

# Section D: High Level Solution Options

---

## D1: Solution Options

Solution Option Summary:	<b>Solution Option 3</b> DSG agreed that only solution option 3 is needed to have a HLISO carried out on it. Please <a href="#">click here</a> to view.
Implementation Date for this Solution Option:	Data Office Change (TBC)
Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)	Option 3 is Xoserve's preferred solution option due to the complexity and potential cutting across UNC with other solution options. The low number of sites that would need investigation leads itself to a none systemised solution where any affected MPRNs are notified to Shipper for appropriate action.
DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)	Option 3. DSG agreed that solution option 3 is the most pragmatic approach to the issue posed in the Change Proposal and recommends this solution as the way forward.
Consultation closeout:	24 <sup>th</sup> May 2019

# Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	npower
	Name:	Amie Charalambous
	Trial:	Gas.codes@npower.com
	Tetrialne:	07917271763
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	npower are supportive of option 3 - We would like to see the current 'interim' solution of rolling the existing AQ to continue ... With the report just highlighting to shippers where this has occurred for action to be taken if required....	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	Publish	

## E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Regarding your request that the 'interim' solution continues, this will be the case. The interim was to ensure the issues being faced with AQ are mitigated and that will continue. The proposed report will only contain instances where there is a negative consumption either side of the estimated transfer reading.
---	---

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Alex Cebo
	Trial:	aleksandra.cebo@edfenergy.com
	Tetrialne:	07875119544
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into	We support the change in principle. We do believe ,however, that the enduring solution should allow for CDSP to re-estimate the CoS estimated read following an actual read submission which then should be sent to the shipper. As a result, we would like to defer the change.	

account costs, risks, resource etc.	
Implementation Date:	Defer
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Defer
DSG preferred solution option:	Defer
Publication of consultation response:	Publish

## E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>Thank you for your representation. Regarding your solution preference to allow the CDSP to re-estimate the estimated transfer (in the instances of negative consumption), the reason this is not being proposed as the preferred option by DSG and Xoserve is due to the potential that annually read Supply Meter Points could have an extended period of time before a new CoS read is re-estimated, and as a result concerns were raised by Shippers that consumer billing may have already closed out potentially causing additional issues. Due to the low numbers of sites since NEXUS, DSG are favourable of highlighting to Shippers where instances of negative consumption are present for further investigation to see if any remedy action would be needed. It was also highlighted that to facilitate the re-estimation process, a UNC modification could be required which could impact delivery timescales for this change. For these reasons, option 3 has been proposed as the preferred option.</p>
---	--

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Southern Electric Gas Limited and SSE Energy Supply Limited
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Trial:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Tetrialne:	02392277738
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We agree that option 3 is the best approach. We request some more information from Xoserve in the form of indicative volumes. We would expect the reports to be split by shipper ID rather than by organisation, as we'll require the shipper reports to be sent to different email addresses for different shipper IDs. This will also help us in understanding any changes to our resource requirements.	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	

## E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Regarding indicative volumes, more up to date numbers are being obtained and will be made available as soon as possible.
---	---

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Gazprom Energy
	Name:	Alison Neild
	Email:	<a href="mailto:Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com">Alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com</a>
	Telephone:	0161 829 0039
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>Gazprom support the progression of either Option 1 or 3 as the process for us as shipper isn't materially impacted by either option. Both options require the SAR process to be instigated.</p> <p>Option 2, re-estimation is deemed as not required as SAR will need to be created between shippers.</p> <p>Currently on receipt of a lower actual first read this already triggers a SAR process internally. The read is not sent to Xoserve on the understanding that it would be rejected (however, the existence of this CP indicates that the negative consumption read is accepted. Please can you confirm?). For this reason we believe the report in Option 3 is not required as we would be working towards resolution prior to Xoserve knowing the issue exists. However appreciate the report could be useful to others if their processes do not match this and therefore would support Option 3.</p>	
Implementation Date:	Approve	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
DSG preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	Publish	

## E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>Thank you for your support in the recommended option 3 (and also option 1), regarding your question surrounding negative consumption read being accepted, this is the case, but only where there is an estimated transfer reading being present. This is because the energy tolerance checks that are carried out on the submitted reading (next cyclic post Shipper transfer) against the last actual reading in UKL and not the estimated Shipper transfer read. If the last actual is lower than the submitted cyclic read (and within tolerance) then the read is accepted into UKL, but when the system creates the reconciliation volumes, where the estimated Shipper transfer read is higher than the cyclic read, it creates a negative consumption. The interim solution (XRN4690) was to ensure the issues being faced with the AQ process (causing AQ's of 1) was mitigated, all other downstream processes can handle negative consumptions, however the apportionment between the incoming and outgoing Shippers would be inaccurate, that would (as you've indicated) require a SAR to be raised to replace the estimated Shipper Transfer reading.</p>
---	---

## E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	E.ON
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley / Lee Stone
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com
	Telephone:	07816 172 645
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We support solution option 3 - Notification report to Shippers.</p> <p>We support Xosereve's assessment that a non-systemised approach will best facilitate Shippers to take appropriate actions manually.</p> <p>E.ON believe an appropriate lead time would be November (at the earliest) to mobilise the appropriate internal arrangements.</p>	
Implementation Date:	November 2019	
Xoserve preferred solution option:		
DSG preferred solution option:	«e1_dsgSolutionOption»	
Publication of consultation response:	Public	

## E2: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation.
--	------------------------------------

