DSC Delivery Sub Group

Monday 19th December at 10:30am
Microsoft Teams Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Industry Attendees		
NAME	**ORGANISATION**	**INITIALS**
Ben Mulcahy	Northern Gas	BM
Joanne Rush	SSE	JR
Jo Hargreaves	Centrica	JH
Kirsty Dudley	EON	KD
Sally Hardman	SGN	SH

Xoserve Attendees	
Paul Orsler (Chair)	PO
Simon Harris	SH
Chan Singh	CS
David Addison	DA

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 representatives. The Action Log was reviewed, and it was confirmed that there are no open actions at present.

Action: Chan to update the website with the previous minutes October and November 2022 meetings.

2. Changes in Capture

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

2a.i XRN 5595 – Changes to the REC Switching Operator Outage Notification Lead Time (R0055)

SH presented this agenda item. SH provided an overview of this Change. This Change is looking to amend the lead time for notification of authorities for the switching operator from 10 working days to 8 working days. This will alleviate some of the confusion around a couple of the category documentation under the REC, that state 10 working days and some 8 working days. Therefore to ensure consistency within the documentation, this Change was raised by the DCC under the REC to just 8 working days. SH advised impact assessments have been conducted on this to ensure the 8 working day lead time can be allotted. SH added that with the impact assessments conducted so far, no external impacts have been found to DSC customers. SH advised that due to this, as a switching data service provider, the CDSP needs to amend processes surrounding interactions with the CSS provider to ensure this is reflected.

SH added that this has been aligned to the February release as there are no system changes or any functional changes related to this. Furthermore, SH advised that once implemented, a CCR will be issued for approval at the ChMC meeting following the report being complete.

2a.ii REC Update – Late Gate Closure Messages and Missing Messages

DA presented this agenda item. DA provided an overview and background to this agenda item. Since CSS implementation, there have been a number of missing messages were expected to come through from CSS that Xoserve has not received. This includes up to current 190 messages that are now missing. Therefore, that will mean that there are circumstances where registrations will have gone live on CSS that we will not have updated within UK link systems. This is clearly a problem because CSS is mastering the registrations.

- Xoserve have reported 93.75% (Sub average volumes) and 80% (Average to Peak volumes) success against the REC Performance Assurance target for October of all messages being received within target each day – 4 days with missed messages

    – Xoserve believe that these have all related to Supplier-less Supply Meter Points, so expect this to be a different functional issue.

DA added that for all of the instances that Xoserve have failed to meet target, it was because of missing messages and so that that target is effectively saying Xoserve need to respond to every missing message, every secured active notification within a 20-30 minute period depending on volume.

BM asked DA why these missing messages are being assessed against Xoserve's performance metrics as the response time is outside of those metrics due to messages being missing. DA advised that the metrics are poorly worded but added that Xoserve must respond to 100% of secured active messages within 20 minutes. Therefore it does not define received messages that require a response but any message that exist. DA also added that there was an issue they were hoping for did not occur, however it did, involving DCC not reporting the messages. This occurred for the first two months and to be as transparent and visible as possible, Xoserve have had a number of conversations with parties where they have questioned why Xoserve have willingly reported an SLA failure. DA advised that in this circumstance, they wanted to shine a very clear and distinct light on the fact at the DCC messages were not coming through to Xoserve, therefore giving that level of transparency was helpful.

In addition, DA advised that when looking at Pot 2 within the presented slides, Xoserve take responsibility for the missing messages on the 2nd August 2022 as they had been rejected due to a drift between Xoserve's architecture and the CSS architecture. There is a view that Xoserve's architecture was a second behind in terms of the clock timing on the virtual server.

DA added that CSS has to create loads of virtual machines, so it'll sit ticking away with a base load of virtual servers and when it gets into the gate closure window, which is at 5:00 o'clock what it will do is it will spin up new instances of virtual servers to process the volume of messages that they need to cope with. This is many millions of messages between 17:00 and 17:20. DA explained that what they will do is spin up these new servers and as Xoserve start to receive those messages, their servers will also spin up virtual servers and what happened on the 2nd of August was when Xoserve were creating these virtual server instances. The clock time of our virtual servers drifted by half a second, because we are exchanging messages with the CSS servers at around 400 milliseconds, that drift meant that Xoserve servers thought that the messages were coming from the future and so it thought it was relating to future dated UM gate closure messages and so on the 2nd of August they rejected 199 of them incorrectly.

DA advised that Xoserve are still waiting on the reconciliation position for all of the missing messages. Xoserve are expecting that the majority of them will be registrations that should go live on UK link.

DA proposed the following option/s in order to support and fix this issue:

• We will set the 'missed Registration' Live prospectively for any missed messages for Switches***

    – If there has been Registration subsequent to the CSS Effective Date, or another Registration is imminent (within **D+[5]** calendar days) – we will not process the 'missed Registration'.

• Still require reconciliation from Switching Operator.

- We have progressed these proposals whilst we wait for confirmation of which Registrations need to be set Live.

- We are developing a system solution to generate the Registration in UKL in lieu of the Secure Active Notification from CSS.

  - This should reduce risk of manual error in the process.
  - Simulate the Secured Active Notification to enable UKL processes (e.g. association with Base Registration Notification) to remain as is.

*** Xoserve are looking at applying the Registration in line with CSS dates for Initial Registrations (TBC)

- If there are updates to the Supply Point from the current Shipper that have yet to become effective (e.g. future dated Capacity Changes; MRF Changes; Class Changes) these will be cancelled – this is a BAU process, we will not provide any further information to the incoming (prospective) Shipper.

  - We expect that this is data related to the previous Shipper Supply Point so not required.
  - If this is required, this will give us a Data Permission challenge to make a new set available to the 'Community' Shipper.

- The UKL Registered Shipper has updated the Supply Point Register post the CSS Registration EFD – these will be retained in UKL (and will not be backed out).

  - If we need to provide the information related to these updates to the incoming (prospective) Shipper, we will need to identify the type of updates that are required to be provided and make reporting available.
  - We have seen small numbers of accepted transactions but the type of transactions considered are:
    - o Meter Readings (9); AQ Corrections (1); Class Change (1) and Meter Asset Updates (1).
    - o Customer Contact Updates – if required, we could just flag that there has been an update, rather than content of update.

  - If this is needed, suggest we agree release of this data explicitly through DPM.

- The UKL system has rejected updates to the Supply Point Register post the CSS Registration EFD from the Prospective Incoming Shipper (i.e. CSS Registered Shipper)

  - Propose that we collate the rejected information and provide to the Incoming Shipper (to assist them to determine what activities they need to resend: MAM Updates (7); SMSO Update (3); Readings (12); Meter Asset Updates (7).
  - Propose we flag the Supply Meter Points where a Customer Contact Update has been rejected

DA also added for customers that there are a number of challenges that have been listed within the presentation slides

- If there are updates to the Supply Point from the current Shipper that have yet to become effective (e.g. future dated Capacity Changes; MRF Changes; Class Changes) these will be cancelled – this is a BAU process, we will not provide any further information to the incoming (prospective) Shipper.

- We expect that this is data related to the previous Shipper Supply Point so not required.
- If this is required, this will give us a Data Permission challenge to make a new set available to the 'Community' Shipper.

- The UKL Registered Shipper has updated the Supply Point Register post the CSS Registration EFD – these will be retained in UKL (and will not be backed out)

  - If we need to provide the information related to these updates to the incoming (prospective) Shipper, we will need to identify the type of updates that are required to be provided and make reporting available.
  - We have seen small numbers of accepted transactions but the type of transactions considered are:
    o Meter Readings (9); AQ Corrections (1); Class Change (1) and Meter Asset Updates (1).
    o Customer Contact Updates – if required, we could just flag that there has been an update, rather than content of update.
  - If this is needed, suggest we agree release of this data explicitly through DPM.

- The UKL system has rejected updates to the Supply Point Register post the CSS Registration EFD from the Prospective Incoming Shipper (i.e. CSS Registered Shipper)

  - Propose that we collate the rejected information and provide to the Incoming Shipper (to assist them to determine what activities they need to resend: MAM Updates (7); SMSO Update (3); Readings (12); Meter Asset Updates (7)
  - Propose we flag the Supply Meter Points where a Customer Contact Update has been rejected

  - Base Registration Nominations may be held in the system (these are valid for 60 days), but recommend that the Incoming Shipper generates a new BRN

    - This would supersede any BRNs in UKL and reduces risk of SP having incorrect Settlement data (or CDSP associating default Settlement data)
    - If not, we will use any valid (e.g. non expired) BRNs … Note: BRNs may reject for other reasons – e.g. Capacity Reduction Window
    - Otherwise, we would use defaults as defined in UNC TPD G Annex G-1

  - Propose NOT to suppress any UKL transactions associated with the Registration

    o Outgoing files will continue to be generated – e.g. BRR; ASN; TMC; URN
    o Incoming transactions would be allowed – e.g. Opening Meter Reads.

    - An Opening and Closing Meter Read will be generated for the UKL Registration Effective Date

      o This will be issued to both Shippers as per BAU process

    - We could insert an estimated Meter Reading for the CSS Registration Date – this would be a CYCL (i.e. not an Opening Reading) but would be beneficial for Reconciliation (if required) and potential settlement between Shippers / Suppliers

Action: JH asked DA to ensure this is all communicated out to organisations or the regulatory managers of organisations in order for them to be aware of this within the new year.

2b. Change Proposal Initial View Representations

2b.i. XRN 5547 - Updating the Comprehensive Invoice Master List and INV template

SH presented this agenda item. SH explained that the key objective of this Change is to support Shipper Users in processing charges correctly and specifically, ensuring the VAT is accounted for correctly on what the charge is. The change will also seek to review the document as a whole, in order to improve the clarity of information presented. The two key areas of this change are:

- The content and format of the Comprehensive Invoice Master List document
- Identification of Charge Types applicable for Domestic Reverse Charge (DRC) and associated clause wording

Customer level requirements have been drafted, provided to the proposer, and submitted for impact assessment. SH presented a list of customer requirements within the slides however, SH stated the overarching customer requirement is the following:

- I want all Charge Types and associated attributes to be clearly defined and reviewed at regular intervals.

PO added that the main focus is to develop Change, and with consistency, therefore presenting the requirements drafted at high level for each Change with discussions occurring with the proposer and DSG group. Once confirmed, Xoserve will be looking to do go forward and append the requirements to the solution options so that customers can see the requirements that they actually used to assess those options against.

BM asked when this change originally came up, there was almost like 2 threads to it. So there was the aspect of the reports are very much by experts for experts. They want to improve the clarity. They want to make the process easier for everyone and he could understand that from what was being shown within the slides. However, in regard regards to that domestic reverse charges, there was a question mark over how that was being applied and that led to a slightly wider conversation about how VAT is handled and how that would be reviewed as they are going forward, whether there was going to be a process or a mechanism put in place for that has noy been mentioned here. Does that mean that the clause wording has been reviewed by the expert and recommendation made to update? Is that just to clarify things or was there an issue there?

SH replied explaining that the conversation with the VAT members is that of a wider discussion which has been taken to DN constituency in which they had a discussion about the Charge types Xoserve invoice on behalf of the DN's. Therefore being that this is not a CDSP call, Xoserve wanted to open up the discussions they have done around where the law could change. This could in turn affect VAT that is being applied.

SH advised the next steps involve the following:

- Any comments are welcomed on the customer requirements presented
- The CDSP will continue the initial impact assessments based on them
- Lower-level internal CDSP requirements will be developed to meet the customer requirements

- High Level Solution Options (HLSO) will be generated and presented back to industry stakeholders.

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

2d. Solution Options Impact Assessment Review Completed

2d.i. XRN 5555 – Amend existing Large Load Site Reporting

PO presented this agenda item. PO explained that at the request of SGN, Xoserve have been asked to modify an existing Distribution Network report, to ensure that it can provide details pertinent to individual Meter Point Reference Numbers for sites that offtake large loads from the Network. These 'Large Load Sites' are reported on a monthly basis to the respective Distribution Network, with the report being formatted in a traditional MS Excel tables and delivered via email to an agreed set of Distribution Network representatives.

PO added that currently the Large Load Site Report does not include the associated Meter Point Reference Number – In instances where multiple Meter and Meter Point Reference Number combinations exist for an associated Large Load Site the data is currently aggregated. PO advised that within the slides, there is an example of proposed amendments to Large Load Site Reports which have also been included within the Change Pack.

PO proposed the next steps involve ChMC approval on the detailed design change pack that has been issued ahead of Januarys meeting.

DN Consultation on Proposed Reporting Change

- The changes proposed to the current Large Load Site Report are currently out for Detailed Design Consultation via the December Change Pack
- DNs are asked to assess the proposed Detailed Design and provide their organisations views ahead of January ChMC where approval of the proposed Design is being sought.

Implementation and Funding

- Our aim is to deliver this change as soon as ready, post approval, and it will be present in the next available monthly iteration of the report from that point forwards.
- The implementation is currently targeted for January 2023, post approval of this Change Pack at Change Management Committee (ChMC).
- As such, no further communication will be issued regards implementation however a closure document will be issued to Change Management post implementation.
- Due to the size and nature of the proposed change, no additional funding is to be sought in order to complete the required work.

3. Changes in Detailed Design

3a. Requirements Considerations – None for this meeting

3b. Design Clarification – None for this meeting

4. Major Release Update

4a. FWACV

PO presented this agenda item. Po advised this is coming towards the end of its phase one completion and the project team are now preparing a closedown report to share with ChMC in January. Alongside this, they will be progressing with phase two of the requirements definition ahead of assessing the solution options for those post day one requirements. The project overall is tracking to green ready for closedown.

4b. February 23 Major Release

PO advised that the project is tracking to green, on track to deliver on the 25th February in line with the implementation plan. The test phases have been completed according to plan. As well as this, PO confirmed that they have had confirmation of the approval of the SGN H100 Fife project modification, therefore clarifying the certainty/completion of the associated XRN, which will be looking to progress to agreed time scales.

4c. March 23 Adhoc Release

PO presented this agenda item. PO advised that for those that are less close to the detail, Xoserve have agreed with change management committee at and extraordinary meeting, the ad-hoc March release of functional and process changes that need to be delivered to support modification changes and continuation of DSC services. Therefore, three changes have been approved into the scope of that release.

One of them relates to the transfer of NDM sampling while the other two relate to arrangements for the procurement of a Class 1 meter read service provider, which is associated to Mod 0710

5a. Change Pipeline

PO presented this agenda item. PO explained there are some small reporting changes that are being targeted to be delivered before the Christmas break and then the March release, February release and associated XRNs have been discussed. The full view of the scoped changes for ad-hoc and future releases can be found within the slide deck

5b. Change Pipeline – REC

PO presented this agenda item and provided and overview of the slides in regard to gate closures, in which DA discussed earlier in the meeting at agenda item 2a.ii.

6. AOB

This was the end of Monday 19th December DSC Delivery Sub Group meeting. Next Meeting: (Monday 23rd January 2022)

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