change pack has been issued for this change detailing solution options, and gave an overview of the change proposal. KA provided an overview of the solution options given (further details can be found in the slide deck). With regards to solution option 1, EL stated that it may take some further time to investigate the change impacts, so they may not be able to provide feedback in time for the change, however they suspect that Minor Release will not be enough notice time for them.

EL stated that if the original option given previously was discounted for not meeting a key requirement (Does not meet customer requirement to issue updated AQ/SOQ/EUC values as soon as possible), if the other options also do not meet the requirement, why are they still on the table, which indicates that the option was discounted more around the file size rather than not meeting the requirement. KA agreed that this wording on slide 8 was not the best choice of words and that the file size was the primary reason for discounted this option 1b. PO stated that we need to ensure that any options we choose to progress, we will ensure we get the buy in from a wider customer group, and if we don't we are running the risk of delivering only a sub-optimal solution. EL stated that the critical thing with solution option 1 is that the analysis of impact in their organisation will take longer than normal and a minor release will not be suitable. PO stated that, to be clear, we are only asking at this state the method of delivery, not necessarily when it is to be delivered at this stage, e.g. if this will fit into a minor release, it doesn't necessarily mean it will be in the next available minor release and potentially one in the future. EL stated that her only concern was that it stated in the change pack that it was the next minor release, however this is just a suggestion.

EL asked, with regards to option 2, if a new file type is being created they don't see how this can fit into a minor release, and there are some concerns on the use of IX to deliver reports. KA stated that this comment has been taken on board and has gone back to the Service provider to give clarification.

With regards to option 3, EL confirmed that the impact is the same as option 1 apart from how this is managed internally. KA explained that this does produce the same external output as option 1.

KA continued to go through the final solution option for this change (full details available in the slide deck). EL stated that, for all options, they need to go away and look at how large the impact is for this and how many sites this relates too, and if the number of sites is small, they are happy for a smaller more simple solution, however if the impact is larger, this will impact which option they favour.

HB highlighted that they are edging towards option 1 and will give their input via change packs this week. IB stated that from an N Power perspective they have already fed in their input directly with James Barlow.

EL stated that, internally, there has been a discussion around a 5th option which changes the TRF file to trigger the prospective AQ/SOQ/EUC if the transfer of ownership takes place between the NRL generation and M-1. PO explains this was likely discounted by our service provider due to the complexity of the change being greater than the .NRL file option. KA/PO to go back to service provider to find out their reasons for not including this as a potential solution option and will respond direct to EL.

#### ***2d.iv. – XRN 5186 - Modification 0701: Aligning Capacity booking under the UNC and arrangements set out in relevant NExAs***

JLR presented the slides, along with the solution options provided. Full details are available in the slide deck. No concerns from DSG on this change, and attendees were encouraged to provide their view via the change pack process.

### **3. Changes in Detailed Design**

***3a. Design Considerations – None for this meeting***

***3b. Requirements Clarification – None for this meeting***

### **4. Major Release Update**

***4a. Minor Release Drop 10 Update***

PO went through the project update as detailed in the slide deck. The project is currently running as green with no concerns from DSG.

***4b. June 2021***

PO went through the project update as detailed in the slide deck. The project is currently running as green with no concerns from DSG.

***4c. November 2021***

PO went through the project update as detailed in the slide deck. The project is currently running as green with no concerns from DSG.

### **5. Change Pipeline**

PO presented this agenda item. PO provided an overview of the Changes in flight and progressing through pre-capture, initial review and capture. PO advised that the timeline is available to view in the slide deck, subject to customers wanting a deeper view.

## **6. CMS Rebuild**

Jo Williams (JW) gave an update on the CMS rebuild as per the slides (all details can be found in the deck). JW explained that all customer forums are being targeted to ensure customers are up to date on the project, and proceed topic specific forums will be held with customers and the invites will be issued accordingly.

JW also gave an update on the summary of how the rebuild detailed analysis will be carried out (as detailed in the slide deck) and that outputs will be shared through the CMS DSG sessions that will be held.

## **7. AOB**

No AOB for this meeting.

This was the end of 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2021 DSC Delivery Sub Group meeting. Next Meeting: (Monday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2021)

If you have any questions relating to the above meeting minutes, please email [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)