



DSC Delivery Sub Group

Monday 23rd March at 10:30am
Skype Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Industry Attendees		
NAME	ORGANISATION	INITIALS
Florentina Monea	Utilita	FM
Sally Hardman	SGN	SHa
Steph Podgorski	Generis	SP
Patricia Parker	Utiligroup	PP
Elly Laurence	EDF Energy	EL
Ikram Bashir	Npower	IB
Helen Bevan	Scottish Power	HB
Niall McPherson	Shell Energy	NM

Xoserve Attendees	
Paul Orsler (Chair)	PO
Megan Troth	MT
Simon Harris	SH
James Rigby	JR
Surfaraz Tambe	ST
Michele Downes	MD

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.

Updates were given on each open action. The action log

Action	Owner	Update
With regards to XRN4990, JB stated that there initially wouldn't be an auto notification to inform Shippers of sites that need to move to Class 4 (Shipper then has 20 WD to do this). JB to confirm if Xoserve would provide a report to state which sites we have actioned on behalf of the Shippers and to confirm how this would look	Xoserve/James Barlow	23/03/2020 - JB to confirm this at the April meeting
In regard to XRN4990 JB to confirm how any enduring costs of applying class change would be recovered and distributed.	Xoserve/James Barlow	23/03/2020 - PO to discuss with Ellie Rogers and James Barlow to request clarification on proposed service line structure and charging arrangements.
In regard to XRN4679, Simon Harris explained that the frequency of LDZ changes is fairly low therefore did not think system changes were justifiable. To confirm whether we could gain some stats on this to get some further understanding of the scenario.	Xoserve/Simon Harris	23/03/2020 - SH to confirm this at the April meeting
Regarding June 2020 Release, PO to identify where the linkages lie between changes that impact CSS and how this will work with the development of changes and confirm whether this will be done in a CSS forum or elsewhere.	Xoserve/Paul Orsler	PO will update with more succinct response in relation to file format changes and any impact to CSS change with the implementation of BAU changes for the April meeting – there will need to be impact assessments done to understand the changes made to accommodate any inconsistencies.

2. Changes in Capture

2a. New Change Proposals – Initial Overview of the Change

2a.i. XRN5116 - Domestic Report - Must Read Prenotification

PO gave an overview of change which can be found [here](#).

2a.ii. XRN5120 – MAP to UKL Monthly Comparison Service

PO gave an overview of change which can be found [here](#). MAP comparison service is something we do directly with the MAPs which allows us to compare data provided by MAPs – no proposal for this to update UKL

2a.iii. XRN5121 – Supplier Portfolio Service

PO gave an overview of change which can be found [here](#). PP asked if CDSP would expect a Shipper to notify the Supplier of this service or will XOS speak to Suppliers. PO explained that we would not expect Shippers to notify Suppliers, we suspect we would be having these conversations to inform Suppliers.

2a.iv. XRN5123 – DSC Service Description Table cosmetic change to Service Line Table v10

PO gave an overview of change which can be found [here](#).

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

2c. Undergoing Solution Options Impact Assessment Review – None for this meeting

2d. Solution Options Impact Assessment Review Completed – None for this meeting

3. Changes in Detailed Design – None for this meeting

3a. Design Considerations – None for this meeting

3b. Requirements Clarification – None for this meeting

4. Major Release Update

4a. June 2020

JR explained that, in the event of shippers deciding not to take part in MT for XRN 4850, that Xoserve could create the necessary files to facilitate a partial MT exercise. DNO and iGT reps have voted in the extra ChMC meeting 5th March to carry on with MT in this event. JR asked the shipper reps attending DSG if they were planning to take part, but they indicated that they weren't.

EL asked if we had had a steer from Ofgem on whether there will be a delay on Releases given the current working conditions. PO stated we had not yet had this steer from Ofgem, however we imagine that there will be more of a steer if BAU processes are impacted as this would take priority. Surfaraz (ST) stated that project team are drawing up scenarios given the current working climate around COVID-19 and this will be going to ChMC and DSG in April in case there are any delays to June 20 release.

PO stated we will take an action to investigate how we are communicating with Ofgem with relation to the current working conditions and where change sites as a priority with other things (e.g. BAU processes) and whether there will be a release delay.

ST stated that he had spoken to EL in relation to 4850, and there is a request from CDSP for Shippers to send the end consumer details over the first few weeks of June 20 implementation in a phased approach to limit impact to systems. EL stated this came on the back of a question to the project team on whether all details were needed for day one.

4b. November 2020

PO gave an overview of the slides for November 2020. In relation to 4780c (Inclusion of Meter Asset Provider Identity (MAP Id) in the UK Link system) SH confirmed that we are actively engaging with MAMs to start receiving data regarding MAP IDs. It is proposed that we will receive a copy of the data that MAMs send to Suppliers (which they are obligated to do so) which will contain the relevant MAP information which can then be used to supplement MAP data from the Shippers into UKL via standard RGMA flows. This means that we will get the information from the MAMs, store this and wait for the Shipper to process a matching RGMA, if there is no MAP ID provided from the Shipper within their RGMA flows we will look to utilise the MAM data to populate the MAP Id into UK Link. SH confirmed we are only using this data to gain the MAP ID as MAMs are obligated to provide this to Suppliers should the Shipper not provide this. Shippers are still responsible to provide this data via RGMA flows and these would always take precedent over MAM updates. We did not want to create new interfaces with the MAMs if we can utilise a current flows so the proposal is for them to provide a copy of ONJOB/ONUPD flows. EL asked a question regarding timelines, and whether the scenario would be that if the Shipper should not provide a valid MAP ID to us within X number of days, this would then be populated? SH confirmed that this mechanism is still to be finalised formally but we would hold the MAM data so it's ready to use if needed once the Shipper provides a corresponding RGMA flow, if no flow is received from the Shipper we would take no action. EL asked why we are using this data from the MAMs if we cannot use this to update system asset data without the Shipper telling us to do so, therefore does this data become redundant. PO stated the responsibilities regarding this data needs to be defined and discussions surrounding the population of MAP Id in MAM flows will be discussed at SPAA in the coming weeks. SH stated that if MAMs do not provide this MAP ID to Supplier or to the CDSP then there is nothing we can do, however this may be mandated through the SPAA agreement.

PO stated that November 20 still on track overall. With regards to the Representation windows, the detailed design change packs will be issued in April, and there is currently no plan to extend representation deadlines and asked if there were any comments from DSG on this. EL stated she is ok with the current timelines, however this depends on the amount of change packs and how manageable this is. DSG ok with current timelines, no concerns raised.

4c. XRN4914 – MOD 0651- Retrospective Data Update Provision

PO gave an overview of these slides and stated that we have taken cuts from Shipper data and MAM data. These cuts were then compared against UKL. We have received over 9 million meter points for comparison. We are now undertaking a 'Deep Dive' analysis to look into discrepancies against each meter point, and the potential reasoning behind these Retro assessable mismatches. Slide 40 within the DSG deck highlights what we will be doing next in relation to Retro.

4d. Minor Release Drop 6

A high level overview of the slides was given. PO explained this was delivered on 29th February 2020.

5. Retail and Network Delivery Overview

PO gave an overview of slides for R&N Overview. No concerns from DSG on this item.

6. Issue Management

6a. AQ Task Force Update

MD gave an overview on the AQ taskforce slides. MD explained that immediate attention has been on resolution and root cause analysis of defects. Defects are still being raised however this is slowing down. Updates will be continually given at all appropriate customer forums. PP asked if we know how many MPRNS equate to each of the statuses of the open / unresolved defects. MD stated this is currently unknown, however this analysis will be taking place at the analysis stage and the team will be engaging with customers accordingly. This will need to be done continually to identify the amount of MPRNs affected until the fix is deployed, however there is still a decision to be made on how often this analysis is to be done.

6b. Issue with AQ Calculation for Class 3 Meter Points

MD talked through the slides provided and explained the issue. Updated slides are attached below to give a more accurate view of the issue:



AQ%20Calculation%
20Issue%20for%20Cl

Any questions in relation to this issue can be sent to the Issue Management team at box.xoserve.IssueResolution@xoserve.com.

Helen Bevan asked if we have any idea how many sites are affected, however MD explained that this is not currently known.

MD asked DSG what they would like us to do next, whether this be more analysis on impact, or more in depth analysis on the options. PO asked if this is being picked up by AQ taskforce, MD confirmed this is being picked up by the taskforce. EL asked if this would be resolved if the sites would be moved to Class 4 (as per the change 4990 that will automatically move sites from Class 3 to Class 4 should the read obligations are not met). EL stated that if a Shipper submits regular reads (as per Class 3 obligations) then this issue will not arise, and when 4990 is implemented the sites will be moved into Class 4 automatically should they not submit regular reads, also negating the issue. This issue may be temporary however the materiality needs to be assessed. The materiality of the issue which will help DSG come to a decision if any action needs to be taken. The 'do nothing' option would be supported given that 4990 is implemented but this would depend on outcome of the analysis and how soon 4990 is implemented.

MD to provide further analysis on materiality for the next DSG meeting.

This was the end of 23rd March DSC Delivery Sub Group meeting. Next Meeting: **(Monday 27th April 2020)**

If you have any questions relating to the above meeting minutes, please email uklink@xoserve.com