

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

<p>Solution Option Summary:</p>	<p><u>Overview</u> XRN4978 “Notification of Rolling AQ value (following transfer of ownership between M-5 and M)” seeks to identify, and notify to incoming Shipper Users, any change to AQ/SOQ/EUC data for MPRNs where the related Supply Meter Point (SMP) changes ownership after the generation of the NRL (AQ WC Notifications) file and prior to the start of the next month.</p> <p>The Change Proposal can be found here</p> <p><u>Change/Solution Overview</u> Currently, at the point at which the NRL is generated and issued to Shipper Users (from M-7) it includes MPRNs that are either Live (LI) or Confirmed (CO) and have had a change to AQ, SOQ or EUC effective from 1st of the next month (M). During the period between NRL generation and M Shippers will continue to confirm transfers which may start on, later or prior to, M.</p> <p>Where an MPRN transfer is Confirmed (CO) post the generation of the NRL to the Shipper with which the MPRN is currently Live (LI), the incoming Shipper is provided with the current AQ, SOQ and EUC values in the TRF (Supply Meter Point Ownership Notification) file but is not informed of any new value that may be effective from the 1st of the subsequent month.</p> <p>The High-Level Solution Option (HLSO) for this change is available and can be found here.</p> <p>The HLSO outlines that Xoserve have identified four solution options to deliver the requirements of the change:</p> <p>Solution Option 1: This solution is to issue a delta NRL file to the incoming Shipper, at the point the confirmation is confirmed, for any MPRN that was included in the initial NRL to the outgoing Shipper. This delta NRL is proposed to be issued on days between initial NRL file generation and M-3.</p> <p>The intention would be to issue the delta NRL where the status of the MPRN changes to CO however this would be configurable to allow it to be updated following the implementation of the Central Switching Service Consequential (CSSC) changes, should it be required.</p> <p>It should be noted that for MPRNs that move to CO at M-2, or later, will have a transfer date equal to, or greater than, M. Therefore, the AQ, SOQ and EUC values that are effective from M will be issued to</p>
---------------------------------	--

the incoming Shipper within the TRF file. The value will be finalised during detailed design but is expected to be configurable to allow for any future changes.

This option can be delivered in a minor release as the delta NRL that would be produced is the same as the existing version produced monthly.

Variation

In addition to the delta file approach, a single run version was also considered which would have been scheduled to run on either M or M+1 to collate all the MPRNs meeting the above criteria i.e. a change to AQ/SOQ/EUC data and moved to CO since initial NRL generation, and issue to the incoming Shipper. This has been discounted as it would not meet a key requirement of the change, which is to issue the updated data as soon as possible, and would also have posed significant risk to job scheduling and performance due to the potential size of the secondary NRL. Both of these points are mitigated by option 1 in that the updated data will be issued on the same day as the TRF and smaller staggered files keep the impact on the batch schedule to a minimum.

Solution Option 2:

This solution is to generate and issue, to the incoming Shipper, a report, or series of reports, of MPRNs that were included in the initial NRL to the outgoing Shipper. It is proposed that the report be generated at M+1, with configuration to allow this to be scheduled as a one off or daily report i.e. from M-7, would include a subset of data items included in the NRL file and delivered via the IX.

Some data items are stated in the HLSO document however these would be confirmed during detailed design. Where data items are already available for reporting then it is assumed that the size/cost would not be impacted.

In addition to delivery via the IX an option to deliver the reports to Shipper Users via email was also analysed. This has been discounted due to GDPR risks of sharing such data via email.

This option can be delivered in a minor release.

Solution Option 3:

This solution is to amend the confirmation workflow to add a step at the point of a MPRN status change to CO to check if the MPRN was included in the initial NRL. Where it was, a record will be added to a delta NRL file to be issued to the incoming Shipper.

This solution option has been impacted assessed against the as is confirmation workflow. However, as it would require a major release to deliver, delivery would be post CSSC implementation. As such, the changes would require further, lower level, impact assessment against the confirmation workflow changes being introduced by CSSC.

Solution Option 4:

	<p>This solution is for new reports and dashboard to be built in the Data Discovery Platform (DDP) to provide the gaining Shipper User with a view of the MPRNs they have gained where the AQ/SOQ/EUC data changed on the 1st of the month and the aforementioned data. The data would be available to view and, or, download for further use.</p> <p>If selected, this solution option can be delivered in a Core DDP drop subject to agreement at Shipper Constituency meetings.</p> <p><u>Additional Information</u></p> <p>All options will provide the gaining Shipper User with the data they are currently not privy to however each takes a different approach to achieving this and cost brackets do reflect this.</p> <p>For option 1 the existing NRL structure will be reused to deliver a delta version between initial NRL generation and M-3. This solution can be delivered through a minor release.</p> <p>For option 2 a new report would be developed and issued to the Shipper via the IX to ensure security. As per option 1, this can be delivered as part of a minor release.</p> <p>For option 3 the complexity and overall size of the change is larger than solution options 1 and 2 and requires further analysis on the CSSC impacts. Due to the size and functional area impacted, this solution option has been defined as Large and would require a major release.</p> <p>For option 4 new DDP reports and dashboards would be created and, if agreed at Shipper Constituency meetings, these could be delivered in a Core DDP drop.</p> <p><u>Shipper Question</u></p> <p>The CDSP would encourage Shippers to include a response to the following as part their representation response: In relation to solution option 1, what notice period would Shippers feel is required prior to implementation of this solution?</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, the NRL file to be used within the solution will be the same format as the existing published version (no file format changes) however, Shipper Users could be receiving multiple iterations of the NRL per month.</p>
<p>Implementation Date Solution Options:</p>	<p>Solution options 1 and 2 could be delivered in a minor release.</p> <p>Solution option 3 will require a major release, the next available scope would be post CSSC implementation.</p> <p>Solution option 4 could be delivered within a Core DDP drop, if agreed at Shipper Constituency meetings.</p>

<p>Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>Xoserve's preferred solution is option 1 as this will deliver the currently unavailable data to Shipper Users using a known file format, in a timely manner and with minimal impacts on existing processes. It is anticipated that this will allow Shipper Users to automate subsequent actions more easily. Also, it will be possible to deliver this, subject to Change Management Committee approval, in the next* minor release.</p> <p>*At time of writing this is Minor Release 11, due for delivery in late November 2021.</p> <p>Solution options 2 and 4 would both provide new reports that the Shipper User would need to understand, handle and utilise the data from in order to make the required updates to their systems. Option 3 would add further complication to Supply Point Administration (SPA) processes that are currently subject to large change (CSSC) and could not be delivered until post CSS implantation.</p>
<p>DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>The solution options have been presented to the proposer and will be taken to DSG on 23rd August 2021 for wider discussion.</p>
<p>Consultation closeout:</p>	<p>31/08/2021</p>

<p>Impact on Service Line(s) and funding (A6) for each Solution Option:</p>	<p>(If differ from original assessment in A6)</p>
---	---

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:	078751 17771
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	<p>We need further information on quantity of impacted sites in order to make an informed decision.</p> <p>In addition we would like an option considered whether updating the AQ value in the TRF based on SSD may be feasible.</p> <p>Regarding the options presented in the change pack:</p> <p>Option 1 - this seems like the most sensible option, however until further impact assessment is undertaken, we cannot agree that a minor release will be suitable.</p> <p>Option 2 - it is unclear how this report will be formatted - i would assume that a new file type would be required to pass across IX and therefore this wouldn't be a minor release</p> <p>Option 3 - seems to deliver the same as option 1 to shippers, with differences being in CDSP processes and resulting cost</p> <p>Option 4 - this is an option potentially if numbers are low. Awaiting confirmation on numbers of sites involved.</p>	
Implementation Date:	Defer	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Defer	
DSG preferred solution option:	Defer	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	<p>Thank you for your consultation response.</p> <p>Having assessed the available options we can confirm that any changes to include this prospective AQ data within Transfer of Ownership files is highly likely to be more complex and costly change to deliver to customers. In addition, we have a responsibility to ensure that the current AQ values are provided to parties, and would need to create new fields to reflect prospective AQ data as</p>
---	---

	<p>without doing so it would cut across our data model and architecture principles.</p> <p>With regards to the feedback you have kindly provided on the available options, we recognise that parties would need suitable notice periods if changes to customers solutions are identified. Option 2 would reflect a new agreed format that would need to be defined and approved by customers during the detailed design phase. Option 3 does as you have stated achieve a similar output via a different central solution mechanism, with option 4 being viewed as a potential alternative, self-service mechanism, which would place more responsibility on customers choosing to integrate this data into the processes that may currently be lacking it.</p> <p>We will ensure that your input has been included during September's ChMC material where it will be considered before confirming the preferred option for DSC Customers.</p>
--	--

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	SSE Energy Supply Limited
	Name:	Mark Jones
	Email:	mark.jones@sse.com
	Telephone:	07810858716
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Agree with Solution Option 1, but implementation should be at least 6 months after approval by the DSC Change Management Committee.	
Implementation Date:	Defer	
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 consultation response. This will be fed in to the ChMC and shall be considering the delivery options available.
---	--

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EON
	Name:	Clare Manning
	Email:	clare.manning@eonenergy.com
	Telephone:	07812 3667271
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	Our preference is option 3, providing it delivers a single file containing all registrations encompassed in one file after the event has passed. If this is not what option 3 will deliver, then our preference is option 1	
Implementation Date:	Support	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Support	
DSG preferred solution option:	N/A	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your consultation response. This will be fed in to the ChMC for consideration ahead of formal approval of the preferred option.
---	---

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power
	Name:	Helen Bevan
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	0141-614-5517
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We are happy to approve Option 1, where we would require about a 3 – 4 month notice period on this.	
Xoserve preferred solution option:	Approve	
Publication of consultation response:	N/A	

E2: Xoserve' s Response

<p>Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:</p>	<p>Thank you for your representation.</p> <p>Based on the feedback we've had through the consultation, the likely outcome is that everyone supports option 1, but will ask for this to be implemented with a minimum notice period (possibly 6 months) – which means we may be looking at a March / April 2022 implementation, via the Minor Release mechanism.</p>
--	---

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

<p>User Contact Details:</p>	<p>Organisation:</p>	<p>Centrica</p>
	<p>Name:</p>	<p>Oorlagh Chapman</p>
	<p>Email:</p>	<p>Oorlagh.Chapman@centrica.com</p>
	<p>Telephone:</p>	<p>07557 614769</p>
<p>Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.</p>	<p>Preferred option is Solution Option 1. However, can we ask a few questions just to check some details please. The "delta" NRL file, is this an NRL file that will be received within month but not at the same time as a standard NRL file (received around the 21st of each month). Would the NRL sequencing name continue, or would the Delta file have its own sequence? Normal NRL files received NRL 1, NRL 2, NRL 3 etc would the "delta" NRL file be named NRL 4 or would it be NRL 1?</p> <p>Option 2 and 4 are not supported, these are reports requiring increased cost and effort from the suppliers to utilise the data. It would be necessary to download then manually update systems (through a costly TSR request every month) with the Rolling AQ values. And option 3, is the most expensive and a major change so we'd want to avoid that for what is going to be a new NRL file each month with restricted usage.</p>	
<p>Xoserve preferred solution option:</p>	<p>Approve</p>	
<p>Publication of consultation response:</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

E2: Xoserve' s Response

<p>Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:</p>	<p>The "delta" NRL files</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These will be sent from the day after the initial/standard NRL is issued up to, and including, M-3 o This will pick up MPRNs changing to CO after the initial/standard NRL is issued and up to the point where the TRF issued would contain any updated information i.e. the start date is equal to, or greater than, the first of the next month - The file number sequencing is expected to continue so, in line with your example, where initial/standard NRL is PN000123 the subsequent NRL, be that the next month's initial/standard or a
--	--

	<p>“delta” version, will be PN000124</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Unique numbering for the delta files has not been requested or considered as part of the solution however the design will be finalised in the next stage and issued for review in a design change pack <p>On the other options, agree with your summary and feedback, thank you.</p>
--	---

Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4978
Solution Details:	Option 1: Reuse the existing .NRL generation logic and trigger a delta .NRL file for switches effective up to M-1
Implementation Date:	TBC
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	08/09/2021