Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	20/03/2023		
DSG Summary:	PO presented this agenda item. PO provided a brief overview of the Change which can be viewed within the slide deck.		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	18/12/2023
DSG Summary:	JB provided background to the Change Proposal advising that XRN5615, it is to bring it in line with the Electricity processes wherever a vacant site process exists and to reduce or remove those commodity and performance and capacity obligations and charges where a site can be proven to be vacant. JB advised that there is a Vacant Site guidance document currently being produced and that will have specific criteria that will have to be met and warranted by the shipper to show that a site can be entered into the vacant site process and that there are, a specific set of rules that would trigger a site to have a vacant status, which CDSP, would be looking to apply against validation against the entry criteria where possible noting that not all entry capacity can be validated by the CDSP. The requirements will also explain how to trigger the exit criteria and inform parties to manage this with all parties and manage that in line with the modification rules and the guidance document. JB explained the purpose of bringing this to the DSG today, in that it is to provide a quick run through of the customer requirements contained in the slide deck. Based on the modification and legal text and the business rules which will be used to drive the HLSO process, which is currently ongoing and DSG, should see progress on that in the new year. JB went through a high-level review of the Customer requirements on Slide 14 of the Presentation document which defines the Customer Requirements that have been drafted, to deliver the

	objectives of the modification and welcomed any feedback or clarification. JB highlighted the Epic requirement and all related requirements that had been captured against the change proposal as detailed on the slides presented and welcomed any feedback from customers. JB following the review, asked if anyone had any questions at this stage, no questions were raised. JB went on to explain that this will be in the Solution Change Pack when this is issued (Target February 2024) and confirmed that the business is looking at lower-level requirements to produce the solution details. PO thanked JB and explained that as this is an overview of the 40+ customer requirements, at confirmed that this demonstrates the level of detail we have captured to ensure we meet the acceptance criteria and allows us to evidence that we are meeting the requirements set out in the Modification, and those the CDSP will look to deliver and activities that CDSP will be asked to provide to enable the end to end process operates correctly.		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		
DSG Date:	19/02/2024		
DSG Summary:	Solution Option PO introduced the first of two solutions that were included in the February Change Pack for industry the first being XRN5615 to support Modification 0819. Rajiv Patel (RP) provided an overview of the design options, which aims to create a new process for Vacant Product Class 4 Non-Daily Metered (NDM) sites which would allow Shippers to receive immediate commodity and performance relief and capacity relief (after 12 months at vacant status) for sites in their ownership. RP went through the process flow diagram (PFD) on slide 12 noting that Shipper users will submit Vacant entry requests to CDSP and the Modification obligations are, that certain validations are carried out by CDSP. RP explained that there are a number of computations in 3a and 3b carried out and there are reports that the Performance Assurance will require for certain performance obligations for industry to use on vacancy. The GTs and potentially IGTs will receive some information around visibility of sites entering and exiting vacancy site status. RP advised that the clock on the PFD, demonstrates that CDSP monitor daily in line with the requirements of the Modification to ensure that the correct actions are taken to resume charges once a site enters or exits vacant site status and the relevant process resumes. RP presented two options for a solution design, which centres around how CDSP get information in and out of the process: - Option 1, to use our existing Contact Management System (CMS), it offers a web-based solution and a visible view into making requests through to		

the CDSP. CDSP carry out various computations as per the Modification, and to get information out would also be via CMS to notify users of the status of sites and what is happening to the site. DDP chief Data visualisation and reporting platform CDSP will look also be looking to amend existing dashboards to provide the user community with a view of vacant site status.

Option 2, Same as Option 1, but the design will use traditional flat files into and out of the system so the user will send files through IX type of file flow basis and it is important to say that this is likely to have new file formats that will be required as well as amending existing file formats, so RP advised that this needs to be factored in. Everything else is the same as Option 1 - DDP is obliged to do this process.

RP explained that there was a 3rd option which has been discounted, this was considering using UK Portal to get data in and out, but there was too may cons, chief amongst these was that it is a screen-based system, but did not lend itself to bulk processing, but it was understood that this was something customers would want to have for vacant sites in the design feature to have this functionality for the vacant site process

RP shared the option comparisons for Option 1 and 2 for pros and cons from slide 13 and the associated costs.

RP asked if anyone had any questions at this stage. No questions raised.

PO advised that there is still 5 days for industry to provide feedback on the consultation, then shared the assumptions, dependencies, and risks from slide 16.

Angela Joyce (AJ) advised what sort of volumes is expected? PO advised that there is no specific volumetrics as part of the modification development, and not certainly hundreds of 1000s, but would think somewhere in the region of 1000s, that would have a vacant site at a given any moment in time, but it is something to prepare for that sort of volume in the central systems. RP added that CDSP would most likely approach, one or two of the larger potential users of the new process and have a conversation around what the uptake could be and then based on these conversations would make sure that the performance of the two systems was adequately scaled for the potential usage.

Oorlagh Chapman (OC) wanted to thank RP and PO for the information which was very useful and clear.

Kundai Matiringe (KM) thanked RP for the overview and asked a question around the process overview on side 12 that it does not appear to show the notification going to the IGTs and GTs and wanted to ensure if the solution had considered this as part of the process. She can see where it is enters but not exits and noted that in the change pack there is a could have customer requirement to provide a delivery mechanism for IGTs and did not know if this was a definite that CDSP are considering IGTs to get those updates against the sites in our portfolio and wanted to understand how to navigate this.

RP apologised that there was only so much information to show on the PFD but did confirm that information is being sent to the IGT and GTs on vacant sites, and this we will be sent when the site exits and enters vacant site status, and this is included in the solution.

PO explained in terms of the 'could have IGT requirement', that RP has described that the process and the solution that CDSP has been sent out

in the change pack, is, capable of meeting that requirement of delivering the IGT and DN notifications of changes to your portfolio wherever a vacant site is flagged, but via the CMS proposed solution. so vacant site data delivery via a DDP reporting option to shippers, DNs, IGT's and to the Performance Assurance committee, so effectively having the opportunity to use that visualisation tool given the expected volumes, which are expected to be in the low 1000s so we can still deliver that 'could have requirement', utilising the existing investment that has been made in the DDP solution option.

PO went onto say that what we can share with IGT customers, is the option and cost of delivery that requirement via an alternative mechanism such as a change to your delta file provision, but is not set out as a 'must have' for this change because it is not set out in the IGT UNC obligations either IGT or UNC as there is not a definitive use of that data for IGT as there is no obligation to incorporate, which is why DDP again, becomes quite a good option because it becomes more of an operational value add provision of data than a must have provision of data and use of data. KM was happy with this. PO explained, if IGT's are happy for using this data and if there is a specific business need to look at this for an obligated use, we can look at this functionality, but didn't want to inflate the cost of delivery the modification rules in order to incorporate a 'could have requirement' and functional change and hoped this had addresses this. PO explained that RP and PO have put some information together to discuss with IGT's to see what the appetite is like and more functional and more definitive data solution, and if it gives you enough information to make a decision as to whether you wish this to be delivered in this or separately at another point in time. KD was happy with the answer to her question.

PO went through the assumptions, dependencies and risks slide 16 and asked if there was anything that needed to be called out. RP called out risk A1 around DDP changes can be accommodated in a prioritised Sprint, and the governance is by a community based. PO agreed it is important to call out the DDP Sprints and what level of priority and what decisions have been made to make decisions around the scope of DDP releases and the 6 releases in plan each year and will look to bring this to the ChMC from April onwards as part of the proposal to align the governance the transparency and scoping decisions and as this is a regulated change, it would take a priority unless customers felt there was a higher priority or urgent requirement, but this would be taken back to validate.

OC advised that she wanted to make sure that there is transparency and governance to those decisions and documented in the ChMC to understand these decisions. PO completely agreed that this needs to be in a governance route so we can see why a decision was made and by whom. OC advised that this is something that she has struggled with as there is not any documentation or paper trail for those decisions, and no one can really ascertain who decided or why those things have been decided. PO agreed and OC concluded that it does need to be documented and it does need to be done in a forum that is an official governance route for the delivery of DDP and we do need to have transparency so that everybody can see why a decision was made and by whom.

No other questions raised.

Design Considerations

PO introduced this change which was discussed in point 2a.c.i. to run through with detailed design and what this is about.
RP outlined the 'Design Considerations' for XRN5615 'Establishing/Amending a Gas Vacant Site Process' for a to be process that will allow and aims to provide a process that allows Shippers to warrant certain sites as being Vacant and, thereby, attracting certain reliefs from charges and performance obligations. There is a part of this process to call out that interoperates with the current must read process. RP advised that Code asks us to put certain sites into the must-read process for a period of time and is about notifying users that a list of sites need to provide a valid meter reading, there is currently a report called the 'Notification Report issued on 20th business day of any given month. RP advised that there is another report that is sent prior to this on the 1st business day of the month and is a pre-curser to the Notification report the 'Pre-Notification Report' explaining the concept of this report is to inform users on this report the 'Pre-Notification Report' could fall into the proper must-read process later in the month if reads are not received by 20th of the month, the ones after, have fallen into this process and the pre-notification are those that may fall into the report, where the later report has fallen into the Must read process. It is this report that the design considerations are for when the vacant site process interacts with the must-read process'.
PO presented the design considerations for: -

- Monthly Must-Read Notifications Report - when the vacant site process interacts with the Must-Read process, and which reads fall into the Must-Read process should a valid meter reading not be provided within the month. CDSP then consider a site vacant, nothing in the system that can show this earlier in the report and if it shows on the Notification report, Vacant site not going to surrender a valid meter reading and over a period of time as more vacant sites get requested, that this report will continually show an increasing amount of vacant sites.

  RP explained that Shippers have informed CDSP that a site is vacant, but yet CDSP at this point is replaying back to the shipper that this will fall into the Must read process and it seems unnecessary, so the design is to exclude vacant sites from the pre-notification report or we let them fall into this pre-notification report. RW advised that we are about to change XRN5605 Amendments to the Must-Read Process (IGT) must read process and there we have chosen to show sites where there is a known issue on this pre-notification report.

RP explained that the choice is to be thought of either we show the vacant sites but the downside being they will stay on there forever and a day, on this report or we can choose to exclude them from the pre-notification report and make sure they are excluded from the later report so meter readings are required so they are then excluded from the later report issued on the 20th of the month.

RP asked if any questions on this. KM asked if this would affect OC with regards to the Must-read modification, are we likely to get reasons for these metering issues for one and secondly are CDSP you proposing to include this on this report, we need to get visibility on the report as this report is for known metering issues for example; meters not working but then also the ones that will be vacant and to explain why it is being issued.

JB just wanted to clarify RP's point and stated that the report is not just for the known metering issues, it is the pre-notification report, it is everything that is potentially due a must read. KM advised that this is not how she understood this. JB advised that it is the Pre-Notification that comes out as standard now which has everything on and as RP called out and post Modification 0159 it will come out and then have everything on with no metering issues with things we are going to stop because they change to shipper and then the notifications won't include that because they drop out, and we do not actually raise the must-read request. KM was happy with this explanation.

PO surmised that it is cleaner if we do not include on the Pre-Notification report, as ultimately those sites would not be in a position to obtain a must read, as the read agent on the basis, that the site could not be accessed because of the vacant status.

OC agreed with PO's assumption as we do not want to jump through quite a lot of hoops for a site to be put into the vacant process so have the justification for it to be excluded and should not be included in the pre-notification if it cannot be read, as long as we still need to demonstrated that a visit has been attempted in accordance with the guidelines for vacant site process, but would be happy to hear others views on this.

Angela Joyce (AJ) asked if CDSP are doing any audit on vacant sites with regards to sites showing on this report forever, as in the electricity world, it is audited once a year. PO said that this is not about the data that CDSP hold about vacancy it is about the pre-notification must read report that will or will not include sites that are vacant. AJ appreciated this but wondered if there was going to be any auditing on sites vacant, so they do not stay on the report forever and wanted to understand if there is auditing on Shippers to leave them on here indefinitely. OC advised that this is covered in the Modification and has strict rules on how long sites can stay in this position and PO and JB concurred with this and suggested AJ review the modification for further information.

PO advised RP that it is at solution stage and would like to get further information and feedback on whether to include or exclude on the pre-notification report.

No further questions raised.

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