

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	20/02/2023		
DSG Summary:	PO presented this agenda item. PO provided a brief overview of the Change which can be viewed within the meeting slide deck.		
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		

DSG Discussion

Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	20/11/2023
DSG Summary:	<p>PO provided the background to this change proposal raised by Wales and West Utilities, explaining that this Change proposal is focussing on Part A of this solution. The intention of this change is to facilitate new processes that improve data consistency between commercial arrangements and physical capabilities of the network, as DN's currently do not have the appropriate visibility of IGT network expansion, rendering contractual IGT capacity monitory systems ineffective. This can lead to low gas pressure issues for DN's and IGT customers managing the network capacity and safe operation of the network for the DN's.</p> <p>PO gave an overview of the change explaining that DN's do not have appropriate visibility of IGT network expansion and so in terms of the Connected System Exit Points (CSEPs) that are recorded in central systems, they relate to contractual agreements between both IGT and Distribution Network customers that the CDSP supports. CDSP record information that's provided to them from IGT customers and then forward that information on to the DN's.</p> <p>PO noted, that any IGT's and DN customers in attendance will be aware that CDSP are looking to address the pain points in the process. In terms of Part A, focusing on the CSEP creation and</p>

Amendment referral requirements, this has been flagged and raised with CDSP and discussed in multiple sessions with IGTs and DNs. PO went on to explain in detail Slide 13 of the presentation explaining each of the customer requirements and user stories. PO asked for feedback from DSG representatives so help and to be able to use to further support the development activities. PO explained next steps which CDSP have handed over to the Service Provider for impact assessment to look at Solution Options in early 2024. PO explained that Xoserve have a plan that we are looking to discuss with DN's and IGT Focus group on 20.11.2023, which will also discuss requirements that have been captured for Part B

KD although professed to not being an expert on this particular change, asked PO to understand why there does not seem to be any reference to shipper requirements and if this had been ruled out, does this mean that there is no knock-on impact to Shippers at all? PO confirmed that for Part A, it is not envisaged that there is any Shipper interaction at that stage as there are no associated meter points when CDSP are creating the CSEP. However, when CDSP are looking at Part B, we will need to understand and consider how this would be orchestrated as Shippers are involved in meter point creation process.

KD went on to ask whether there are any implications on the IGT meter point range process. PO explained that neither Part A or B is proposing any changes to the IGT meter point ranges, explaining that the way the IGT meter points are allocated will remain as is. KD said she is comfortable if this is the case, PO advised that CDSP will look to bring more detail in Part B. KD explained that the PSR process has not been reviewed for a while and has been in place for several years and not revisited, but may require changes to the IGT UNC, but she will wait to see what has been designed first.

Tom Stuart (TS) went on to reassure KD, as the proposer of this change, to give some comfort from a Shipper perspective. He advised that engagement has been made with Shippers and in particular Claire Manning had passed this on to her internal colleagues, who did not seem to pick up any kind of direct impact and that is why Shippers have been perceived as to not being impacted. KD thanked TS and was glad that discussions have taken place with shippers. But from her own perspective would still like to further understand this and get clarity as she has not been close to this change. TS offered KD the opportunity to contact him should she have any further questions. PO thanked KD and TS and asked those on the call if this has triggered any thoughts or questions, to reach out or if further clarification is

	<p>required, please feel free to get in touch with Xoserve and we can look to pick this up directly with you.</p> <p>Action: PO to understand and consider Shipper Impacts on this change for Part A and Part B</p>		
<p>DSG Recommendation:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
<p>DSG Recommended Release:</p>	<p>Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY</p>		
<p>DSG Date:</p>	<p>19/02/24</p>		
<p>DSG Summary:</p>	<p><i>2c.ii. XRN5616 – CSEP Annual Quantity Capacity Management (part A)</i></p> <p>Solution Option</p> <p>Rob Westwood (RW) apologised that Benjamin Snell is on leave and would be unable to dial in as he is overseas, so he will provide an overview of the High-Level Solution (HLSO) on his behalf for XRN5615. RW explained that Distribution Networks (DN's) do not have visibility of IGT expansions, and this change is to provide a mechanism to allow DN operators to provide capability of reviewing the approval or rejection of applications for the creation or amendment of IGT CSEPs (Connected System Exit Points) to ensure compliance with obligations set out in IGTAD preventing CSEP AQs from being exceeded without the DN Operator being aware and this is the driver of this change. RW advised that the changes from the solution overview are those highlighted in yellow square on the solution overview slide 19 and is where the changes exist. These changes will enable compliance with the obligations set out and enable the DN's to manage this This change will provide through DN Portal new referral portal screens review, accept/reject CSEPs so new rejection codes are required and stored in UK link and communicated back to the IGTs. RW advised from 'Option Slide, 20' the changes required to include changes to the DNO Portal, for UK Link a new table to store and manage data and changes existing programs to archiving rules supporting the new logic and status developments and in SAP BO new Proxy development. Further information on the pros and cons can be found on slide 20. RW advised that the estimated cost for delivery will be estimated at £340k to £465k. PO advised that the Customer requirements slide 21 and how the option meets these requirements and has been around several rounds of discussions with the IGTs and DNs and how this would achieve this acceptance criteria, PO also briefly discussed, the assumptions and risks for parties to review and what these looks like, and asked RW and Tara Ross (TR) if anything needed calling out going into the next phase of the change.</p>		

	<p>RW said the one he would call out, is the risk around the CSEP amendment referral requests not going live on the anticipated or requested date due to the DNs needing some business days to review and assess the requests, but advised that CDSP are looking to communicate some clear guidance to the IGT's to mitigate this by agreeing the cut off time for the DNs to assess those referrals due to DNs needing some days to review, cutoff date to mitigate this, for the following business day but CDSP will need to communicate this with the DNs.</p> <p>PO shared Appendix A provided early visibility of what the screens could look like and the introduction of those screens.</p> <p>KM raised a question about the change summary which states that this change can impact the gas networks with low pressures, but I was not aware of this specifically causing any low-pressure incidents and had asked for some detail, but had not had this back and wanted some context around it and what this means with this change.</p> <p>PO advised that this was a driver that the DNs had raised and welcomed Tom Stuart (TS) from Wales and West to provide some background to this issue on poor pressure, that if TS advised that GT development building over what we are aware of, could cause constraints in other areas of the network or low pressure in other areas of the network, we have found this on quite a few of our sites and is not necessarily linked directly to an IGT development, but could be another area of the network, but do have some examples and could redact some of that information and provide it at one of our next working groups if that would be useful and provide more context around the issue.</p> <p>KM welcomed this at the workgroup. TS also mentioned around the risk that was raised about the time to assess the additional capacity and advised that we think this will be an exceptions process and for the majority of the time, the process would be that the IGT's demand would match the DN demand, and all the amendments and creations would just flow through the process as normal and therefore, this portal will just give us a bit more clear visibility about highlighting these discrepancies to allow time to assess and if any additional capacity for us to allow the increased demand, but need to discuss the timescales but would think to think that a request would go through as normal.</p> <p>PO advised that this is to introduce a checkpoint or control that capacity is being managed well rather so that these exceptional circumstances are being managed as its always a retrospective activity to try and recover he situation.</p> <p>ACTION: CDSP requested if TS could provide some scenarios of low pressure or capacity constraints to share at the next Joint IGT/DN working group on this change to support and allows us to demonstrate that this is managed well and discuss with relevant parties.</p> <p>PO welcomed any questions or feedback in the consultation to take forward from the change pack to determine what decisions and next steps to take forward.</p>		
<p>DSG Recommendation:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approve</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Reject</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Defer</p>

DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY
--------------------------------	---