Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 2457.5 – RT - PO |
| Comm Title: | XRN4922 Review of the CSSC Shipper Business Requirements Document |
| Comm Date: | 14/10/2019 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For Representation |
| Close Out Date: | 28/10/2019 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number: | XRN4922 |
| Change Class: | Functional |
| ChMC Constituency Impacted: | All Shipper Users |
| Change Owner: | Neil Rogers |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Background and Context: | These changes relate to the overall development of XRN4627 [Ofgem Switching Programme - Shipper Consequential Change]  Ofgem has introduced the Switching Programme to deliver faster switching – including the capability for next-day switching and improved reliability of the switching process through better management and oversight of industry data. This document, along with several other associated Change Packs (see Associated Changes below), details the consequential change required to ensure that Xoserve’s systems and processes (including the wider gas industry processes and interactions) can be updated to support the changes introduced.  The purpose of this Change Proposal is to facilitate an industry review, across Shipper organisations, for the CSSC Shipper Business Requirements Document. |

# Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional: | UK Link Consequential Change |
| Non-Functional: | No impact |
| Application: | SAP ISU, AMT Market Flow, SAP PO |
| User: | Shipper |
| Documentation: | Business Requirement’s Document |
| Other: | NA |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Files | | | | |
| File | Parent Record | Record | Data Attribute | Hierarchy or Format  Agreed |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Change Design Description

|  |
| --- |
| The implementation of the new central switching service leads to a number of consequential changes having to be made within UK Link, as summarised below:   * Moving to a Supplier led switching process via CSS and removing the Shipper led confirmation process within UK Link for in-scope Supply Meter Points * Provision and capture of settlement parameters for an incoming Supplier registration from the incoming Shipper * Stakeholder changes required to support new CSS processes * Synchronisation of meter point and registration data between UK Link and CSS * Capture of Meter Asset Provider details for all installed meters * SPA data updates for Supply Meter Points   The Shipper BRD can be found here:  [Switching Programme Consequential Change - Shipper BRD v1.2.1](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7350/switching-programme-consequential-change-shipper-brd-v121-markup.pdf)  The above document presents the requirements identified during Detailed Design. |

# Associated Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Associated Change(s) and Title(s): | CSSC Programme Change Reference: XRN4627 |

# DSG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target DSG discussion date: | N/A |
| Any further information: | N/A |

# Implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Release: | CSS Implementation Date (TBC) |
| Status: | For approval |

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SSE | |
| Name: | Megan Coventry | |
| Email: | megan.coventry@sse.com | |
| Telephone: | 02392277738 | |
| Representation Status: | Support | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | It would have been useful for the change pack to include a change tracked version of the Shipper BRD v1.2, in order to be able to follow what has been updated since the previous iterations that have already been reviewed. Could this be provided in future please?  We note that in Xoserve’s response to one of the questions we submitted in relation to 2438.1 - RT - PO XRN4627 - Create Supply Meter Point and Market Sector Code (Detailed Design) in the September 2019 CSSC change pack, the answer somewhat conflicts with what is stated in the Shipper BRD v1.2.  Our previous question was: We request clarification on whether UK Link will send the MSO Flow following Market Sector Code changes, or will this be turned off (in light of CSS responsibilities here)? Xoserve answered: Xoserve is monitoring the progress of the Switching Programme CR E-49 (published after the release of this Change Pack). This was discussed at the final CSSC DSG meeting 24th September 2019 and it was provisionally agreed to descope this functionality if it is deemed a duplicate of the CSS message. In the CSSC Shipper BRD v1.2, section 5.13 on Market Sector Code Updates it is stated: “5.13.2 Where there is a change to the Market Sector Code outside of the switching process then an outbound MSO file will be issued to the registered Shipper when the new Market Sector Code becomes effective (based on the effective date provided by on the CSS registration event sync message).”  “5.13.3 Where there is a change to the Market Sector Code as part of the switching process no outbound MSO notifications will be issued to Shippers and the update will be provided directly by CSS as part of their registration notification messages and will also be included within the TMC file.”  Please can you confirm that UK Link will send the MSO flow following Market Sector Code changes only when they occur outside of the switching process, as is stated in the Shipper BRD v1.2 section 5.13.2?  Please also note minor text errors in 5.13.1 for correction, 'Shippers can no longer be submit changes', and 'as all updates should to be requested by the Supplier'. | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | REP 1.1: “It would have been useful for the change pack to include a change tracked version of the Shipper BRD v1.2, in order to be able to follow what has been updated since the previous iterations that have already been reviewed. Could this be provided in future please?”  XOS 1.1: Noted Both clean and track change versions will be available  -----------------------------------  REP 1.2: "We note that in Xoserve’s response to one of the questions we submitted in relation to 2438.1 - RT - PO XRN4627 - Create Supply Meter Point and Market Sector Code (Detailed Design) in the September 2019 CSSC change pack, the answer somewhat conflicts with what is stated in the Shipper BRD v1.2  Our previous question was: We request clarification on whether UK Link will send the MSO Flow following Market Sector Code changes, or will this be turned off (in light of CSS responsibilities here)?  Xoserve answered: Xoserve is monitoring the progress of the Switching Programme CR E-49 (published after the release of this Change Pack). This was discussed at the final CSSC DSG meeting 24th September 2019 and it was provisionally agreed to descope this functionality if it is deemed a duplicate of the CSS message.  In the CSSC Shipper BRD v1.2, section 5.13 on Market Sector Code Updates it is stated: “5.13.2 Where there is a change to the Market Sector Code outside of the switching process then an outbound MSO file will be issued to the registered Shipper when the new Market Sector Code becomes effective (based on the effective date provided by on the CSS registration event sync message).”  “5.13.3 Where there is a change to the Market Sector Code as part of the switching process no outbound MSO notifications will be issued to Shippers and the update will be provided directly by CSS as part of their registration notification messages and will also be included within the TMC file.”  Please can you confirm that UK Link will send the MSO flow following Market Sector Code changes only when they occur outside of the switching process, as is stated in the Shipper BRD v1.2 section 5.13.2?”.  XOS 1.2: Yes. This is correct UK Link will send the MSO flow following Market Sector Code changes only when they occur outside of the switching process. Please not, however, the existing MSI interface will be continue to be used for non-CSS sites only and Market Sector Amendment Request for CSS sites will receive a rejection code in the Market Sector Amendment Response file (MSO).”  ------------------------------------  REP 1.3: “Please also note minor text errors in 5.13.1 for correction, 'Shippers can no longer be submit changes', and 'as all updates should to be requested by the Supplier'.”  XOS 1.3: Accepted. Text amended.  ----------------------------------- |

Please send the completed representation response to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Centrica | |
| Name: | Bryan Hale | |
| Email: | bryan.hale@centrica.com | |
| Telephone: | 07971069822 | |
| Representation Status: | Update Required | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | Section 3 – Amend first bullet to highlight (make it clear) this is a 2 way API. API for submission of data by Shippers and Webhooks for provision of data to Shippers  Section 3 – Does the second bullet still apply? Which file formats are under consideration?  Section 3 – Does the third bullet still apply? I understood the batch approach and timings was on its way to be defined. May be this should be amended to say new batch schedule?  Should Xoserve be changed to CDSP in the diagrams to align with the rest of the BRD?  Inconsistent use of Shipper and shipper (uppercase S) throughout document  Can a statement be made regarding the scope of the diagrams. I notice these don’t include CSS updates relevant to Shippers or Supplier. This statement should refer Shippers to CSS documentation (including Abacus)   4.3 Forced Registrations – For consistency CSS message ids should be included in the diagram  4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Change “Switch Progressing” going in to 4.13 to “Switch Secured”  4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Show conditional 1 hour delay between CSS Pending and submission of BRN before going to defaults.  4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Show new ACT.C01 file from Gemini to Shipper  4.11 Opening Meter Reads – More details are required in the process to show the difference between a valid estimated read and a rejected or non-submitted (invalid) estimated read. The process map suggests all reads are estimated (11.02)  4.12 Registration Sequence Diagram – Can date and version be added for consistency  4.12 Registration Sequence Diagram – Can additional detail be added to the note related to the ASN to highlight the hours wait for a BRN before default values are used. It would also be good if the 3pm deadline for a BRN association was shown.  5.4.2 – Text needs amending as does not read correctly i.e. “Changes to the NOM file format will be amended”  5.5.1 – Are there any changes to an initial registration process to provide CSS with Meter Point Address data in support of linking the MPRN to a REL address?  5.6.4 – Refer to the RegistrationID rather than “any registration identifier”  5.6.5 and 5.6.6 – Would it be better to reference the BRN in brackets after the term “Shipper provided Settlement Data” to be clear. ASN is referenced in these paragraphs as a file. Same for other sections.  5.6.8 – Should the Secured Inactive synch message be used to trigger the TMC to the outgoing/losing Shipper? Same for other sections.  5.6.9 – Is it also worth mentioning the old Supplier and Shipper receiving the Pending and Secured Inactive notifications from CSS? Same for other sections.  5.9.2 – Are the data items not now defined?  5.9.5 – To be clear, one valid BRN per MPRN/Shipper/Supplier. This statement could be added to 5.9.12 instead?  5.9.14 – 5.9.20 – Can the default rules for initial registrations also be included, e.g. DM SOQ/DM SHQ can’t be the previous Shippers values.  5.11.5 – Can it be made clearer that only a valid D read will result in a URN, and any other read whether it be a non D valid read or invalid/absent read will result in a MBR.  5.13.2 - should be removed  5.19.1 - See 2457.3 comment relating to 5.18.1 above | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | “Section 3 – Amend first bullet to highlight (make it clear) this is a 2 way API. API for submission of data by Shippers and Webhooks for provision of data to Shippers”  Noted however the final decision on how the APIs will be implemented from a technical point of view has not been finalised.  ……………………………………………………………………... “Section 3 – Does the second bullet still apply? Which file formats are under consideration?”  This bullet point has been removed now that the design is decided upon.  ……...……………………………………………………………… “Section 3 – Does the third bullet still apply? I understood the batch approach and timings was on its way to be defined. May be this should be amended to say new batch schedule?”  This bullet point has been removed now that the design is decided upon.  …………………………………………………...…………………. “Should Xoserve be changed to CDSP in the diagrams to align with the rest of the BRD?”  A footnote has been added to clarify that in the context of this document Xoserve refers to CDSP  …...…………………………………………………………………. “Inconsistent use of Shipper and shipper (uppercase S) throughout document”  Capitalisation updated where referring to Shipper entity  ………………………………………………………………………. “Can a statement be made regarding the scope of the diagrams. I notice these don’t include CSS updates relevant to Shippers or Supplier. This statement should refer Shippers to CSS documentation (including Abacus) “  Accepted. A footnote containing the relevant links has been added to the relevant bullet point in section 2.4.2 Out of Scope  ……………...…...…………………...…...………………………. “4.3 Forced Registrations – For consistency CSS message ids should be included in the diagram”  Accepted. Diagram has been updated.  …...……...………………………………………...………………. “4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Change “Switch Progressing” going in to 4.13 to “Switch Secured””  Accepted. Diagram has been updated.  …………………………………...………………………………... “4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Show conditional 1 hour delay between CSS Pending and submission of BRN before going to defaults.”  Accepted. Diagram has been updated.  …………………...…………………………………………...…… “4.4 Supplier Switching and Change of Shipper – Show new ACT.C01 file from Gemini to Shipper”  Notes, however, file flows form Gemini are out of scope of this document  ………………………………………………...……………......… “4.11 Opening Meter Reads – More details are required in the process to show the difference between a valid estimated read and a rejected or non-submitted (invalid) estimated read. The process map suggests all reads are estimated (11.02)”  Noted, however this is a Level 2 process diagram intended to provide context for the change.  ………...……………………………………...…………...……... “4.12 Registration Sequence Diagram – Can date and version be added for consistency”  Accepted. Diagram updated  …...………………………………………………………………... “4.12 Registration Sequence Diagram – Can additional detail be added to the note related to the ASN to highlight the hours wait for a BRN before default values are used. It would also be good if the 3pm deadline for a BRN association was shown.”  Accepted. Diagram updated  ………......…………...………………………………………...…….. “5.4.2 – Text needs amending as does not read correctly i.e. “Changes to the NOM file format will be amended””  Text has been amended to make it scan better.  ...……......………......………………...…………………………….. “5.5.1 – Are there any changes to an initial registration process to provide CSS with Meter Point Address data in support of linking the MPRN to a REL address?”  Meter Point Address is provided in the CSSP RMP API when the RMP is created and when the Supply Meter Point is updated in UK Link and the changes synched across to CSS. Both of these processes trigger the REL update process in CSS.  …...……...……...…………………...……………………………...… “5.6.4 – Refer to the RegistrationID rather than “any registration identifier””  RegistrationID appended to provide clarity  …...………………………………………………………...………….. “5.6.5 and 5.6.6 – Would it be better to reference the BRN in brackets after the term “Shipper provided Settlement Data” to be clear. ASN is referenced in these paragraphs as a file. Same for other sections.”  Yes. Change here and 5.7.4  …………………...………………………………...………………….. “5.6.8 – Should the Secured Inactive synch message be used to trigger the TMC to the outgoing/losing Shipper? Same for other sections.”  Understood. This could be used. Using the Secured Active is a design decision in this process.  ...…………………………...…………...………......………...…...….. “5.6.9 – Is it also worth mentioning the old Supplier and Shipper receiving the Pending and Secured Inactive notifications from CSS? Same for other sections.”  Have updated to reflect The Losing Shipper and Supplier will both receive notifications from CSS when a registration request progresses to a registration status of Secured Inactive. However the matrix of which stakeholder receives which message at each state change is complex (i.e. Losing Supplier at validated and cancelled but not the Losing Shipper etc. ) and probably couples this BRD too closely to the CSS spec so I’ve added “Full details of the notification provided to all parties can be obtained from the CSS documentation.”  ………...……...……………………………………...……………….. “5.9.2 – Are the data items not now defined?”  Yes. Text altered to reflect finalised design.  ……...………...……...……………...………...……………………. “5.9.5 – To be clear, one valid BRN per MPRN/Shipper/Supplier. statement could be added to 5.9.12 instead?”  This statement reflects the final design and subsequent valid BRN now replace the current valid BRN although the data model you refer to does reflect an earlier design option  ………………………………...…………………...…………………... "5.9.14 – 5.9.20 – Can the default rules for initial registrations also be included, e.g. DM SOQ/DM SHQ can’t be the previous Shippers values.”  For C1 & C2 this is correct. We will require these in RRN for switch which Gaining Shipper has provided. (but for initial registration there is no default from Previous shipper to bring forwards)  ………………………………………………………………………………...... "5.11.5 – Can it be made clearer that only a valid D read will result in a URN, and any other read whether it be a non D valid read or invalid/absent read will result in a MBR.”  Updated Shipper BRD => V1.2.1 . Where a valid reading is received with a reading date that is equal to D, the read provided will be used as the Opening Reading. This reading will be provided to both the Gaining and Losing Shippers in an URN file.  ………...…………………………...…………………………….. “5.13.2 - should be removed”  domesticPremisesInd may be received from CSS outside in the RegistrationEventSynchronisation outside of a switch and will update the Market Sector Code held in UK Link  …………………………………………...………………………... “5.19.1 - See 2457.3 comment relating to 5.18.1 above”  The 5 day object window is the electricity industry objection window of five working days. A description can be found in the ‘D-4.1.6 E2E Operational Choreography v2.1’ document in the E2E Design Products section of the Ofgem Switching Programme website. |

Please send the completed representation response to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Gazprom Marketing & Trading Retail Ltd | |
| Name: | Lisa Saycell | |
| Email: | lisa.saycell@gazprom-energy.com | |
| Telephone: | 01618290077 | |
| Representation Status: | Support | | |
| Representation Publication: | Publish | | |
| Representation Comments: | For updates to the shipper/supplier relationships stated in 5.1.4 will the notification to the CSS provider be a ‘real time’ message, as is the case for the gas transporters referred to in 5.2.1. as it is required to: - Maintain shipper’s current ability to manage its portfolio size; - Data is sync’d with the CSS ‘real time’ - Validation of the ‘Change of Shipper Registration Event’ is not delayed.  Can the data items for the BRN which have already been agreed during detailed design and be added to 5.9.2?  5.9 refers to the BRN (Base Registration Nomination) as the Settlement Details Notification, is it possible to use one name for consistency?  5.9.10 Why is the BRN rejected for emergency contact details, if the switch still goes ahead the settlement data can be changed post switch via the SPC files?  5.11.6 What is the cut-off for read submission, if the read window is D+10 the read could be submitted after this date? Is the read window and the submission window the same length?  5.12 There was some discussion regarding the ability to process multiple Supply Point Amendment updates at the same time, is this no longer being considered? | | |
| Confirm Target Release Date? | Yes | | «h1\_userDataAlternative» |

# H1: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | “For updates to the shipper/supplier relationships stated in 5.1.4 will the notification to the CSS provider be a ‘real time’ message, as is the case for the gas transporters referred to in 5.2.1. as it is required to:  - Maintain shipper’s current ability to manage its portfolio size;  - Data is sync’d with the CSS ‘real time’  - Validation of the ‘Change of Shipper Registration Event’ is not delayed. “  Yes, Where it is used to “Maintain shipper’s current ability to manage its portfolio size;” it will be a ‘real time’ update to CSS.  ……………………...…………………………………………….. “Can the data items for the BRN which have already been agreed during detailed design and be added to 5.9.2?”  Yes, the paragraph now contains the agreed list of data items  …………………………………………...……………………... “5.9 refers to the BRN (Base Registration Nomination) as the Settlement Details Notification, is it possible to use one name for consistency?”  Where Settlement Details Notification is used then BRN has been added in bracket at least once per paragraph to provide clarity  ………………………………………………………………….. “5.9.10 Why is the BRN rejected for emergency contact details, if the switch still goes ahead the settlement data can be changed post switch via the SPC files?”  If the mandatory requirement for Emergency contacts is not satisfied then the BRN will be rejected as the confirmation would be today (albeit that the Registration will still go ahead without the updates from shipper being applied to the confirmation)   The shipper can submit further BRN up to cut off time to apply the contact details to the confirmation otherwise previously held Emergency contacts will be held at the site but we will not include this detail in the response files to the shipper either through ASN or TMC .   Once registration has been successful, Shippers may still amend Emergency contacts through the EMC file.   …...……………………………………...………………………. “5.11.6 What is the cut-off for read submission, if the read window is D+10 the read could be submitted after this date? Is the read window and the submission window the same length?”  Yes, read and submission window is the same i.e. D+10 (class 3 & 4)  Updated BRD => V1.2.1 with following text “If no read has been provided by D+10 then an opening reading for D will be estimated. This estimated opening reading can be replaced after this date as an agreed replacement read.”  …………………………………………………………………. “5.12 There was some discussion regarding the ability to process multiple Supply Point Amendment updates at the same time, is this no longer being considered?”  There are no plans within the scope of the Consequential Change project currently to provide the capability to apply multiple Supply Point Amendment updates. |

Please send the completed representation response to [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com)