

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	15/07/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Simon Harris (SH) provided an overview of this Change. SH stated that this change has been submitted by British Gas and involves sending out an AQ notification to the incoming Shipper where the AQ has changed and due to go live post the confirmation effective date. SH stated that each month, by M-5, the .NRL file (AQ notification file) is issued from the CDSP to Shippers to notify of the new AQ/SOQ values that will be going live on the 1st of the month. If there is a transfer of ownership in progress whose status changes to CO in the period following file generation and new AQ go live, the incoming User is not notified of the new AQ/SOQ values. This leads to the NRL file only being issued to the live shipper at the point of file generation. The incoming Shipper will receive a TRF file, though that would contain the AQ which is effective at the point of Confirmation Effective Date, and hence they will not learn of the planned revision to AQ to go live shortly after Confirmation Effective Date and not have this information available to their systems to aid in forecasting. This change was raised to provide the new User with a view of the amended AQ/SOQ values.</p> <p>SH provided an overview of the appendix and prioritisation score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Change is endorsed by ChMC • The impacted party for this Change is Shippers where the business process impact will be SPA. • There is a perceived delivery effort of 0-30 days • The Change Beneficiary would be multiple market group • There is between 2-5 impacted service areas • Low Change improvement scale. • There is currently no workaround in operation • Overall this Change has a prioritisation score of 46% <p>Danny Byrne (DB) asked when looking at informing the Shipper of the revised AQ, how is the CDSP proposing to do that? SH stated that during Capture stage the method used can be discussed, SH suggested it could involve a new file flow, amendment to existing file flows or a file flow that is already sent out that can be triggered at a different point along with an enhancement to an existing API solution. All options will be brought to a future DSG to work through pros and cons and allow members to provide input into development of a recommended solution.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	26/04/2021		
DSG Summary:	<p>PO presented this agenda item. PO provided a brief overview of this Change. This is Change was raised to provide the new User with a view of the amended AQ/SOQ (There is already an approved change to provide a report for this scenario for Formula year values). IB asked if it is known which point in the Year this Notification of Rolling AQ value occurs? PO advised that there were two previous changes raised regarding prospective formula Year AQ, whereas this change looks at the rolling AQ. IB asked is there a reporting line from Xoserve to Shipper to make the Shipper aware of this Rolling AQ? PO stated that there is no process in line at the moment and this change looks to help define that process with a solution. EL asked PO about and NRO file that might be something related to this process and Change.</p> <p>Action: PO to chase internally what the NRO file relates to and report back to DSG and EL with findings.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	21/06/2021		
DSG Summary:	<p>KA presented this agenda item. KA provided a background and update regarding XRN4978. This change highlights a gap in the .NRL file flow process. In specific that if a site moves to CO between M-5 and M, the incoming Shipper does not receive the .NRL file along with associated updated Rolling AQ/SOQ/EUC, as this is sent to the previous Shipper at M-5.</p> <p>KA advised that capture sessions have been held between Xoserve and Correla and a list of functional and non-functional requirements have been drafted.</p> <p>A number of solution options have been identified including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reissuing the .NRL files for all sites which move to CO between M-5 and M to the new Shipper. - Reporting and DDP options. <p>KA added that the HLSOs for the various solution options will be presented at July's DSG. In addition, the HLSOs will be included in July's Change pack.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	23/08/2021
DSG Summary:	<p>KA stated that the change pack has been issued for this change detailing solution options, and gave an overview of the change proposal. KA provided an overview of the solution options given (further details can be found in the slide deck). With regards to solution option 1, EL stated that it may take some further time to investigate the change impacts, so they may not be able to provide feedback in time for the change, however they suspect that Minor Release will not be enough notice time for them.</p> <p>EL stated that if the original option given previously was discounted for not meeting a key requirement (Does not meet customer requirement to issue updated AQ/SOQ/EUC values as soon as possible), if the other options also do not meet the requirement, why are they still on the table, which indicates that the option was discounted more around the file size rather than not meeting the requirement. KA agreed that this wording on slide 8 was not the best choice of words and that the file size was the primary reason for discounted this option 1b. PO stated that we need to ensure that any options we choose to progress, we will ensure we get the buy in from a wider customer group, and if we don't we are running the risk of delivering only a sub-optimal solution. EL stated that the critical thing with solution option 1 is that the analysis of impact in their organisation will take longer than normal and a minor release will not be suitable. PO stated that, to be clear, we are only asking at this state the method of delivery, not necessarily when it is to be delivered at this stage, e.g. if this will fit into a minor release, it doesn't necessarily mean it will be in the next available minor release and potentially one in the future. EL stated that her only concern was that it stated in the change pack that it was the next minor release, however this is just a suggestion.</p> <p>EL asked, with regards to option 2, if a new file type is being created they don't see how this can fit into a minor release, and there are some concerns on the use of IX to deliver reports. KA stated that this comment has been taken on board and has gone back to the Service provider to give clarification.</p> <p>With regards to option 3, EL confirmed that the impact is the same as option 1 apart from how this is managed internally. KA explained that this does produce the same external output as option 1.</p> <p>KA continued to go through the final solution option for this change (full details available in the slide deck). EL stated that, for all options, they need to go away and look at how large the impact is for this and how many sites this relates too, and if the number of sites is small, they are happy for a smaller more simple solution, however if the impact is larger, this will impact which option they favour.</p> <p>HB highlighted that they are edging towards option 1 and will give their input via change packs this week. IB stated that from an N</p>

	<p>Power perspective they have already fed in their input directly with James Barlow.</p> <p>EL stated that, internally, there has been a discussion around a 5th option which changes the TRF file to trigger the prospective AQ/SOQ/EUC if the transfer of ownership takes place between the NRL generation and M-1. PO explains this was likely discounted by our service provider due to the complexity of the change being greater than the .NRL file option. KA/PO to go back to service provider to find out their reasons for not including this as a potential solution option and will respond direct to EL.</p> <p>No recommendation given as customers were encouraged to respond via the change pack route</p>
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input type="checkbox"/> Reject <input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

DSG Date:	25/04/2022		
DSG Summary:	<p>Michelle Niits (MN) gave an overview of background of this change and provided a walkthrough of the detail design Change Pack. Eleanor Laurence (EL) queried whether the solution covered both change of Shipper and change of supplier events. MN confirmed that the solution caters for both scenarios and noted that when CSS goes live, a Change of Supplier will also trigger a delta .NRL file even if the Shipper remains the same. This is the same for any switch where the Shipper does not change (i.e a re-confirmation (for non-CSS sites) or a switch with no Change to Shipper or Supplier). EL also queried how Shippers would differentiate changes to conversion factor that are triggered as part of the normal NRL process against those that are not triggered when the Delta NRL files are provided. MN noted that where a Shipper does not update the conversion factor within 30 days of the monthly NRL, the CDSP will attempt to change it. However, the delta NRL will not act as a trigger, internally, to start the 30 day countdown which essentially provides the Shipper with a longer period (until a monthly NRL file is issued) to update the conversion factor before the CDSP attempt to change it. MN confirmed that Shippers could choose to treat the delta NRL notification in the same way as a monthly NRL i.e. as this would enable an update to invalid conversion factor as soon as possible after receiving the notification from the CDSP.</p>		
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

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 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.</p>
---------------------------------	--

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:

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

	<p>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>

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1.0	With DSG	23/07/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with Discussions from DSG 15 th July 2019
2.0	With DSG	05/05/2021	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 26 th April 2021
3.0	With DSG	02/07/2021	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 21 st June 2021
4.0	Approved	08/09/2021	Rachel Taggart	Solution Review Change Pack and reps added (August) Section F added Updated with the Solution outcome from ChMC on 11/08/2021
5.0	With DSG	04/05/2022	Chan Singh	CP updated with discussions from DSG 25 th April 2022