High Level Solution Options Change Pack

# Communication Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comm Reference: | 3235.1 - VO - PO |
| Comm Title: | XRN 5614 - Improving IGT SMP New Connection Process to support accurate and timely Supplier Registrations – Solution Option Change Pack |
| Comm Date: | 13/11/2023 |

**Change Representation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Action Required: | For Representation |
| Close Out Date: | 27/11/2023 |

# Change Detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Reference Number: | XRN5614 |
| \*ChMC Constituency Impacted: | IGT  Shipper |
| Change Owner: | [uklink@xoserve.com](mailto:uklink@xoserve.com) |
| Background and Context: | Change Proposal [XRN5614](https://www.xoserve.com/change/customer-change-register/xrn-5614-improving-igt-smp-new-connection-process-to-support-accurate-and-timely-supplier-registrations/) has been raised by IGT customers due to challenges they experienced in aligning industry datasets and reflecting correct contractual details against IGT MPRNs during their creation and initial registration.  At present, when a property developer notifies an IGT of contracted Shipper and Supplier details against IGT MPRNs, IGTs and Shippers are able to agree this information and CDSP records are reflected accordingly.  This information can be corrected and maintained by IGTs up until the point at which an IGT MPRN has undergone first registration activities within Central Switching Service processes.  After this point, whilst IGTs and Shippers may become aware of changes to property developer contract alternations, IGTs are unable to notify the CDSP of such changes and the CDSP consequently is unable to notify a Shipper that IGT MPRN details have been removed or added to their prospective portfolio.  The driver for this Change Proposal therefore is to improve the IGT Supply Meter Point New Connection process, by enabling the CDSP to accept relate amendments from IGTs and ensuring that the relevant parties have the information they need to support accurate and timely Shipper and Supplier Registration details. |

# Solution Options

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Solution Option Summary: | The attached High Level Solution Option (HLSO) document describes in detail the solution which has been identified;    **Solution Title: Amend the validations in UK Link and generate comparison datasets**  **Solution Option Overview**  This solution enables IGT Meter Point Amendment requests, as supplied via the .IMA file, to be handled and processed by the CDSP regardless of the presence of CSS Registration Activity.  This will be achieved by removing existing validation logic which currently prevents .IMA file flows from being accepted where an IGT SMP is registered within Central Switching Service systems. It also enables associated Shippers to be made aware of their appointment and deappointment against the associated IGT Supply Meter Points, in line with the details that will have been shared and confirmed via the existing PSA and PSB process.  Whilst progressing with this DSC Change Proposal with IGT customers, several requirements were identified that would be necessary to fully mitigate the challenge of accurate registration records across industry systems – these are listed below and are included within the HLSO document in full;   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | CR3.0 | CDSP | I want to notify the Central Switching Service (CSS) of changes to registered Shipper/Supplier details | So that the CSS can make the appropriate updates to the registration details recorded against the relevant IGT meter points | - Audit history maintained of update sent to CSS - Relevant details sent through to CSS | | CR3.1 | CSS | I want to process and update to the registered Shipper/Supplier details from the CDSP | So that central systems are updated with the correct information | - Registration details updated within the CSS - Update issued to CDSP to confirm result of request | | CR3.2 | CDSP | I want to process submission response from the CSS | So that the result of the submission is known | - Audit updated to reflect result of the submission |   At this stage the CDSP solution that has been identified does not meet these requirements. This is due to the dependency of an associated Retail Energy Code (REC) Modification Change Proposal. Any Modification of this nature would look to set out the specification of any related activities placed on the CDSP, to which the CDSP would be obligated to implement.  If the above requirements are not progressed via a Retail Energy Code Modification, Xoserve would recommend external reporting and monitoring requirements are introduced within the scope of the solution that has been identified, to enable comparison datasets to be made available and data accuracy to be monitored. This would support parties in taking appropriate measures using existing functionality and rules that exist within the REC and CSS registration processes.  **Solution Option Cost summary**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Solution Option Cost Range** | **Low** | **High** | | **£165,000** | **£209,000** |   The solution identified at this stage is anticipated to cost no less than £165,000, but probably no more than £209,000. This includes a contingency margin of approx. £19,000.  **Implementation Timeline and Funding**  It is recommended that the solution is delivered within a major release to provide the full support and lead time for the associated changes. Alternatively, the solution may be delivered via an Adhoc Release, subject to customer approval.  The proposed funding of this change within the Change Proposal is 50% Shipper - 50% IGT – feedback on this is welcomed as part of this Solution Option Change Pack Consultation. |
| Proposed Implementation Date: | To be confirmed |
| Xoserve preferred option:  (including rationale) | A single solution option has been identified and is proposed within the Change Pack |
| DSG preferred solution option:  (including rationale) | To be presented and discussed at DSG on November 20th |
| Consultation closeout: | 01/01/1900 |

# Service Lines and Funding – for each option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing | Service Area 3 – Manage Updates to Customer Portfolio  A new service line is anticipated to support the change once implemented |
| Level of Impact | Medium – due to changes that are being made within existing interfaces – with these interfaces being core to the IGT new connection process. |
| Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix | No impacts have been identified to either UK Link Manual or the Data Permissions Matrix at this stage of development. |

Industry Response Solution Options Review

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Indigo Pipelines Limited |
| Name: | Cher Harris |
| Email: | cher.harris@sse.com |
| Telephone: | 07747559101 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Option 1  IGTs can update their own systems to reflect the change of shipper (through the PSA/PSB process), but shippers advise that they cannot progress the change of shipper/supplier without receiving the AES file from CDSP. As such, the benefit to shippers is the key driver for this change but it is understated in the HLSO. This proposal enables the new Shipper to progress the change of Shipper/supplier and fulfil their obligations to the customer. | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | Energy Assets Pipelines Ltd / EAP |
| Name: | Michelle Brown |
| Email: | michellebrown@energyassets.co.uk |
| Telephone: | +447538629496 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Option 1 | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | SEFE Energy |
| Name: | Lisa Saycell |
| Email: | Lisa.saycell@sefe-energy.com |
| Telephone: | 07860408770 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | Option 1  The costs for the change seem considerable. Please can you provide more information on the following queries, in relation to the detailed requirements and if changing or removing them would have a material impact? CR4.0 - This asks for data values to be configurable. Please clarify what data values are being validated, as the change is to remove validation. For priority is this a SHOULD and not a MUST? CR6.0 - What are the benefits on reporting on the service, if uptake is low, whose performance is being measured? CR7.0 - Is there currently no query and support process for IGTs? If one exists why is this a requirement for this process? I have never seen this called out before, so would like to understand the difference? | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Many thanks for your representation. We can confirm that Customer Requirements are used to support assurance of viable solution options as these are developed and delivered through the change process. With regards to those requirements you have listed (CR4 – CR7 inclusive), these are standard customer requirements that are captured against all changes for the following purposes  • we have considered and simplified where possible our ability to make future changes to the impacted processes  • we have the relevant reporting datasets available to evidence how the change is performing once it is operational and; • that we have not overlooked the need to provide service management to the changes once these become operational.   By capturing these requirements we ensure that the appropriate support and evidence customers would reasonably expect to be made available from the CDSP is not overlooked by any proposed solution. I can confirm that for the purposes of this change, these standard requirements have not had any implication on the proposed solution costs. The proposed solution costs are predominately influenced by the complexity in making changes to validation logic and impacted interfaces which are not presently triggered via the IGT MPRN Creation and Amendment process. In order to facilitate the changes, new data tables will need to be created within the UK Link, with these being integrated with the relevant data flows and reporting solutions. |

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | E.ON Group |
| Name: | Andrew Eisenberg |
| Email: | andrew.eisenberg@eonnext.com |
| Telephone: | 07890555151 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | We have reviewed the solution provided and we are not currently in support of the approach. We believe it to be a substantial cost to fix an issue which has been around since 2017 (often referred to as gazumping at the IGT UNC discussions in 2017/2018). We are also concerned that the ‘customer requirements’ have been focused on fixing issues flagged by the IGTs, but may have overlooked key problem areas for shippers due to not being approached to feed in our detailed requirements.  We understand that the impact of the current issues are around 1k MPRNs across all IGTs. Should the change be delivered as suggested (especially at the upper cost limit), that is an extortionate cost per MPRN. As IGT and Shipper costs are ultimately picked up by end consumers, we do not believe this solution has a value for money benefits case. Especially when the costing has been suggested to be a 50:50 share between Shippers and IGTs and it is only fixing IGT issues. We have become used to gazumping and have internal processes to close skeleton accounts where the situation occurs.   Our view is that a review of the New Connections process would be more beneficial, this is because it is currently clunky from PRA issued to UK Link updates of the Supply Point Register. Our preference would be to have the IGT UNC and the DSC jointly work together to revolutionise the new connections processes, to make it .com. We believe that the cost of this change could be better spent and resolving wider process inefficiencies would benefit the industry and not just fix a small, clunky issue.  We recognise that the IGTs are trying to navigate around a process imperfection for them (which may also be clunky for some Shippers), but for the cost suggested we believe there must be a more cost effective and wider reaching solution. We therefore urge the decision making on this change to return to the ChMC to discuss the options. | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | reject | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# Organisation’s preferred solution option

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| User Contact Details: | Organisation: | BUUK |
| Name: | Sarah Brown |
| Email: | sarah.brown@gtc-uk.co.uk |
| Telephone: | 01359243312 |
| Organisation’s preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc. | As a proposer of the change we support the intention of the change as we understand it.    • The proposed change will not automatically change the Shipper and will trigger a notification to the Shipper to withdraw and prompt new shipper to register. Shippers have agreed PSR A/B to withdraw (losing) and accept (gaining) so misaligning by not accepting through the CDSP would cause impact? We would be billing the wrong supplier post meter fit if CDSP doesn’t align PSR process agreed by losing and gaining shipper. Developers making a commercial decision to change their mind which is out of party control. Function is required to align all parties to honour Developer choice.   • Need confirmation IMA will address the change in number of MPRNs required? MRPNs confirmed with shipper – developer reduces number of plots on quote. Deletion PSA confirmed by Shipper. MPRNs require to be made EX on Xoserve. Current function does not allow where registration in place.    • BUUK support the proposed funding arrangements of this change, noting that there is an impact to Shippers, if IMA discrepancies are not resolved (despite PSA withdrawal/acceptance) pre- meter fit, which could in turn lead to losing shippers being incorrectly billed for a period of time and this may also impact end consumers if the correct Shipper and Supplier details are not reflective in industry datasets when a consumer moves in to a new build property. With regards to solution options – BUUK noted that Shippers have been identified as low impacted from a technical perspective however BUUK believe that Shippers should also be viewed as medium impacted by the proposed change and solution.   • With regards to solution costs, BUUK question how the costs were determined to be so high. How much do other equivalent changes cost?   • When the request to change the shipper is issued, and CDSP approve awaiting Shipper response, what is the mechanism to ensure this happens, and in what timescale?  • BUUK request clarification as to whether the scope of the change excludes any metered plots – i.e. once a plot has a meter the ONJOB/ONUPD files are the mechanism to use to notify of such activity?    Only 1 solutions option on offer which we support on the basis all IMA functions reinstated. | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Many thanks for your representation.   With regards to the questions raised in bullet 2, we believe the proposed solution supports addressing the differences between registration datasets and will allow appropriate withdrawal / end dating of associated MPRNs where service no longer exists or is no longer planned to exist. With respect to bullet 3, we would happily update our assessment of the level of impact / benefit to Shippers based on the information you have provided.  In terms of bullet 4, we can confirm that the proposed solution costs are predominately influenced by the complexity in making changes to validation logic and impacted interfaces which are not presently triggered via the IGT MPRN Creation and Amendment process. In order to facilitate the changes, new data tables will need to be created within the UK Link, with these being integrated with the relevant data flows and reporting solutions. By absorbing these changes within CDSP systems and processes the solution minimises the level of impact Shippers and IGTs experience. In response to bullet 5, it is noted that the changes proposed will not mandate or force any specific registration changes across Central Switching Service records, therefore reporting and monitoring would need to be used to ensure actions had been taken by the appropriate parties, within agreed timescales, to ensure data alignment can be achieved. Finally, with regards to bullet 6, we can confirm that the scope of this change has not identified any impacts to the way in which ONJOB / ONUPD activity takes place between IGT and Shipper parties. |

# *Please consider any commercial impacts to your organisation that Xoserve need to be aware of when formulating your response*

# 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. | We support the proposed funding split and would support implementation during a full release. | |
| Customer decision on preferred solution option: | approved | |
| Publication of consultation response: | N/A | |

# Xoserve’ s Response

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments: | Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision. |

Change Management Committee Outcome

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Change Status: | Approve | Reject | | | Defer |
| Approved Solution Option | Solution Option 1 | | | | |
| Industry Consultation: | 10 Working Days | | 15 Working Days | | |
| 20 Working Days | | Other [Specify Here] | | |
| Date Issued: | 13/11/2023 | | | | |
| Comms Ref(s): | 3235.1 - VO - PO | | | | |
| Number of Responses: | 6 | | | | |
| Solution Voting: | Shipper | | | Please select. | |
| National Grid Transmission | | | Please select. | |
| Distribution Network Operator | | | Please select. | |
| IGT | | | Please select. | |
| Meeting Date: | 13/12/2023 | | | | |
| Proposed Release Date: | Major/Adhoc | | | | |

Approved Solution Option

# Approved Solution Option

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Details: | Solution Title: Amend the validations in UK Link and generate comparison datasets  Solution Option Overview  This solution enables IGT Meter Point Amendment requests, as supplied via the .IMA file, to be handled and processed by the CDSP regardless of the presence of CSS Registration Activity. |
| Implementation Date: | 01/01/0001 |
| Approved By: | Shippers, IGT |
| Date of Approval: | 13/12/2023 |

**Version Control**

**Document**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Status | Date | Author(s) | Remarks | Approved By |
| 1.0 | Approved | 09/03/2022 | Rachel Taggart | Initial Review Change Pack transferred to own document | Change Management Committee on 09/03/2022 |
| 1.1 | Approved | 25/04/2023 | Rachel Taggart | Updated with new font branding | Emma Smith |
| 1.2 | Updated | 14/08/2023 | Kate Lancaster | Updated Representation tabs |  |