Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 2439.3 – RT - PO |
| Comm Title: | Amendments to MRF\_TYPE\_CODE description field to provide additional clarity |
| Comm Date: | 16/09/2019 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For Approval |
| Close Out Date: | 30/09/2019 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number:  | N/A |
| Change Class: | Documentation |
| ChMC Constituency Impacted: | Shippers |
| Change Owner:  | Max Pemberton (Customer Advocate Representative)max.pemberton@xoserve.com 0774 262 3186Simon Harris (Customer Change Representative)simon.harris@xoserve.com 0121 623 2455 |
| Background and Context: | Following customer feedback, a description change is required within inbound file format documents to add in additional context to the MRF\_TYPE\_CODE description field. This change is looking to provide more clarity to describe the conditions under which the field becomes Mandatory (as the OPT specifies it as an Optional data item) that is causing confusion on when data is required to be provided. |

# Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional: | None |
| Non-Functional: | None  |
| Application: | None |
| User: | Shipper |
| Documentation: | File Format Description Change Only |
| Other: | N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| Files |
| File | Parent Record | Record | Data Attribute | Hierarchy or FormatAgreed |
| **NOM** - NOMINATION REQUEST FILE | N/A | S48\_SMP\_NOMINATION\_REQ | MRF\_TYPE\_CODE | F |
| **CNF** - CONFIRMATION REQUEST FILE | N/A | S42\_SSP\_CONFIRMATION | MRF\_TYPE\_CODE | F |
| **SPC** - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENT REQUEST | N/A | C38\_CLASS\_CHANGE | MRF\_TYPE\_CODE | F |
| **SPC** - SUPPLY METER POINT AMENDMENT REQUEST | N/A | S34\_MRF\_AND\_BATCH\_FREQ\_CHNAGE\_REQUEST | MRF\_TYPE\_CODE | F |

# Change Design Description

|  |
| --- |
| **Overview**Following a number of discussions with Shippers representatives, it has been highlighted that there is a need for additional contextual information to be provided for the Meter Read Frequency data item within inbound SPA files. The data item MRF\_TYPE\_CODE within a number of SPA Record/File Type currently has it’s OPT (Optionality) set as Optional. This is accurate however in some instances this data item becomes Mandatory and the description does not currently contain context to provide additional clarification on this point that is leading to confusion and additional SPA rejections for Shippers. This change pack highlights the proposed changes to related File Formats to mitigate this and will seek approval at ChMC in October for the changes to take immediate effect. **Detail**System rules exist during file/record validation where the MRF\_TYPE\_CODE can be considered a Mandatory data item if the Supply Meter Point is being nominated into the Class 4 Product as the Meter Read Frequency is specified by the Shipper and has to be provided for this Class. For Class 1, 2 & 3 only one Meter Read Frequency value is valid for each of these Class Products and therefore is considered optional in these instances as the Shipper does not have to provide a Meter Read Frequency value for these Class Products. If the Meter Read Frequency is not provided within SPA files for these Class Products then UK Link system will defaulted to the only allowable value for each (clarification below):* For Class Product 1 & 2, the MRF\_TYPE\_CODE should always be Daily (D) and the system will assign the MRF to [D] if the field is left blank
* For Class Product 3 the MRF\_TYPE\_CODE should always be Monthly (M) and the system will assign the MRF to [M] if the field is left blank
* For Class Product 4 the MRF\_TYPE\_CODE can be selected as either, Monthly (M), Six Monthly (6) or Annually (A), and therefore no default value can be assigned by the system, the System User must provide the relevant instruction within the record in order for the SPA File to be accepted and processed. However for Class 4 Sites with an AQ greater than 293,000kwh then M is mandated and must be selected

**Proposed Amendments**The following marked up Record Type files have been provided for System Users to review and comment upon. Approval to be sought at ChMC with the files being set to LIVE straight after approval has been granted. [S48\_SMP\_NOMINATION\_REQ (.NOM)](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7234/s48_smp_nomination_req-nom.pdf)[S42\_SSP\_CONFIRMATION (.CNF)](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7235/s42_ssp_confirmation-cnf.pdf)[C38\_CLASS\_CHANGE (.SPC)](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7236/c38_class_change-spc.pdf)[S34\_MRF\_AND\_BATCH\_FREQ\_CHNAGE\_REQUEST (.SPC)](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7238/s34_mrf_and_batch_freq_chnage_request-spc.pdf)**Additional Information** It is proposed that amendments are only made to inbound File Formats, this is due to the CDSP either always having a Meter Read Frequency to populate due to the above specified rules of defaulting for certain Product Classes or the data item only containing a playback of submitted Meter Read Frequency value from System Users on outbound file formats.For clarity, the below file formats/record types contain the data item [MRF\_TYPE\_CODE] but are NOT affected by this change due to the reasons specified. **Outbound Files - CDSP to Shipper****ASP** - Core Amendments Inv Supporting Information **CZI** - Core Capacity Individual SMP Supporting Information **ZCS** - ZCS Core Capacity Invoice Supporting Information **Outbound Files - CDSP to Transporter****EWS** - EWS File to EMWS **Record Type contained in Outbound Files - CDSP to Shipper****S03** - SMP MRF AND BATCH FREQ CHANGE (.SCR) **S04** - SP MRF CANCELLATION (.SCR) **S07** - ACCEPTED CONFIRMATION (.CFR) **S10** - SMP WITHDRAWAL NOTICE (.CFR) **S15** - TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP (.TRF) **S16** - REJECTED SSP CONFIRMATION (.CFR) **S21** - SMP NOM REJ OR REF (.NMR) **S59** - ACCEPT SMP ENQUIRY (.NMR) **S64** - OFFER DETAILS (.NMR/.NRF) **T04** - NTFN SMP AQ REVISION (.NRL) **X09** - CLASS CHANGE RESPONSE (.SCR)**MRF\_TYPE\_CODE data item Mandatory on Inbound Files (Shipper to CDSP)****S35** - CANCEL MRF AND BATCH FREQ CHANGE REQ (.SPC) |

# Associated Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Associated Change(s) and Title(s): | None |

# DSG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target DSG discussion date: | 16th September 2019 (For awareness) & 30th September (?) for Rep Review |
| Any further information: | None |

# Implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Release: | Following ChMC Approval (9th October 2019) |
| Status: | For Approval |

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to uklink@xoserve.com

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF Energy |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence |
| Email: | eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com |
| Telephone: | 07875117771 |
| Representation Status: | Approve with comments |
| Representation Publication: | Publish |
| Representation Comments: | Whilst we appreciate that these documents are currently incorrectly showing MRF as an optional field whereas it's Conditional Mandatory and therefore need updating, we are disappointed that this was not picked up by Xoserve, especially given the comprehensive work that was done as part of Nexus regarding file formats. We would therefore like to request an imminent review of file formats is done to ensure that there is nothing else that is incorrect. As i'm sure Xoserve appreciate - we build system processes relying on what is stated in the file formats and so errors like this can be costly but are totally avoidable if the documentation is up to date. Whilst we appreciate other documents have these details it is not always possible to reflect these back fully to the file formats for parties to assess such issuesIn addition to this we would like it noted that the process associated with requiring MRF to be populated at the NOM flow stage is not suitable, on the basis that AQ value is not easily available utilising legacy processes. It would be more suitable to have the MRF in the S38 record on the CNF flow - mirroring the SSP registration process.  |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation relating to MRF\_TYPE\_CODE Description Change. The data item MRF\_TYPE\_CODE is currently displaying the optionality as “optional”, please note that this denotes it not being a mandatory data item so therefore the optionality of ‘O’ is correct. We do however appreciate that this is not always clear as what denotes conditional mandatory especially without Context being clearly specified. We are assessing options about how this could be made more transparent to recipients and originators of UK Link Communications. As you would imagine that this will be a significant task to retrospectively apply to the interface definition, therefore we will need to consult extensively before we embark on this. |

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com