DSC Change Proposal

Change Reference Number: XRN4645B

Customers to fill out all of the information in this colour ■
Xoserve to fill out all of the information in this colour ■

Section A1: General Details	
Change Title	The rejection of incrementing reads submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA flows)
Date Raised	03/04/2018
Sponsor Organisation	Xoserve
Sponsor Name	Sat Kalsi
Sponsor Contact Details	sat.kalsi@xoserve.com
Xoserve Contact Name	David Addison
Xoserve Contact Details	david.addison@xoserve.com 0121 229 2138 / Mobile 07428559800
Change Status	Proposal / With DSG / Out for Consultation / Voting / **Approved** or Rejected

Section A2: Impacted Parties	
Customer Class(es)	☒ Shipper
	☐ National Grid Transmission
	☐ Distribution Network Operator
	☐ IGT

Section A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

As of 07/05/2020 this change has been split into two parts, part A and part B. The reasoning for this is so that the rejection code element of the change, which has previously been ratified by DSG and will prevent the occurrence of the exception BI49 by rejecting an RGMA transaction for an isolated site that contains an incrementing read, can be deployed under XRN4645A in order to support the implementation of the Urgent COVID-19 related modification 0723. Part B, which will look to develop an enduring process to support the new rejection code, will continue through the change process.

From this point, updates will now only be made to the CP relevant to that part of the change. This document will maintain updates relevant to Part B.

An issue has been identified where following Project Nexus Implementation Date (PNID). Xoserve has received in excess of 3500 RGMA transactions where the User has provided a Meter Information Notification (JOB transaction) or Meter Information Update Notification (UPD transaction) to reverse an isolation of a Capped or Clamped Supply Meter Point but that the reading provided in the transaction has incremented from the reading provided at isolation.

When a User indicates that the Supply Meter Point is isolated, they are indicating that it is not capable of flowing gas (UNC Section G 3.4), and therefore an incrementing reading is not expected following such isolation. Other reading processes reject any incrementing readings.

Where a User submits an RGMA transaction to reverse the isolation the initial JOB or UPD transaction is currently being processed, and the UK Link system is being updated with the Metering Information contained within the transaction. However, given that the User has informed the CDSP that the Supply Meter Point is not capable of flowing gas this has been

excluded from allocation processes, and therefore any attempt to reconcile the Supply Meter Point creates an error within the invoicing process. As such these items are being currently excluded from the Amendment invoice.

This is causing issues with the daily volume and energy calculated for reconciliation
A proportionate solution needs to be developed to support the ability for Users to retain the ability to notify where a Meter is not capable of passing gas (UNC Section G3.4) but reduce the risk to downstream processes and the wider industry.

XRN4645 - The
Rejection of Incremen

Proposed Release	RX / DD/MM/YYYY
Proposed Consultation Period	☐ 10 Working Days ☐ 20 Working Days ☐ 30 Working days Other:

Section A4: Benefits and Justification	
Benefit Description *What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change?* *What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?*	
Benefit Realisation *When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?*	
Benefit Dependencies *Please detail any dependencies that would be outside the scope of the change, this could be reliance on another delivery, reliance on some other event that the projects has not got direct control of.*	

Section A5: Final Delivery Sub Group Recommendations	

Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.

Final DSG Recommendation	**Approve** / Reject / Defer
DSG Recommended Release	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

Section A6: Funding		
Funding Classes	☒ Shipper	100%
	☐ National Grid Transmission	XX%
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	XX%
	☐ IGT	XX%
Service Line(s)		
ROM or funding details		
Funding Comments		

Section A7: CHMC Recommendation	
Change Status	☒ Approve – Issue to DSG ☐ Defer – Issue to Consultation ☐ Reject
Industry Consultation	☐ 10 Working Days ☐ 20 Working Days ☐ 30 Working days Other:

Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX
DSC Consultation	
Issued	☒ Yes ☐ No
Date Issued	13/01/2020
Comms Ref(s)	2514.1 – JLR - JR
Number of Responses	Two approvals
Section A8: DSC Voting Outcome	
Solution Voting	☒ Shipper **Approve** / Reject / NA / Abstain ☐ National Grid Transmission Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain ☐ Distribution Network Operator Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain ☐ IGT Approve / Reject / NA / Abstain
Meeting Date	12/02/2020
Release Date	Release: TBC if Major or Minor at ChMC in March
Overall Outcome	Approved for Release X / Rejected

Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

Section C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	16th July 2018 / 6th August 2018
DSG Summary	

16th July 2018

DSC Delivery
Sub-Group - 160718 \

Quick update provided by DA – slides 58 to 59. Exceptions still being received @ 4-5k
No vote provided against Class A – didn't have problem with solution but issues being implemented outside of major release.
Would have to overcome principles re reconciliation against a read sent in to us.
Are there any views in DSG?
LW commented that it would be a complex build and complex testing – one is higher scale option than the other.
DA stated he has asked for an updated version of the materiality of this issue – how much gas is this impacting.

6th August 2018

Click here to access the DSG Material on Xoserve.com

DA presented this agenda item to DSG.
DA stated that he didn't have any statistics to present; the acquisition of the statistics was in progress on 6th August. These statistics will show where we have materiality. In less than 10% of the instances, the materiality is less than 100 kWh. The average is 3,700 kWh. DA stated that the likelihood of these sites commissioning gas is small.

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C: DSC Change Proposal: DSG Discussion

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

Section C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	20/08/2018
DSG Summary	

Click here to find the presentation pack.

SH presented slides 47 to 49. The purpose of this section was to inform DSG members of an action from previous DSG regarding the materiality of consumption during the isolation period. SH presented the preliminary data findings on slide 48. On average, there are 8 valid reading during the isolated period. 10% of Supply Points included in the investigation have a consumption figure of less than 100kWh.

SH presented the two solution options on slide 49:
- Original solution proposal was to reject the RGMA transaction, indicating that an incrementing reading was included in the transaction
- Accept the transaction as it was expected that this was small volumes of gas associated with commissioning (data findings indicate that this is not the case in most instances)

SH asked DSG for their views on the above solution options in light of the data findings. Elly Laurence (EL) stated that the best solution would not involve rejecting accurate readings. JB questioned whether reconciliation principles would need to be amended. LW said that this is more material than what was originally envisaged; it has been sent to the UIG team for investigation. LW suggested exploring automation of reads being received, continuing to reject reads in the short term, and generate reports.

At the moment, this issue generates exceptions which require manual monitoring. BC asked how many sites are affected. Simon said 9,000. SH stated that Dave Addison (not present) is working on process options as well as technical actions.

EL asked if these instances are associated with a particular Shipper or across the industry. Rachel Hinsley (RH) said that it's evenly spread across the industry.

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C3: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	20/08/2018
DSG Summary	

Click here to find the presentation pack.

David Addison (DA) presented this section to DSG. This section attracted significant DSG discussion; therefore, greater detail will be included in the minutes. To summarise, DA presented several preliminary data findings, on slide 29, to support DSG discussion regarding the possible solution options on slides 30 to 31. DSG agreed that given the data findings, they were satisfied that was not commissioning gas. After much discussion, Xoserve agreed to take an action away to identify scenarios regarding the data of the current population to articulate necessary tasks to resolve data prospectively. This will enable Shippers to assess the solution options. Shipper attendees at DSG agreed to investigate their portfolios to identify a quantity of their sites which are isolated but receiving reads.

Action 0850: - DSG (Shippers) to identify the quantity of sites, within their portfolios, that are impacted by the issue associated with XRN4645: The rejection of incrementing read submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA Flows)

Action 0851: - David Addison to identify scenarios associated with each of the solution options associated with XRN4645: The rejection of incrementing read submitted for an Isolated Supply Meter Point (RGMA Flows). These solution options can be found on slides 30 to 31

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C4: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	04/03/2019
DSG Summary	

David Addison (DA) had hoped to come back with scenarios. However the scenario's given were beyond the scope of XRN4645 and missing solution options. DA didn't want to come with a view of problems without having proposed solutions. Apologies for having to defer for another couple of weeks.

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C5: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Summary	

David Addison presented this agenda item. DA stated that the main point to take away from the slides presented is DA's intention and recommendation is to propose that we reject any incrementing RGMA transactions. DA highlighted that some of the exceptions will be as a result of Xoserve generated estimates.

Action: DSG to consider what information would need to be available to Users in order to support their processes and submit adjustments.

The change XRN4645 was raised as there was no relevant rejection code that could be used where the CDSP saw an incoming RGMA transaction that was providing an incrementing meter reading on isolated Supply Meter Points. DA indicated that when he had previously presented this issue DSG had requested a greater understanding of the scenarios that could lead to this. DA highlighted the following scenarios where incrementing meter readings have been loaded:

- through the UMR batch job, this was a defect that was resolved around NEXUS implementation.
- via RGMA transactions
- where the CDSP had created an incrementing estimates (typically for Change of Shipper or RGMA readings) as the estimation routine didn't take into account the isolation flag for a period of time. DA indicated that this was resolved in October 2017

DA indicated that there were circa 7,000 Supply Meter Points that are in exception. He proposed that resolution of these exceptions would be considered once a remedy had been agreed to resolve the treatment of the RGMA transactions as this is the only process that still allows incrementing Meter Readings.

DA stated that we haven't defined the rejection code yet, but asked DSG to consider whether they supported the principle of rejection. In addition DA suggested Users consider whether reporting should be established where the RGMA transactions are being rejected so that the CDSP can inform the customer with that information. This

report can be used as a feed into a customer's consumption adjustment or exception processes.

DA has summarised the reading of the 3 slides regarding UNC code but to note that it is not the CDSP's job to interpret the UNC as discussed. DA explained that his own interpretation of those UNC guidelines was that

- Shippers are responsible for setting and maintaining the Isolation Flag
- If following the Isolation, the Shipper withdraws from the Supply Point, under Modification 0424 and 0425 then if the gas is being off taken then the Shipper remains responsible
- Where it is established where gas can be off taken – i.e. it is Re-established – then the Supply Meter Point could be treated as if that isolation has not occurred – subject to further conditions
- First reconciliation after a Change of Shipper becomes the responsibility of the Incoming User, potential greater risk if the Isolation Flag has been set and not maintained

DA asked DSG to assess this, and welcomed their conclusions. DA explained why this is causing the problem, since the commodity invoicing is deemed as being nil within period, the Amendment Invoice (aka Reconciliation) creates an exception as there is no Commodity to 'reconcile' against. DA suggested the complexity is increased due to:

- Length of time that the isolation may have been in place – some of these are prior to Project Nexus Implementation and before
- Change of Shipper events have been undertaken
- Incrementing Meter Readings have been loaded in error

There are circa 7,000 Supply Meter Points where an exception has been generated and DA remained DSG that subsequent variances will not be invoiced until the exception has been resolved. DA stated that the CDSP is planning to zero the consumption for the exception variance period. This in turn will lead to subsequent variances expected to be released. In addition the CDSP will provide portfolio and read data (and expected Consumption values) to the Registered Shipper / last Shipper. As well as provide an indication whether the isolation remains in place. Furthermore the CDSP propose to provide scenarios against which the Meter Point is classified by the CDSP.

DA suggested that in regards what the CDSP will be asking Shippers to do is raise the Request for Adjustment (RFA) or to confirm that a RFA is not required (i.e. a zero consumption is valid). There will be some instances where there will be some consumption. During this period the CDSP will monitor where RFA's have/have not been raised, and provide support to Shippers as needed.

Ikram Bashir (IB) asked DA if there is no amendment invoice generated, would Shippers need to do consumption adjustments? DA responded by stating in some of these instances there are actual reads that the CDSP is receiving where the site is isolated, so where there is an actual reading, where consumption is being used, the fact that the CDSP is zeroing the commodity period, the CDSP has to go back in time to do a consumption adjustment of when that period started. DA also suggested that he does believe there will be instances where there will be a negative consumption adjustment. DA suggested next steps of adding the slides presented to the next DSG meeting for more discussion. To get a suggested approach agreed or alternative suggestions.

In addition for DSG to consider, what reporting is needed from the CDSP to help support users in regards to XRN 4645 – RGMA Rejection Reporting and BI49 Backlog – Existing Population.

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendations	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C6: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations	
DSG Date	01/07/2019
DSG Summary	

David Addison (DA) recapped over the previous DSG meeting 17th June 2019 and explained that by rejecting, other than a 0 incrementing meter reading, the next step would be for Shippers to submit consumption adjustments which can then be allocated to the correct period. IB asked DA what is the number of MPRN's impacted. DA stated that Xoserve would provide the Shippers with that information by providing the meter points in their portfolios where there is an exception. DSG supported the rejection of RGMA transactions where the isolation flag is set where an incrementing reading was provided

Capture Document / Requirements	INSERT
DSG Recommendation	N/A
DSG Recommended Release	TBC

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

(To be removed if no DSG Discussion is required; Xoserve to collate where DSG discussions occur)

DSG Date:	27/07/2020

DSG Summary:	JB provided a background on this change being raised to address the scenario of a valid RGMA transaction being submitted for an isolated meter point, with a read that shows progression (offtake). JB stated the transaction is currently accepted and an exception generated when attempting to calculate consumption for the isolated period. The change was split into Part A and Part B:
	– Part A to deliver the rejection functionality
	    • This is currently in development
	– Part B to review the process required to support the proper allocation of volume
	
	What is the way forward:
	
	JB stated that after further investigation, into the process, the CDSP does not believe there is an appropriate change that will improve the current process.
	
	• Shippers are required to inform the CDSP as soon as they find an isolated meter is capable of flowing gas. Therefore, the current industry processes should be utilised:
	
	- As soon as a shipper becomes aware that a meter is no longer isolated they notify the CDSP using the date of:
	    • When they have been told the status changed e.g. site visit/appointment date
	    • If this is not available then the earliest date available i.e. isolation date +1, last read date +1 –
	
	- The read used when removing the isolation should be the same as the latest accepted read
	
	    • Following delivery of XRN4645A, a read greater than the previous actual read will result in the transaction being rejected
	
	- Reads should then be submitted as normal, when available
	    • If the meter was found with a read higher than the previous/isolation read then following the RGMA status update this higher read should be submitted using the appropriate read file for the product class
	
	IB asked how often will DDP be updated with the sites mentioned? PO stated that once the DDP team has screen the user story and situation, they will work with the user to arrange when they will be updated, whether it be weekly, monthly etc.
	PO added that it would be up to the customer to drive that requirement through their user story. IB asked if there is a drive

	from Xoserve side to work with customers to deal with updates to the sites that have not been investigated.
	
	PO explained there is an option mentioned under the impact assessment. This is to deliver legacy reporting under this XRN to do the following as an interim measure.
	   - Requirements will be added to the Data Discovery Platform (DDP) backlog to create reporting to support the identification of impacted sites. Suggested measures:
	   - Isolated MPRNs that have had incrementing reads rejected
	   - MPRNs where an attempt was made to remove the isolation with an incrementing read and that read has not been submitted
	PO asked DSG for views if they would want to endorse this and if they are of any use. EL and IB agreed this is not something they endorse.
	JB asked if DSG are happy to recommend the closure of XRN4645B.
	DSG members agreed if this was to be progressed via DDP.

Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve ☐ Reject ☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

Solution Option Summary:	**Link to CP** XRN4645 was raised to look at preventing issues in energy calculation processes caused by consumption being allocated against isolated meter points. This change has been discussed with DSG, and a single option approach agreed on how to prevent the scenario from occurring. Option 1: - New RGMA Rejection Code to be provided for the rejection of incrementing reads where the Isolation Flag is set in the UK Link system Please note, this solution HLSO only considers the functional change required to the UK Link systems i.e. addition of the rejection code. As part of the solution it is further proposed that reporting is made available to Shipper Users to provide additional information to them to identify the Reading at Isolation (or the Latest Reading, if a subsequent Reading has been loaded) in order for them to resubmit the RGMA transaction AND for them to determine whether a Consumption Adjustment should be raised. Detailed option assessment will be conducted once this functional change is scheduled so that this can be assessed against proposed capability in DDP drops. No further solution options were considered necessary by DSG. **Link to HLSO**
Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)	Solution Option 1
DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	Solution Option 1
Consultation closeout:	27/01/2020

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.		Whilst we support the proposal - we note in the change documentation that an action was taken from DSG to provide shippers with their portfolio relating to this issue: ' DA stated that Xoserve would provide the Shippers with that information by providing the meter points in their portfolios where there is an exception. ' I cannot recall having seen this information and this would allow us to be able to identify any scenarios which may have been avoidable and thereby reduce the number of these instances going forward. Please can you provide this information
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 response. We will follow up on the action described and provide the reporting to impacted shippers.

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd
	Name:	Alison Price
	Email:	alison.price@npower.com
	Telephone:	07557202065

Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We are in support of the 1 solution put forward
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, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4645
Solution Details:	Option 1 - New RGMA Rejection Code to be provided for the rejection of incrementing reads where the Isolation Flag is set in the UK Link system Release TBC
Implementation Date:	
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	12/02/2020

Document Version History

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes

2.0	Draft	10/08/18	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 6th August added to section C
3.0	Draft	24/08/18	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 20th August added to section C
4.0	Draft	20/09/18	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 17th September added to section C
5.0	Draft	04/10/18	Xoserve	Change Request add to a Change Proposal
6.0	Draft	11/03/19	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 4th March added to section C
7.0	Draft	26/06/2019	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 17th June added to section C
8.0	Draft	09/07/2019	Xoserve	DSG comments from the meeting on 1st July added to section C
9.0	With ChMC	10/02/2020	Jai Le Resche	Solution Review Change Pack and Responses added for approval at ChMC on 12th February 2020
10.0	Approved	20/02/2020	Rachel Taggart	Updated with ChMC outcome from the meeting on 12th February
11.0	With DSG	04/08/2020	Chan Singh	Updated with discussions from DSG 27th July 2020