Section D: High Level Solution Options

# D1: Solution Options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | [**Link to CP**](https://www.xoserve.com/change/change-proposals/xrn-4780-inclusion-of-meter-asset-provider-identity-map-id-in-the-uk-link-system-css-consequential-change/)  **Overview**  The UK Link system will be responsible for providing the Meter Asset Provide Identifier (MAP Id) to CSS. Provision of notifications to MAPs is a cornerstone of the CSS design and therefore any degradation of data will impact the efficacy of these notifications.  XRN4780 Part B originally had several requirements within scope, however during solution consultation, a number of representations were received raising concerns about the approach outlined, specifically for the ongoing maintenance of the MAP Id data item which lead to this element being de-scoped from XRN4780 Part B (June-2020) for further consideration.  As some of the requirements within XRN4780 Part B were required to support CSS testing, it was decided to deliver these in June 2020 and the ongoing maintenance of MAP Id implemented in November 2020.  Following representations received we have descoped notification of Supplier change to MAPs. This has been removed from scope of any variant of XRN4780.  The proposed Solution Options outlined in the attached HLSO document are not exclusive and though should be made around the possibility of implementing both options 2 & 3 for a complete all-round solution.  Due to risk to maintain MAP Id or RGMA information we recommend implementation of Solution Option 3 (with the Shipper also retaining the ability to update MAP Id via RGMA (Option 1)).  **Solution Option 1:** Do Nothing  This solution option will not introduce any functional changes to how MAP Id updates are handled within the CDSP systems from what was/is being implemented under Part A & B. This means that RGMA flows from Shippers, with MAP Id being optional will remain the only means to maintain MAP Id data in UK Link Systems.  This solution will have the lowest system impact to UK Link systems but will require input to industry systems to ensure MAP Id is populated in line with RGMA specifications in SPAA.  As part of XRN4780 Part B, Meter Asset Providers have been tasked with providing the CDSP with portfolio data (MPRN/MSN etc) to allow the bulk population of MAP Id within CDSP systems, something that was discussed and agreed with the Shipper community. However, post this bulk data load is a concern that, if the MAP Id updates remain optional within RGMA flows, and no other way to update this, the data held within the UK Link systems will degrade. For context, due to the purpose of how JOB files are treated, if no MAP Id is provided within the file, then the incumbent MAP Id if present will be removed and left blank once the JOB file has been processed (less risk with UPD due to rolling over the existing MAP Id if one is not provided).  Since implementation of Part A in June 2019, only 69k MAP Ids are now recorded on UK Link systems but more than 2.6m RGMA flows have been successfully processed in the same period.  **Solution Option 2:** Mandate MAP Id updates via RGMA flows  This solution option is looking to make MAP Id (MARKET PARTICIPANT segment, ASSPR - Asset Provider) a mandatory data item within inbound RGMA (ONJOB/ONUPD) flows for certain types of updates (i.e. Installs/Exchanges/Updates, not for Removals/Repositions).  RGMA transactions would be rejected back to the submitting party if the [ASSPR - Asset Provider] data item is missing or incorrect (as per current rule to check provided value against CDSP held MAP Organisation List). A new rejection code will be introduced to highlight to the submitting party the reason for the RGMA rejection to aid in resubmission if required.  This solution option presents a risk to Meter Asset data quality within CDSP system if a step change in MAP Id provision is not demonstrated as volume of RGMA transaction rejections would increase.  **Solution Option 3:** MAP Id direct updates via Meter Asset Providers  This solution option will allow the Meter Asset Provider to update the MAP Id data item directly into UK Link where they have identified a data discrepancy, however RGMA flows received from the Shipper will take priority over direct MAP updates.  This would entail the following new interfaces and respective responses:  a. **[MAP to UK Link]** - MAPs to update UK Link on individual asset with MAP Id details, would only be carried out if validation rules are met (i.e. MAP MSN = UKL MSN) with response file confirming outcome of attempt  b. **[UK Link to MAPs]** - MAPs to be notified for updates on assets they are to be assigned to due to RGMA Flows sent by Shippers (Install, Exchanges, Updates) and Direct MAP Flows  c. **[UK Link to Shippers]** - Shippers to be notified of the MAP Id updates on their MPRN portfolio when processed via Direct MAP Flows. This is expecting to utilise existing organisation notification records.  For clarification, Meter Asset Providers will **not** be updating asset details (or any other data) within CDSP systems, only the data item MAP Id shall be updated as part of the proposed direct MAP updates.  We note that some users had reservations about MAPs updating the MAP Id on their Supply Meter Points. We could, as part of this solution, propose a configurable table that would allow Shippers to prevent MAP Direct updates where the Shipper has indicated that they will take sole responsibility for managing this information, thus rejecting any attempt by the MAP to update the MAP Id on their Supply Meter Points.  [**Link to HLSO Documentation**](https://www.xoserve.com/media/7916/xrn4780-partc-high-level-solution-option-assessment-v10.pdf) |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | Solution Option 3 |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | TBC (DSG 27th January 2020) – Extended consultation window to ensure discussion at DSG |
| Consultation closeout: | 10/02/2020 |

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | EDF |
| Name: | Eleanor Laurence |
| Email: | eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com |
| Telephone: | 07875117771 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We believe that any of the options presented here should not be progressed without changes to RGMA processes used by MAPs/MAMs.  We cannot see how we as a supplier/shipper can fulfil our obligations to 1 – provide MAP ID as a mandatory data item (option 2), or 2 - uphold industry data quality of metering information inc MAP ID where MAMs are not mastering the data as part of the asset information (referring to option 3 limitations) We feel that this CP should not be progressed without the end to end processes across industry being defined including the MAMs who should be responsible for updating the supplier with MAP ID at the same time as the Asset information they already provide suppliers. MAMs should master the data – they should be enforced to communicate the data to each other as part of the CoS process and should provide any updates to the supplier who would then pass to shipper and update CDSP (option 2) We would like to see a process implemented that works across all industry participants that should be involved in the process and that works for the future along with trying to streamline processes where possible with the electricity industry and as a result - as a standalone change we will reject all of these options, but would prefer to see option 2 implemented alongside the other industry changes mentioned - without these we could not fulfil option 2. | |
| Implementation Date: | Reject | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Reject | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Reject | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, the details contained within this will be discussed at ChMC and approval sought to move into delivery for an agreed solution option. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | OVO Energy |
| Name: | David Morley |
| Email: | david.morley@ovoenergy.com |
| Telephone: | 07817250252 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Overview  We have chosen the option to defer the implementation date and proposed solutions for reasons that we have set out below.   We believe:  -MAP IDs need to be held in a centralised database,  -This database needs to be accessible by all affected parties (Shippers, MAMs, MAPs) -It should be mandatory to update this data -A last updated history should be available -The performance of updating the MAP should be monitored by a performance assurance board -If we cannot mandate the MAP to update the MAP ID under UNC/SPAA, this should fall on the shipper -The effect that any change will have on the relationship between MAMs, MAPs, and Shippers must clearly be thought about and worked through in detail with all affected parties prior to the implementation of any change  Main points  -We have concerns that the MAPs will update MAP ID data without oversight from any performance assurance body. Mandating that MAPs become signatories to the UNC and/or SPAA would bring them under the UNC’s PAC or REC PAB. Without a performance assurance mechanism, we believe that there is the ability for unchecked misuse of the functionality that is proposed by XRN 4780 Part C.  -If this performance assurance is in place, as proposed in point one above, we are tentatively OK with MAPs being able to update MAP IDs (and only MAP IDs), as long as we can override the MAPs with the flag, as proposed within XRN 4780 Part C.  -Failing the points made in point two, we are supportive of mandating Shippers to update the MAP ID via RGMA flows.  -In consideration of solution B or C of XRN4780(c), we do not feel as though MAM processes (as found within the RGMA Baseline) have been duly considered, and believe that a thorough examination of the effects of this modification on MAMs should take place to guide the final solution  -We believe that there is need for clarification on what changes would be made to RGMA processes (for example, how would obligations on the MAM/Shipper to send RGMA flows be set), how these changes would take place (eg what timescales would be mandated; what rejection codes would be implemented, if any), and, importantly, why specific changes (such as timescales, and rejection codes) are required.  -Furthermore, if the MAP updates the MAP ID on Xoserve, how will the MAM and Shipper be informed of the update? We propose that this functionality would need explicit clarification prior to option 3 of XRN 4780 (c) being approved for implementation. | |
| Implementation Date: | Defer | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Defer | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, the details contained within this will be discussed at ChMC and approval sought to move into delivery for an agreed solution option. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Centrica |
| Name: | Oorlagh Chapman |
| Email: | Oorlagh.chapman@centrica.com |
| Telephone: | 07557614769 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Solution 1 – Reject, this solution would create a backlog of blank MAP IDs similar to the blank MAM IDs we have due to a similar approach. This has caused much work for industry and would be best avoided for MAP ID.  Solution 2 – Reject - We cannot support this solution, it is of greater importance metering updates are held by Xoserve, more than they receive an updated MAP ID. Delaying metering updates may lead to incorrect data being provided to Shippers when they gain supply of a meter point.  Solution 3 – Centrica Preferred option. It would be preferable, as a Shipper, that we only receive notifications of an update to a MAP ID, i.e. where it has changed, rather than duplicate updates made by MAPs. It is not clear from the document how this would be managed. we remain concerned about any large volume updates and would like Xoserve to confirm how these will be managed, i.e. if there was a change in ownership of a number of meters between two MAPS as a single update. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, the details contained within this will be discussed at ChMC and approval sought to move into delivery for an agreed solution option. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SSE Energy Supply Limited |
| Name: | Megan Coventry |
| Email: | megan.coventry@sse.com |
| Telephone: | 02392277738 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We support this change. Our preference is for solution Option 3. We note that Option 2, although not our preferred option, also has merit in providing a robust method to the update of MAP IDs. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, the details contained within this will be discussed at ChMC and approval sought to move into delivery for an agreed solution option. |

# E1: Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Npower Ltd |
| Name: | Alison Price |
| Email: | alison.price@npower.com |
| Telephone: | 000 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We are most supportive of Option 3 (Xoserve's preferred solution), as this covers all elements i.e. control, disputes and a complete process. Currently the MAP is a non-mandatory item, and this has led to this position and the requirement for a solution, which is partly because Suppliers aren't always aware or in a position to manage. Option 3 places more control of this item with the MAM, and they are best placed to take MAP ownership.  If Option 2 is favoured, then we would expect additional changes to be brought into the MAMCoP to ensure that MAMs are given greater responsibilities to liaise with the Supplier help resolve anomalies, disputes and maintenance of the MAP Id.  We do not support Option 1. | |
| Implementation Date: | Approve | |
| Xoserve preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| DSG preferred solution option: | Approve | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# E2: Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, the details contained within this will be discussed at ChMC and approval sought to move into delivery for an agreed solution option. |