

DSC Change Proposal Document

Customers to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured ■
 Xoserve to fill out all of the information in the sections coloured ■

A1: General Details

Change Reference:	XRN4865		
Change Title:	Amendment to Treatment and Reporting of CYCL Reads		
Date Raised:	19/02/2019		
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Xoserve	
	Name:	Steve Rist	
	Email:	Steve.Rist@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	07841488631	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Chandni Khanna	
	Email:	Chandni.Khanna@xoserve.com	
	Telephone:	0121 229 2097	
Change Status:	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> With DSG	<input type="checkbox"/> Out for Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator
	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Change Description:	<p>An issue has been identified with the estimated read created for the confirmation effective date (CED) for class 3 and 4 meter points in the case where the asset is installed for a date prior to the confirmation effective date. The estimated read which is currently stored in the system as a CYCL read is reported to the shippers in the MBR file. Below are the issues identified on this read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly treated as an actual read for any subsequent read validations, even though it is an estimate. Since the CYCL read which is an estimated read is being used for read validations, it is resulting in subsequent reads being incorrectly rejected if they are lower than the CYCL read.
---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>2. The read type in the MBR file for the CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly reported as N (normal) instead of E (estimate).</p> <p>3. The read reason code description in the MBR file format does not state that CYCL read can relate to a Back Billing estimated read for Confirmation effective date. Although it was agreed as a part of an industry workaround to send such estimated reads as CYCL reads in the MBR file, there was no change done to the file format description which is now not consistent with what is being reported in the file.</p> <p>Once XRN4534 (Amendment to RGMA validations) is implemented as part of Future Release 3 Track 2B in March 2019, the instances of generation of such estimated CYCL reads will increase. Due to the consequential impact to read rejections and inconsistent reporting of reads in MBR file, this change needs to be implemented as soon as possible. Customers are aware of the issue and tickets have been raised regarding this.</p>	
Proposed Release:	Release X: Feb/Jun/Nov XX or Adhoc 01/11/2019	
Proposed Consultation Period:	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	<p>The change will stop subsequent customer reads from getting rejected incorrectly and AQ from not being calculated. It will also correct the reporting of these reads via the MBR file to the customer. It will be bring consistency to the file format.</p> <p><i>What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?</i></p>	
Benefit Realisation:	<p>Immediately upon delivery</p> <p><i>When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?</i></p>	
Benefit Dependencies:	<p>N/A</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	

A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

Final DSG Recommendation:	<i>Until a final decision is achieved, please refer to section C of the form.</i>		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: June 2020		

A6: Funding

Funding Classes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Shipper	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	XX %
	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	XX %
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Xoserve)	100 %
Service Line(s)		
ROM or funding details:		
Funding Comments:	<p>This change will be funded internally by the Xoserve improvement budget.</p> <p>22/03/2019 – this change is expected to have no impact to the DSC service lines.</p>	

A7: ChMC Recommendation – 13th March 2019

Change Status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approve (to proceed to DSG)	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
Industry Consultation:	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 Working Days	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 30 Working Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Other [Specify Here]	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX		

DSC Consultation Issue:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Date Issued:	14/06/2019	18/11/2019
Comms Ref(s):	2346.6 - RJ – PO	2489.12 - RT - PO
Number of Responses:	1 approval response (solution review) 3 approval responses (detail design)	

A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	Please select.
	<input type="checkbox"/> National Grid Transmission	Please select.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Distribution Network Operator	Please select.

	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	Please select.
Meeting Date:	10/07/2019	
Release Date:	26/06/2020	
Overall Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
	Approved to be included in the June 2020 Release	

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:	18/03/2019		
DSG Summary:	<p>Simon Harris (SH) presented this Change Proposal to DSG. SH explained that it relates to an issue has been identified with the way UK Link systems are treating estimated reads-specifically where they have been created for the confirmation effective date (CED) for class 3 and 4 meter points in the case where the asset is installed for a date prior to the confirmation effective date. SH gave an overview of the change details.</p> <p>SH talked DSG through Appendix One, which indicates that this Change Proposal has a prioritisation score of 49%. PO confirmed DSG are happy with the scoring.</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 X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

Section D: High Level Solution Options

D1: Solution Options

<p>Solution Option Summary:</p>	<p>For XRN4865, we are looking to fix a number of issues being faced with business processes relating to the treatment of CYCL reads (issues listed below) so as a result, there is only one solution option that has been put forward for HLSO.</p> <p>a) The CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly treated as an actual read for any subsequent read validations, even though it is an estimate. Since the CYCL read which is an estimated read is being used for read validations, it is resulting in subsequent reads submitted by the Shipper being incorrectly rejected, if they are lower than the estimated CYCL read (as this should be accepted).</p> <p>b) The read type in the MBR file for the CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly reported as N (normal) instead of E (estimate)</p> <p>c) The [READ_REASON_CODE] description in the [M03 BILLREADS] record (MBR file) format does not currently state that CYCL read can relate to a Back Billing estimated read for Confirmation effective date. Currently states “CYCL – Cyclic Reads (Prime & Sub Reads)” only. Although it was agreed as a part of an industry workaround to send such estimated reads as CYCL reads in the MBR file, there was no change done to the file format description which is now not consistent with what is being reported in the file.</p> <p>1) Fix multiple issues that are being experienced in SAP ISU relating to CYCL Confirmation Effective Date estimated reads</p> <p>Details of the HLSO are available and can be found here</p>
<p>Xoserve preferred option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>1) Fix multiple issues that are being experienced in SAP ISU relating to CYCL Confirmation Effective Date estimated reads</p>
<p>DSG preferred solution option: (including rationale)</p>	<p>TBC (DSG 17th June 2019)</p>
<p>Consultation closeout:</p>	<p>28/06/2019</p>

Section E: Industry Response Solution Options Review

E1: Organisation's preferred solution option

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com
	Telephone:	07875117771
Organisation's preferred solution option, including rationale taking into account costs, risks, resource etc.	We agree with solution being proposed.	
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 comments.
---------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Section F: Approved Solution Option

F1: Approved Solution Option

XRN Reference:	XRN4865 Amendment to Treatment and Reporting of CYCL Reads
Solution Details:	<p>There is only one solution</p> <p>The solution option seeks fix multiple issues that are being experienced in SAP ISU relating to CYCL Confirmation Effective Date estimated reads</p>
Implementation Date:	26/06/2020
Approved By:	Change Management Committee
Date of Approval:	10/07/2019

Section G: Change Pack

G1: Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2489.12 - RT - PO
Comm Title:	XRN4865 - Amendment to Treatment and Reporting of CYCL Reads - Detail Design
Comm Date:	18/11/2019

G2: Change Representation

Action Required:	For representation
Close Out Date:	02/12/2019

G3: Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN4865
Change Class:	CDSP System Configuration Changes
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	Shippers
Change Owner:	Simon Harris Customer Change Service Development Specialist simon.harris@xoserve.com 0121 229 2642
Background and Context:	<p>Link to CP</p> <p>Currently UK Link (Supply Point Register) is incorrectly treating estimated CYCL reads that are generated by the CDSP for the Confirmation Effective Date on Product Class 3 & 4 Supply Meter Points, as actual readings where a Meter asset is installed prior to the Confirmation Effective Date (Greenfield & Brownfield). The treatment of these estimate readings as actuals are causing several issues for downstream processes, most notably reducing the Registered Shippers ability to submit subsequent Meter Readings.</p> <p>Below are the issues identified that require addressing as part of this change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly treated as an actual read for any subsequent read validations, even though it is an estimate. Due to this treatment the subsequent reads submitted by the Shipper are being incorrectly rejected, if they are higher than the last actual and if lower than the estimated CYCL read. • The read type in the MBR file for the CYCL estimated read is being incorrectly reported as N (normal) instead of E (estimate). • The [READ_REASON_CODE] description in the [M03 BILLREADS] record (MBR file) format does not currently state

	that CYCL read can relate to a Back Billing estimated read for Confirmation effective date. Currently states “CYCL – Cyclic Reads (Prime & Sub Reads)” only. Although it was agreed as a part of an industry workaround to send such estimated reads as CYCL reads in the MBR file, there was no change done to the file format description which is now not consistent with what is being reported in the file.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

G4: Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Meter Reads
Non-Functional:	None
Application:	SAP ISU
User(s):	Shippers
Documentation:	File Format (Description Amendment)
Other:	None

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
MBR	N/A	M03	READ_REASON_CODE	File Format (Description Amendment)

G5: Change Design Description

Overview

As specified in the background section, UK Link is incorrectly treating estimated CYCL reads that are generated by the CDSP for the Confirmation Effective Date on Product Class 3 & 4 Supply Meter Points, as actual readings where a Meter asset is installed prior to the Confirmation Effective Date (Greenfield & Brownfield). This change is looking to amend the way the Supply Pont Register treats these readings in the scenarios outlined.

Treatment of CYCL (Back Billing)

Where a Meter is installed prior to the Confirmation Effective Date the CDSP will estimate a read for the Confirmation Effective Date to ensure effective billing for the pre-Confirmation period (back to the Meter Install Effective Date). This estimate reading is labelled as a CYCL. The estimated ‘CYCL’ read gets created in scenarios such as (a) when the D+10 day is reached (b) when the RGMA for meter installation is received after D+10 days.

Where a subsequent reading is submitted (post Confirmation Effective Date) by the Registered Shipper, the validation for tolerance checks only goes back to the estimated CYCL reading, treating it as an actual read and not, as is expected, going back to the Meter Installation Reading, which is in fact the last valid actual reading held on UK Link for that Supply Meter Point. This issue has a subsequent impact on the Meter Read

validations, especially when the Shipper submitted actual read is lower than the CYCL read (valid scenario) that is then getting rejected.

This change looking to amend the treatment of the estimated CYCL reads within the above outlined scenario as 'estimated' read in the UK Link system so when the next actual read is submitted, validation/tolerance checks will go back to the Meter Installation Reading.

For clarification, for the estimated CYCL reads which have already been created before the go-live date, the read type will remain as 'actual'. This change will only cater for any CYCL reads created after the change implementation date.

Population of .MBR File

Currently the 'Read Type' contained in the .MBR (Billable Meter Readings) file will be sent as 'N', following this change, the 'Read Type' contained within the .MBR file will be sent as 'E' for CYCL readings showing that this is an estimated reading. For the avoidance of doubt, Prime & Sub reads within the .MBR file will remain as 'N' for its Read Type.

File Format Amendments

For clarity, it is proposed that the description of the 'Read_Reason_Code' data item in the .MBR file format document is to be updated. Attached is a link to the marked-up File Format of the M03 Record containing the proposed description for Read Reason Code of 'CYCL' for approval.

<https://www.xoserve.com/media/7613/xrn4865-suppl-doc.pdf>

Additional Information

For the avoidance of doubt, any Prime & Sub Supply Meter Points where readings have been obtained by the Transporters will continue to have the 'Read Reason Code' as 'CYCL' and Read Type as 'N' in the .MBR file.

G6: Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	N/A
------------------------------------	-----

G7: DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	N/A
Any further information:	N/A

G8: Implementation

Target Release:	June-2020
Status:	Approved

Please see the following page for representation comments template; responses to uklink@xserve.com

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Npower Ltd	
	Name:	Alison Price	
	Email:	alison.price@npower.com	
	Telephone:	07557202065	
Representation Status:	Large Shipper		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	No comments		
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»	

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.		
---------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	EDF Energy	
	Name:	Eleanor Laurence	
	Email:	eleanor.laurence@edfenergy.com	

	Telephone:	07875117771
Representation Status:	Approve	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	None	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.
---------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Scottish Power
	Name:	Helen Bevan
	Email:	Helen.Bevan@scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	01416145517
Representation Status:	Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	N/A	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, we will feed this into ChMC for a final decision.
---------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please send the completed representation response to uklink@xoserve.com

Appendix 1

Change Prioritisation Variables

Xoserve uses the following variables set for each and every change within the Xoserve Change Register, to derive the indicative benefit prioritisation score, which will be used in conjunction with the perceived delivery effort to aid conversations at the DSC ChMC and DSC Delivery Sub Groups to prioritise changes into all future minor and major releases.

Change Details

Change Driver Type:	<input type="checkbox"/> CMA Order	<input type="checkbox"/> MOD / Ofgem	
	<input type="checkbox"/> EU Legislation	<input type="checkbox"/> License Condition	
	<input type="checkbox"/> BEIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ChMC endorsed Change Proposal	
	<input type="checkbox"/> SPAA Change Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional / 3rd Party Service Request	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Customer group(s) impacted if the change is not delivered:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shipper	<input type="checkbox"/> IGT	<input type="checkbox"/> Network
	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve	<input type="checkbox"/> NG Transmission	<input type="checkbox"/> NTS
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Associated Change Ref Number(s):	N/A	Associated MOD Number(s):	N/A
Perceived delivery effort (days):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 30-60	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 60-100	<input type="checkbox"/> 100+	
Does the change involve the processing of personal data?	'Any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified in particular by reference to an identifier' - includes MPRNS.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (if selected please answer the next question)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:	<input type="checkbox"/> New Technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Theft of Gas	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mass Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Employee Data	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vulnerable Customer Data	<input type="checkbox"/> Fundamental changes to Xoserve	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
	(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Information Security Team (Kevin Eltoft-Prest) to complete the DPIA.		
Change Beneficiary: <i>How many market participant or segments stand to benefit this change?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Participants	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Market Groups	
	<input type="checkbox"/> All UK Gas Market Participants	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve Only	
	<input type="checkbox"/> One Market Group	<input type="checkbox"/> One Market Participant	
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area:	Service Area 1: Manage Supply Point Registrations		
Number of Service Areas Impacted:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One	<input type="checkbox"/> Two to Five	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Five to Twenty	<input type="checkbox"/> All	

Improvement Scale?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input type="checkbox"/> Low
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety of Supply at risk		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Customer(s) incurring financial loss		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Switching at risk		
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer System Changes Required		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Testing Likely Required		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Training Required		
Primary Application impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> BW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ISU	<input type="checkbox"/> CMS
	<input type="checkbox"/> AMT	<input type="checkbox"/> EFT	<input type="checkbox"/> IX
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gemini	<input type="checkbox"/> Birst	<input type="checkbox"/> API
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Business Process Impacted:	<input type="checkbox"/> AQ	<input type="checkbox"/> SPA	<input type="checkbox"/> RGMA
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reads	<input type="checkbox"/> Portal	<input type="checkbox"/> Invoicing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<If [Other] please provide details here>	
Any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of this change?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<If [Yes] please provide details here>	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		

Workaround Details

Workaround in operation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	If [No] please do <u>not</u> continue completing the [Workaround Details] section
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Who is accountable for the workaround?	<input type="checkbox"/> Xoserve	<input type="checkbox"/> External Customer <input type="checkbox"/> Both
What is the Frequency of the workaround?		
What is the lifespan for the workaround?		
What is the number of resource effort hours required to service workaround?		
What is the Complexity of the workaround?	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<i>(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<i>(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> High	<i>(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)</i>

Prioritisation Score

Change Prioritisation Score:	49%
---------------------------------	-----

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	Proposal	19/02/2019	Xoserve	CP Raised. This was originally a CR. Funding section populated.
2	Proposal	13/03/2019	Xoserve	Appendix added
3	With DSG	15/03/2019	Xoserve	Updated with the ChMC outcome from 13 th March 2019
4	With DSG	22/03/2019	Xoserve	Updated funding section
5	With DSG	22/03/2019	Xoserve	Updated and notes added from DSG 18 th March 2019
6	Out for Review	14/06/2019	Xoserve	Solution Option added to Section D for June Change Pack
7	Voting	04/07/2019	Xoserve	Change pack reps added, ready for solution option and release decision at ChMC in July
8	Approved	14/05/2019	Xoserve	Outcome from ChMC meeting on 10 th July added
9	Voting	10/12/2019	Rachel Taggart	Change Pack and Reps added from November Change Pack

Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Superseded	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11 th July 2018.
4.0	Superseded	07/09/2018	Emma Smith	Minor wording amendments and additional customer group impact within Appendix 1.
5.0	Superseded	10/12/2018	Heather Spensley	Template moved to new Word template as part of Corporate Identity changes.
6.0	Approved	12/12/2018	Simon Harris	Cosmetic changes made. Approved at ChMC on the 12 th December 2018.