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:	XRN4991	
Change Title:	Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3 – MOD0700	
Date Raised:	30/07/19	
Sponsor Representative Details:	Organisation:	Gazprom
	Name:	Steve Mulinganie
	Email:	Steve.Mulinganie@gazprom.com
	Telephone:	
Xoserve Representative Details:	Name:	Dave Addison
	Email:	David.Addison@Xoserve.com
	Telephone:	
	Business Owner:	Alex Stuart
Change Status:	☐ Proposal	☐ With DSG	☐ Out for Review
	☒ Voting	☐ Approved	☐ Rejected

A2: Impacted Parties

Customer Class(es):	☒ Shipper	☒ Distribution Network Operator
	☐ NG Transmission	☐ IGT
	☐ All	☐ Other <Please provide details here>
Justification for Customer Class(es) selection	Shipper parties are impacted as direct users of the service with the service area being attributed to both. There may be impact on DN's with the increased movement to class 3 meter points falling into the must read process (no read for 4 months will trigger)	

A3: Proposer Requirements / Final (redlined) Change

Problem Statement:	To ensure that the CDSP has capability to manage the significant and unprecedented increase in Supply Meter Point Class change transactions from Product Class 4 to Product Class 3 and the subsequent increase Meter Read submissions

Change Description:	To create a mechanism for Xoserve to control SPC Class change transaction volumes and reject transactions in excess of a parameterised limit. To mandate that Shippers submit Class 3 readings in a maximum of weekly batched to be received and processed by Xoserve and apply appropriate controls to enforce this read submission frequency. For sites in EUC Band 1 a minimum of one read per week will be loaded to UK Link and subject to the existing validations and used for all downstream processes. Reads for EUC Bands 2-9 will continue as normal. To create logic and a mechanism for selecting and loading a subset of the reads received by Xoserve into the UK Link application and 'assuring' the quality of the reads which are not loaded for further processing. To develop an enduring data store for the reads which are not loaded into the UK Link application and making these reads available for reporting and analysis. To [asses the benefits of a] change [to] the Class 3 amendments reconciliation processes and supporting information to create single aggregated energy variances for the period between Actual Readings rather than creating daily energy variances for the periods between actual readings. For the avoidance of doubt, the change to the supporting information would be in the aggregation of the data displayed in the file, NOT the format or file structure.
Proposed Release:	Release: Adhoc – on a date to be agreed

Proposed Consultation Period:	☐ 10 Working Days	☐ 15 Working Days
	☐ 20 Working Days	☒ **<u>Other – not required</u>**

A4: Benefits and Justification

Benefit Description:	If the change is not implemented, Shipper Users could breach UK Link processing capability, which could mean that UK Link systems are not available to process Meter Readings and potentially other processes essential to the operation of the UK gas industry.
	What, if any, are the tangible benefits of introducing this change? What, if any, are the intangible benefits of introducing this change?
Benefit Realisation:	Immediately upon delivery of the change
	When are the benefits of the change likely to be realised?
Benefit Dependencies:	Approval of the UNC Modification
	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.

A5: Final Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations – Removed

(see Section C for DSG recommendations)

A6: Service Lines and Funding

Service Line(s) Impacted - New or existing	DSC Service Area 5: Metered volume and quantity This change is closest aligned to this service area, however the funding will need to be agreed.		
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor/ **Unclear**/ None		
If None please give justification			
Impacts on UK Link Manual/ Data Permissions Matrix	To be identified during Capture		
Level of Impact	Major/ Minor/ **Unclear**/ None		
If None please give justification			
Funding Classes :	Customer Classes/ Funding	Delivery of Change	On-going Budget Amendment
	☒ Shipper	XX %	XX %
	☐ National Grid Transmission	XX %	XX %
	☒ Distribution Network Operator	XX %	XX %
	☐ IGT	XX %	XX %
	☐ Other <please specify>	XX %	XX %
ROM or funding details:	Funding to be agreed		
Funding Comments:			

A7: ChMC Recommendation – 7th August 2019

Change Status:	☒ Approve (to proceed to DSG)	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
Industry Consultation:	☐ 10 Working Days	☐ 15 Working Days	
	☐ 20 Working Days	☐ Other [Specify Here]	
Expected date of receipt for responses (to Xoserve)	XX/XX/XXXX		

DSC Consultation Issue:	☒ Yes	☐ No
Date Issued:	12/08/2019	
Date Issued	28/08/2019 – Extraordinary Change Pack	

CP_V7.0

Comms Ref(s):	2404.2 - RT – JR	2415 - CS - PO XR
Number of Responses:	12/08/19 – 7 N/A	28/08/19 – 3 Approve, 1 Reject, 2 N/A

A8: DSC Voting Outcome

Solution Voting:	☐ Shipper	Please select.
	☐ National Grid Transmission	Please select.
	☐ Distribution Network Operator	Please select.
	☐ IGT	Please select.
Meeting Date:	Click here to enter a date.	
Release Date:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY or NA	
Overall Outcome:	☐ No	☐ Yes	If [Yes] please specify <Release>

Please send the completed forms to: box.xoserve.portfoliooffice@xoserve.com

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	05/08/2019
DSG Summary:	James Barlow (JB) presented this agenda item. JB explained that UNC MOD 0700 looks at changing how the CDSP handles Class 3's, looking at the anticipated increase in demand. JB stated that the slides presented for discussion are regarding changing the limit of Supply Point Amendments (SPC) to increase the availability of Change into Class 3. JB explained that the current daily limit for the SPC is 26,000. There is no limit defined at the moment but that number of 26,000 is looking to be increased. Therefore within UK LINK MANUAL will be changed to state the new limit. From there the CDSP will look to set out how the daily User value is derived. JB stated that anyone exceeding their allowance of SPC's will be rejected back for the exceeding SPC's. JB stated that this will define how excessive volumes will be communicated to Users (subject to design). Furthermore JB outlined it is proposed that Users will provide projected Supply Point Amendments for the following month: – User allocated volume = (User requested volume / Total requested volume) * **Total Available Volume** – This will be defined as a daily limit (User allocated volume / no. of processing days) – May be a need to take account of unused User volume (in subsequent months) to prevent Users constraining capacity…. E.g. User requested volume – previously unused User allocated volume • Discussion point ONLY now – as any subsequent use of this will only be after issues identified, therefore adjustment to calculation can be targeted – Contract Management will be informed of the Total requested and

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="2"></td>
<td colspan="3">allocated volume values provided [where requested volumes exceed capacity]

JB stated that just to confirm, this applies to any Supply Point adjustment. JB stated the main impact is Class changes from Class 4 to Class 3. JB added there could be other supply point changes and capacity adjustments also. IB asked a question regarding Shippers migration plans being submitted to the CDSP. IB stated that Xoserve should have visibility of those plans, therefore would the CDSP be comfortable sharing what the numbers might look like. PO confirmed that the question being asked is when will the CDSP be sharing the market wide migration plans?

Action: IB asked if/when will the CDSP be sharing the market wide migration plans?

PO also raised the question earlier asked by SH regarding when MOD 0700's implementation date is being set for. SH stated that due to the congestion the CDSP is having with Change, she would like to clarity. JB stated that the approval date is the 28th August and at the moment the options are being worked up on how the Change can be slotted in. SH stated that the Change is needed to go in before the 1st October with approval from MOD panel and the necessary governance. SH added that with the Change congestion, SME and resource issues, will the issues impact the Changes and releases going forward. RH stated that there will be communication at ChMC regarding current investigations around resources and options for delivery of MOD 0700, RH stated that that this all really depends on what is approved at ChMC. RH further added that on the 28th August the solution for this MOD will be available and help define how it is delivered. RH explained that there is work being conducted around how the SME's and resources are being distributed to enable projects to work better. RH stated that this is work in progress at the moment and there are internal discussions on how this can be managed better going forward. JB also added that the high level plan regarding what will happen to the reads involves focus on non-opening reads and for 1 in 7 to be validated from a weekly batch. PO confirmed that the proposal is to only process one of the 7 weekly submission reads into downstream processes and the other reads will be archived and used for performance reporting. IB added that there were questions in the workshop of which read the CDSP will accept. E.g. 1st read or a random read of the 7 submissions. JB confirmed that, this will be ironed out in the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr></tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture Document / Requirements:</td>
<td colspan="3"><Insert where appropriate></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG Recommendation:</td>
<td>☐ Approve</td>
<td>☐ Reject</td>
<td>☐ Defer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG Recommended Release:</td>
<td colspan="3">Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY</td>
</tr>
</table>

C2: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	19/08/2019

CP_V7.0	PO presented this agenda item and outlined the information within the appendix of the Change Proposal. PO found that there were a few amendments needing to be made with the appendix; - The number of impacted service areas to be updated from one to two to five. - The number of impacted primary applications need to be updated as only BW, ISU and AMT are selected. PO asked DSG if they were happy so far with what had been presented and listed within the appendix and explained that the amendments will be made to the areas outlined earlier. DSG did not object to any of the appendix. The current prioritisation score given is 35%. This score is subject to change when the amendments are made to the appendix. **Action; update and amend the appendix with the following points** - **The number of impacted service areas to be updated from one to two to five.** - **The number of impacted primary applications that need to be updated as only BW, ISU and AMT are selected.**
DSG Summary:	James Rigby outlined a commitment given at ChMC and CoMC regarding how we interact with the industry with this Change. JR stated that there is a dedicated page on Xoserve.com and area that has been created under the issue management page and content to provide updates. JR also suggested there may need to be an extraordinary DSG meeting in the interim between this meeting and the meeting going forward. JR also stated that the ChMC committee were asked if they approve of a Change Pack to go out to the industry. (Issued 27th August 2019).JR added that there has been a space created on Xoserve.com dedicated for this MOD. JR stated that due to the time constraints of the MOD, Xoserve is having to work with an agile approach. SH then provide a background to MOD 0700, explaining that MOD 700 was raised to limit the impacts to UK Link systems of Large Scale uptake of Class 3. - Manage migration to Class 3 - Smooth Meter Reading submission profiles - Manage impacts to UK Link Application of large scale Meter Readings SH stated that there was a Change Pack issued on 12th August with a communication reference 2404.2 – RT – JR. Furthermore ChMC have agreed to allow further extraordinary Change Packs to be issued as necessary. SH informed DSG that to manage migration to Class 3, the CDSP is able to define a daily limit for the user for migration to Class 3. SH stated that the IS Service definition document, currently indicates that daily limit for all the users is 26,000 SPC files. SH added that Xoserve is currently assessing available volumes to users and are expected to keep SPC Capacity under review during the transition period. Furthermore SH stated that code reflects that the Supply Point Amendment process generally will be monitored and SPC files rejected that exceed the daily specified limit. NM asked a question about Xoserve choosing to use large volume of SPC files being linked with the MOD. SH responded by stating that capacity is allocated to users following request. This will be communicated via email and other routes of communication such as Customer Advocates. There is also an approach to be proposed to DSG CoMC that suggest that a minimal allocation is provided to all users and remaining capacity is allocated to users following request. Furthermore there is a request that capacity is constrained for EUC01 and that this will prove difficult to identify at a file level, therefore is disregarded. SH stated that to manage migration to Class 3, a process has been inserted into the UK Link Manual To reflect the new code communications (lines 397-399). Therefore going forward users need to specify projected utilisation in

CP_V7.0	forthcoming calendar month (10 days prior to CoMC). With this there was also a request that representations are invited from users regarding the format of SP file rejections. These can be provided by email rather than UK Link communication (Via IX) but will be considered on a temporary basis from a MOD implementation perspective.
	SH then spoke around a slide with diagrams regarding smooth meter reading submission profiles. SH suggested that this gives an idea of how Class 3 volumes work before and after UIG factor publication is applied. SH stated that submission profile smoothing was proposed during discussions about nexus requirements and it was not expected back then that there would be a huge number of migration into Class 3.
	SH stated when looking at the smooth meter reading submission profiles, pre 0700 C3 rules, Xoserve is expecting Shippers to submit their read profiles in batches; weekly, fortnightly or monthly. This is different for post 0700 rules, Xoserve is looking for Shippers to submit on a weekly batch (or less). Post 0700 rules any read being submitted D+10 calendar days will be disregarded in the selection process.
	SC asked a question whether it would be a problem if they used the same process as the other EUC's or can the same concept be applied. SH responded by stating the concepts are the same, however anything not within EUC01 band will be processed as normal. Furthermore to reduce peak day smoother submission profiles UNC stated that the daily/weekly batches and D+10 validation is applied across all EUCs, however since the volumetrics in EUC2-9 are limited, a solution has been identified so this validation need not be applied.
	Manage impacts to UK Link Application of meter readings Slide.
	SH outlined that since the following changes were to manage large scape volumes into the UK Link Application, these rules only apply to smaller Supply Points into Class 3 (i.e. EUC01). Furthermore larger supply points (EUC 2-9) are not subject to Mod 700 rules as all readings are validated by the CDSP and if accepted will be valid. In addition to this, all replacement and opening meter readings and readings with non-zero RTC (for all EUCs_ are not subject to mod 0700 rules). Any read with a TTZ will be taken as priority and another read will be taken from the batch.
	SH stated that since the following changes were to manage large scale volumes into the UK Link Application, thee rules only apply to Smaller Supply Point
	Manage impacts to UK Link application of readings (EUC1, non-opening readings only.
	    ● Meter reading selection
	    ● CDSP required to take a minimum of one meter reading per batch period to determine whether
	        - Valid meter readings will prompt reconciliation (and AQ)
	        - If the selected meter reading isn't valid , CDSP will select one more meter reading to validate
	        - CDSP will assign assured status to remaining meter readings in batch if meter reading is valid.
	        - Assured meter readings contribute towards meter reading performance
	        (NB: Users are still required to Validate ALL meter readings)
	IB asked that if two readings are selected and both are rejected, then would the whole batch be rejected. SH responded by saying the 2 reads selected would be rejected and the other reads in that batch will be set as unassured. Ikram Bashir asked a question regarding if a date needs to be provided for the meter readings to be validated on a certain day. SH and PO answered that this is flexible to allow the customer to pick a date that month to be used as the priority read. SH used the diagrams that can be found in the slide deck as an example. PO gave an example that a Shipper request Xoserve to use a specific read for settlement purposes on a specific day. SH clarified that it is not mandatory to provide a date as the readings will be validated

CP_V7.0	from a date within the respective submission window.
	SH outlined the definition of Batch period using passages and extracts from the UNC. To sum up SH stated:
	5.8.1 In relation to each Class 3 Supply Meter:
	         (a) a "**Batch Period**" *is a period of 7 Days* (provided a Batch Period may have a shorter duration);
	         (b) a "**Batch Submission**" is the *submission by a User of Daily Meter Readings as a batch for each Day in a Batch Period*.
	5.8.3 In relation to Smaller Supply Meter Points *not all Meter Readings shall be subject to a check on validation* by the CDSP and the Validation Rules: …
	         (b) shall provide that *at least one Daily Meter Reading in each Batch Period is subject to a check on validation by the CDSP*;
	In addition based on Shipper Batch submission (solution option)
	  – Exception to the shipper batch submission rule will be the transfer scenarios where any reads received for a date after the shipper transfer date will be processed only once the shipper transfer read has been fulfilled.
	  – Note: Batch Submission should be no more than 7 days – if greater than 7 days, if not rejected then CDSP will only load one Meter Reading from this Batch Submission. If the submission of reads is around 10 reads, SH stated that a lot of them will be disregarded as the aim if to achieve validation on a read week batch submission.
	There are some discounted options proposed
	• Discounted options
	  - Fixed within week – e.g. Mon-Sun
	  - Fixed within Month – e.g. 1-7; 8-14; 15-21; 22-28; 29-31; 1-7…
	  - Determined by start of MPR in C3 – whether SPC; or Confirmation Effective Date
	SH suggested that Users can specify a preferred read date, and if there is a reading present for that date, it will be selected by the CDSP for processing. Other than the user 'specified date', the CDSP will select a Meter Reading within the batch. This will typically be the last Reading in the batch but there may be some exceptions, so this will not always be the case.
	Therefore SH stated that a user can set the preferred date for the portfolio by submission of an email to the CDSP (as per draft code communications document) issued out within Change Pack – 2404.2.
	UNCVR Impacts – Relational Validation
	SH explained that in UNCVR, validations relate to the previous meter reading and to verify that the (volume) recorded is within its expected limits. Furthermore for EUC01, where only certain meter readings within a batch period will be used, this relational validation may cause problems. Therefore SH suggested there will be round the clock validation which indicates whether the meter reading has gone through the zeros since previous reading. To fix this, the CDSP will scan for non-zero RTC counts and prioritise loading these Meter readings. SH then went on to explain tolerance bandings which test whether the meter reading consumption has advanced as expected against the previous meter reading may also cause issues. To fix this, SH stated that the CDSP will suspend the inner tolerance checks for Class 3 (EUC01) but retain the outer tolerances as currently used.
	Inner tolerance validations –
	• Originally planned to suspend for Class 3 EUC01 Non Opening Readings, but:
	  – Since Opening and Replacement Meter Readings would be subjected to Tolerance Validations, the latest submitted Non Opening Reading may not be accepted (i.e. within UKL), hence same risk as Non Opening Readings
	  – Non Opening reads with a non-zero TTZ and EUC band 1 will be prioritized for processing and will follow the normal read

CP_V7.0	validations. It would be difficult to differentiate these reads to determine whether to apply Inner Tolerance checks – For meter points where EUC band changes from/to Band 1, the read will be validated based on the last accepted read which again may not be the latest submitted read by the shipper. Due to the above complexities in terms of inner tolerance validations, **it is recommended that inner tolerance checks are suspended for all Class 3 Meter Readings.** DSG members were in favor of this approach. SC asked a question regarding how long the interim process is going to be. SH responded by stating that at the moment it is unknown but once there is an idea and timeline, it will be communicated to industry to keep them informed. PO asked SH the decision point form DSG is for some support around batch submissions, for example 7 day batch submissions, would they be submitted daily, every couple days or weekly. This is to give an idea to the CDSP of what can be expected. SH also outlined that the CDSP would like to understand how DSG feel about the Inner tolerances being suspended in the interim. SC asked when referred to as interim process, what is meant by interim and the length of time. SH responded by stating that the interim process has not yet been defined as that there are a few other items running in parallel. SH stated that hopefully by the time of the next Change Pack being issued out, some clarity could be provided within that if any process is defined. PO asked SH if Shippers can provide specific dates/if wanted of reading submission validation. SH answered that the idea would be something similar or as an example, monthly on the 21st day. SH outlined SPC file cap stated there will be an allocation given but the entire allocation won't be maxed out to the industry so that there is capacity to provide further allocation if requested of needed by a Shipper. Furthermore SC asked a question about forecasting volumes. Brett Court (BC) answered and explained that Customer Advocates are in communication to obtain forecast of volumes so that Xoserve can portion them as necessary. There was a question asked from NM regarding Shipper of last resort and supplier of last resort scenarios. **Action; Provide what would happen in the regards to a Shipper of last resort. Question raised by NM.** JR asked DSG and Shippers to be proactive and not just to wait for the Change Pack but to communicate any questions or issues the industry has regarding the design. IB asked if all Shippers had been consulted with their migration plans so they can plan ahead, or if they were pre booked. SH added that there will be response files sent back for accepted or rejected reads of that week. JR also added that some parties have provided their migration plans to aid in planning. Moving on from this, NM asked how are replacement reads processed. SH took the question away to investigate. **Action; SH to investigate what process occurs if a Shipper resubmits reads.** JR stated it might be good to have a FAQ's section on the Xoserve.com website regarding this to allow questions to be asked and a list of current questions and answers to be provided to industry. Niall asked about Shipper agreed read process approved reads if they will be affected. PO responded that they would needs to use no changes to opening change rules or Shipper agreed rules. In addition PO added that the CDSP will communicate out through all channels as per the agile approach being taken. TL has stated there will be internal testing conducted and communicated out to the industry via Customer Advocates. **Action; An FAQ's document to be made and added to the website, allowing clarity for any issues or concerns regarding Mod 0700.**
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>

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

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	27/08/2019
DSG Summary:	**<u>Introduction Slides (1 - 4)</u>** PO convened the meeting at 10:30am. PO explained that the second slide in the deck just shows the UIG weighting factors that have been set by AUGE. PO stated that the AUGE diagram shown in slide 2 provides a deeper understanding of the weighting factors for Class 3 and 4 from 2017 all the way to 2019-20. PO outlined that the impact of weighting factors meant that a significant number of Class 4 sites in EUC1 and EUC2 bands that could potentially benefit from moving to Class 3 product. PO further explained that MOD0700 has been introduced to look at implementing changes to minimise impact of mass migration of EUC1 band, Supply Points into Class 3 product, specifically: - Number of Class changes being processed - Number of reads being processed through to read Validation. **<u>Scope of MOD0700 Requirements (Slide 5)</u>** - SH stated for MOD700 there are changes with how Class Changes will be processed involving the SPC file within CDSP systems. Significant increase in the number of expected class changes processed through SPC file, so therefore the CDSP will look to monitor and potentially limit the number of class changes that can be processed in a single day. - Class 3 read submission process will also undergo a moderate change. SH added that there is a potential significant increase in the amount of reads being submitted within the Class 3 product. Which part of MOD0700 and UNC validation rules, the CDSP is trying to change the way in which Class 3 readings are being submitted. These changes in the UNC are changes to specify for Shippers to submit weekly 7 day or less batch submission of cyclic readings to the CDSP via UBR file. - In addition there is a new "Batch" Process with regards to the CDSP's systems. When the reads have bene submitted to reduce the number of reads processed through to read validation and to specifically select 1 out of a shipper batch to move forward into downstream processing through UK Link. What the CDSP is looking to achieve is a read staging area and read selection process. The reads will be stored and one read from shipper batch will be provided to go through the read validation process which will include tolerance and the current standard read validation checks, incorporating the D+10 rule. - A question was asked if the batch is shipper based or based

CP_V7.0	on the CDSP storing a number of batches and selecting a "preferred batch". SH responded by stating that there has been a design change from previous communications and the CDSP will now utilise the Shipper submitted batches to select 1 read from for downstream processing. A further question was asked, that if a Shipper was to submit daily batches of single reads, would that be processed individually and a response file would be received for all of those submitted, SH stated that this is correct and would be the case.
	- Furthermore SH added that on the read validation, there is a new rule being introduced of D+10, D being the read date, any reads with a read date after D+10 will be rejected back to the Shipper within the URS file. Question was asked, is the time D+10 business days or D+10 calendar days? SH responded by stating it will be D+10 calendar days.
	- SH added that there will also be moderate change to some reporting such as PARR reports and the monitoring of resubmissions and Class changes. Question asked: To clarify, will only one read be validated per Shipper batch, is that one read then going to be used for invoicing or will all the reads in the batch be used for invoicing. SH responded stating that only one read will be used for invoicing, but 2 attempts will be made to validate a read for further processing. Another question was asked off the back of that reply, whether the AML will increase or not. Will it be the 1 read selected to be validated? SH & JHJ replied stated that the AML file generates a record per gas day regardless of the amount of reads that go into it. There will still be a line a day but the energy for each of those days will be a portion between the 2 actual readings.
	Class Change SPC File (Slide 6) SH stated that the Class change SPC file contains not just the class change record but many other different transactions that can be done within that. The main file being looked at is the SPC file RT_C38_CLASS_CHANGE. This file for each record type has a limit of 1000 records, meaning the maximum number of records within a single SPC file can be up to 8000 records if all allowable records were utilised. SH added that the vast majority however being seen in BAU files are Class Change transactions (C38), the others are quite infrequent. In addition, SH added that the SPC file max processing capacity is currently set at 26,000 as per the UK Link IS Service Definition document and that is being looked into as well in regards to amending that figure. SH stated that more details will be provided if there is a new limit introduced once it is known. Question asked: To clarify, currently there is 1000, is that going to be lowered? SH replied stating that it will not be amended in the File Format due to the 6 month lead time needed. It is just the SPC file max processing in the UK Link IS Service Definition document that specifies 26,000 records as the maximum, combined system capacity. SH stated that this is being looked into as it depends how many files the CDSP can be taken in across all customers not just one. Therefore the CDSP is assessing the limit and will advise once known. **How to determine SPC Limit (Slide 7)** As part of MOD0700 the CDSP is able to limit SPC files being processed, so if there is a potential breach or potential increase in traffic, it gives the CDSP

CP_V7.0	the ability to limit the SPC files being submitted and the CDSP can reject files back to the respective parties. Each Shipper will be provided a daily limit on the number of SPC files that can be processed. SH stated there are a few considerations to keep in mind as the limit per user has not been defined as of yet, analysis is being conducted on both the limit per User and the SPC file limit that can be processed on a daily basis. Once analysis has been completed that information will be provided to the industry. Furthermore more information will be provided in the Change Pack with regards to potentially requesting increasing limits.
	SH stated that to determine the SPC limit per user, there are a few consideration:
	   - Processing of SPC files for non-class change activities.
	   - Max number of SPC files that can be processed though AMT and SAP ISU, this is to give a baseline of what the system can handle.
	   - Customer forecasts for Class changes currently being provided to customer advocates, 2 way communication regarding peek system times and planned migration to Class 3 will also take place.
	SH asked DSG representatives to note:
	   - Files that are pass AMT validation but result in breach of allocation shall be rejected back to the submitting Shipper, this will be done via either email or UK Link communication (IX) but this has not yet been agreed. Furthermore the consultation Change Pack for MOD0700 will closing out and so far the responses received reflect the questions asked regarding communication. A question was asked on the phone regarding the SPC limit being given as a daily allowable limit per organisation, has any consideration been given to low quantity requests when determining the way in which the limit is set. SH replied by outlining that the CDSP is identifying the best way in which to limit as the CDSP is aware most organisations are not pushing towards a mass migration, further, there is BAU activity for non-class change processing that is being taken into consideration also.
	   - In addition, please note that the SPC max submissions within the UK Link IS Service Definition document will be increased; however this has not yet been agreed. This will be communicated out to industry formally once agreed.
	PO asked SH if the detail explained so far is a warm up for DSG to provide understanding for the extraordinary Change Pack that is planned to be issued 28/08/2019. SH replied that PO is correct.
	SH asked DSG for any further questions regarding this. DSG provided no further questions.
	Read submission to read validation overview (Slide 8)
	SH explained that when the UBR file is submitted, EUC01 opening readings, replacements readings including Class Change and all non EUC01 banding reads (2-9) will pass through to 'pending read validation' status straight away. SH stated that EUC0 1 Cyclic Reads will flow a new validation of D+10.
	Within the D+10 validation (if passed) reads with a TTZ > 0 will be given priority and passed to read validation, all other cyclic reads will be set as 'pending validation' (E).
	Reads in a batch outside of D+10 will be rejected via standard Unbundled Meter Read Response (.URS). A question was asked if D+10 was month date +10, SH replied that the D+10 is the read date +10 days.
	Reads that have passed D+ 10 validation will then move forward into

CP_V7.0	'pending read validation' stage (E) The Shipper can set a 'preferred' date with a calendar month that will be prioritised if present within the batch submission to move into Read Validation. If the Shipper 'preferred' read fails or is not available within the batch then the last read within the batch will be selected to pass through Read Validation. PO stated that discussions similar to this occurred at last DSG regarding the Shipper preferred read. PO outlined that if a Shipper submits 4 weekly batches of reads, only one of those batches will contain a Shipper preferred read date and the other batches will be looking for a suitable candidate read from the batch, which in this case would be the last read. Question; is there anticipation that Shippers will specify a date each month, or will they specify a type of read, such as the last day of the month? SH responded to say it will be a specific date in the month that has been noted as preferred date for the Shipper. SH outlined that it will be a specific date agreed with the CDSP's Advocates team for example the 21st of the month, set as priority date until notified or amended by the Customer. **Action: Will the last day of the month be an option as a preferred date for Shippers, taking into account the dates change month by month and whether they are business days or calendar days.** **Update: As per the Change Pack issued on the 28th, the 'preferred' date can be any date within a month, but please note that if this date is the 29th, 30th or 31st of the month, some months will not have an opportunity for any submitted batch to have a 'preferred' read for selection. Specifying the 'last day in a month' would add complexity to the solution being proposed for XRN4991.** Rose Kimber (RK) & Alison Neild (AN) asked for further discussion regarding the preferred times as Shipper preferred dates might vary within their portfolio where multiple Supplier relationships exist. **Action: PO and SH to contact AN & RK regarding the preferred date.** SH added that if the last read fails then the next available read is selected, that is if no available shipper preferred read is available. SH stated that per batch, two attempts to validate reading will be carried out. If not then the batch will end up invalidated and all reads within that batch (excluding the rejected ones) will be set to Unassured (N). SH then stated once a reading has been obtained, the read goes through the read validation process, which involves inner tolerance validation (EUC1). Furthermore SH explained that for the projected go live date the inner tolerance validation will remain as is, but this may be removed for EUC1 following monitoring of read rejections and UNC agreement. More information regarding that will be provided when this has been agreed, but for the moment, the inner tolerance validation will remain. Furthermore reads that fail standard read validation will be rejected (via URS file) and a new read will be selected. If a read passes validation, it will be marked as uploaded and processed through to the UK Link system. If a reading in a batch has an accepted reading, all reading in the batch will be marked as assured (A). On the other hand, if a both readings in a batch fail validation, then all other readings in the batch will be marked as unassured (N). In this case, unassured readings will count towards read performance. The scenarios involving the unassured readings can be found in the slide deck. Question: was there a proposal to remove the inner tolerances, have the CDSP moved on from this idea? SH replied by stating that the original idea was to remove inner tolerance from EUC1 Band but from a design perspective it was discussed that it would be better to remove it from all EUC bandings. This was taken to UNC committee, who stated that the inner tolerances should only be removed for EUC1 band. PO added that this is something that needs further work and analysis before it can be justified to the UNC. Brett Court (BC) added that at DSG 19th August there were discussions around the rational why it would be challenging from a design

perspective to limit the inner tolerances being removed to just EUC1. The diagram within the slide deck (slide 8) shows the EUC1 pass through both validation stages in both (P) and (E) that the reason is it would be challenging. Brett added that there should be further conversation whether removing the inner tolerances from all EUC bands but if not then it will just be removing the inner tolerances from EUC1 band at a later date of XRN4991 Go Live.

AN asked about the inner tolerance and the impact that it will cause from EUC 1 and whether it will be affecting all EUC bands across the board. SH stated that only EUC 1 will be doing batch frequency, whereas if a Class 3 read submission for EUC band 2-9, every reading will be processed as per BAU.

Slides 9 – 14 in the slide deck presented show scenarios for each situation.

4. Both Selected Reads Fail, Batch Re-Submitted, Read Accepted (Slide14)

PO stated that the main point that jumps out about that, is the read performance information, the longer it takes for a Shipper to re-churn those reads and re-submit them, the more likely the reads that they have previously submitted will fail due to the D+10 checks. PO added that the examples provide a good overview of how the proposed validation process will work.

BC asked DSG to note that when expecting responses for the files, they will only be given for the reads that are either rejected or selected for progression into UK Link (F/U). Assured (A) or Unassured (N) reads will not be contained within the read response file (URS). SH added the change pack will outline further the need for request of the batches to be submitted as 7 day batches.

Class Change Scenario (Slide 15)

SH explained to DSG for examples used are and illustration purposes only. Ikram Bashir (IB) asked if Xoserve will estimate the reading on the same day for class 3 change. This will be double checked by Xoserve and clarified in the Change Pack.

Action: Clarify will the CDSP estimate the reading on the same day for Class 3 Changes.

SH added that there will be more slides added to the slide deck to be issued out to industry with more scenarios covered once additional questions have been raised in the Change Pack responses.

Shipper Transfer Scenario (Slide 16)

SH explained that in one of the scenarios an incoming shipper submits 7 day batch that does not include a read marked as opening reading, this read within the shipper batch accepted and uploaded (Shipper preferred read or last read). Please check slide for reference of scenario. IB asked about the scenario and how would that estimate. Would that estimate be based on previous Shipper reads? SH responded stating he is correct

SH added once again that if there are any questions on scenarios then please get in contact and clarification will be provided.

Question asked: If a file is submitted with a TTZ indicator in it and a preferred read. Due to the TTZ being maybe after the preferred read which will be processed first? SH replied stating TTZ files are given priority but the Shipper preferred read will be also processed at the same time so all reads will be processed in read date order to avoid any issues.

Question asked: If there is a TTZ and a Shipper priority read, would the shipper priority read not get validated? SH responded stating it would be validated and processes as another read is validated from the batch submitted.

To conclude PO informed DSG that the Change Pack will be issued out 28th August but will have a shorter consultation period so that the responses can be spoken about and received before ChMC 11th September. In addition, TL provided some information regarding implementation; there have been some

	initial discussions to implement this on the morning of the 28th September during the 7am maintenance window. This is still in discussion and subject to approval of ChMC. PO and James Rigby (JR) suggested a further placeholder to be put into the 9th September for a possible extraordinary DSG if needed.
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve ☐ Reject ☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

DSG Date:	02/09/2019

DSG Summary:	Simon Harris (SH) presented this agenda item.
	Brett Court (BC) explained that the update for the meeting was to familiarise customers with how file limits are proposing to be set for SPC files. BC explained that as a part Modification 0700, the CDSP have the ability to introduce a rule that will reject SPC files if system capacity/performance is compromised, solutions of which are covered in the below slides.
	There are options to be considered:
	1. Set a Shipper limit on SPC files (e.g. 5 files into AMT per Shipper, per day)
	    - BC explained the rationale behind that option, is that it gives Xoserve the ability to restrict those files. BC added that if the file limit is exceeded e.g. a sixth file being submitted, then it would be rejected. BC explained that from a build perspective, it can be delivered within project timescales and would have minimal impact to AMT performance.
	       BC stated to DSG that the approach is to proceed with this option.
	
	2. Set a Shipper limit on SPC – Class Change records (e.g. 1,000 records into AMT per shipper, per day)
	    - This option would involve setting a limit on a record level rather than a file level. This would provide control over the number of SPC records being submitted however BC added that while this give some control over the records being submitted, after conversations with AMT, they stated it was quite a complex option and would not be achievable in the project timescales as well as having a greater cost. BC added that it may also add in some performance constraints to AMT, this wouldn't be a problem but more so something to acknowledge as it would use higher processing power. This is an interim solution that doesn't seem feasible to go to such cost and

constraints.

3. Leave as is, and monitor through customer engagement.
   - BC explained the downside to this approach is that Xoserve currently has no technical capability to reject these files and would require manual intervention if any files are needed to be rejected
   - This option relies entirely on forecasts being produced

BC suggested the approach for this solution is to proceed with option 1.

Louise Hellyer asked questions about the SPC file changes and if any analysis been conducted on the number of files and batches that are submitted at the moment. SH replied by asking if that was specifically SPC submissions. SH explained that this information has been fed into the analysis of this solution and the BAU processes and how it is utilised at the moment. SH added that at the next Class3 DSG meeting, the analysis will have been completed and will be fed back to the group for discussions. LH stated she has the impression option 2 might be complicated and harder for Xoserve to monitor. BC explained that analysis has been done on the frequency the files are being submitted to determine the limit. In addition BC stated that from the analysis to date the submissions and frequency is very infrequent.

Option 1 Shipper Limit SPC files slide:

BC moved forward and explained the following points in regards to option 1.

- Modification in AMT to set a limit per shipper for the number of SPC files.
- If a file is sent above the SPC limit it may be rejected using the proposed file rejection code FIL000018 (this has been amended to FIL0000124 since the DSG on the02.09.2019).
- As an exception files may be rejected via email.
- Xoserve will have the capability to report on number of files sent and records received in AMT & SAP ISU.

Rejection Codes slide:

The rational for choosing this code to be used is that the code is used currently to send back files if they exceed the 1,000 record count within the SPC file, therefore from a solution perspective this seemed loosely aligned. However the description itself might not be fit for purpose and this will be discussed further into the meeting. The intention is that a limit will be set and as a default they will be technically rejected through AM but there will be an exception process whereby the files will be rejected manually via the email methods. BC added that last DSG it was suggested it will be done in AMT from a technical perspective and the solution has been aligned to that. BC stated that with this in mind, the idea

CP_V7.0	cannot be discounted that Xoserve may need to send some manual rejections in exceptional scenarios. Furthermore BC added that it this solution will have the capability to report on the number of files being submitted in AMT and ISU which can then also be compared against the forecasts provided.

BC stated that due to the time constraints of the MOD, a selection of rejection codes have been selected to be used for rejection.

The option proposed for rejection code is FIL00018 – a physical count of the detail records in the file does not match that held in the count field on the trailer.
BC asked if anyone objected to reusing the rejection code FIL00018

SH added that the Change Pack sent out last month specified the rejection code of FIL00018.
PO asked DSG if there is anyone who wants to object to using this code please do so now, as this code will be used if not as a rejection code. No objection from any DSG members. BC explained that there has been a lot of analysis being done on the number of files being needed to be restricted and the magnitude of different ways of doing that. This information will be shared at the extraordinary DSG 9th September. SH also added that the kind of content would be to go through the capacity, the logic surrounding that and how the BAU processes look.

PLEASE NOTE: Since DSG on the 02.09.2019, the approach has been amended and rejection code FIL0000124 will be used.

There was also a key point regarding reporting and the impacts that might occur onto those reports. There is a meeting scheduled with PATHA. This is to identify and discuss the impacted reports.
BC explained that the analysis is being conducted on the impacted points and the main largest impact to the reports, are the new statuses for unassured and not assured reads, and whether to include those statements into those reports.

SH informed DSG of couple of things to note:

- Change pack issued Wednesday 28th September and closes out 9th September
- Any responses received from Change packs or enquiries have been uploaded and responded to on the FAQ's page that can be found on Xoserve.com

    There will be more supporting material found on the Class 3 page regarding this modification and FAQ's, SH added that any responses received so far from Change Packs have been added and any questions have been added into the FAQ's on the class 3 page that can be found on |

CP_V7.0	Xoserve.com with responses. SH added that if there are any questions that have not been addressed in the FAQ's to send them into the uklink@xoserve.com box account so they can be picked up and added to the FAQ's. PO stated that at next DSG Monday 9th September, Xoserve will be looking to share the approach for determining capacity share for the SPC bandwidths. PO also explained that the performance assurance framework committee are looking to provide a comment or response to the change pack. PO explained that this is another area that needs to be clarified. Danny Byrne (DB) asked a question on the phone regarding Capacity share and if that was going to be addressed at the Extraordinary 9th September. BC added that that will be discussed next week at DSG 9th September 2019. DB asked a further question of when will Xoserve be introducing the read staging area. SH explained the staging area will not be externally facing. SH explains that many of the FAQ's and answers provided are specified in the FAQ's page and answer a lot of the questions raised in today's discussion.

Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>		
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

DSG Date:	09/09/2019
DSG Summary:	**How will SPC file limits be defined? (Slide)** James Barlow (JB) explained to DSG how the SPC file limits will be defined. JB explained that an individual party's SPC limit will be defined using their forecast demand against the total volume requested by the industry.

CP_V7.0	JB stated that if no forecast volume of SPC activity is provided then it is assumed only BAU activity will occur and therefore no file limit will be set. Furthermore JB suggested customers to contact your customer advocate to confirm their forecast demand. JB stated: - This is to be the total monthly demand requirement and Xoserve will smooth this across the month to define the file limit. - This should be done a minimum of 10 business days prior to the first working day of the month, this will allow Xoserve to collate the information, conduct some analysis and smooth over across the period. This will allow the total allowance to be managed and shared across the board between customers. - The total industry volume requested will be centrally managed. In addition JB stated that where Xoserve believe the forecast demand will adversely impact the performance of its systems then allocations will be reviewed. - Xoserve will analyse the overall demand and work with shippers to smooth SPC submission over a number of days or weeks Louise Hellyer asked a question regarding the minimum of 10 business days prior to the first working day of the month and whether Xoserve expecting customers to supply information on all supply point amendment activities or is it just the class changes where there is a possible capacity limit. JB responded by stating that everything that is low level BAU is okay, this is due to the analysis showing that BAU activity does not see massive volumes of SPC. JB explained that the customers would need to inform Xoserve if they were choosing to submit more than the normal BAU expected from them. Steve Mulinganie (SM) raised a point what is the relevance of knowing the upper activity as most volume that is an issue sits with class 3 EUC band 01. JR responded stating that BAU usage of SPC files has had some analysis done and historically there have been spikes where Shippers have used a different record type in that file, outside what is usually expected. JR explained this could be due to Shippers conducting data cleanse activities and around read frequencies. In general it is just for customers to give Xoserve's CAMS an idea if they would be using that file in an extraordinary way above and beyond class 3 usage. Action: JR to take away and define what is meant by extraordinary to avoid any ambiguity. Louise Hellyer (LH) raised some concerns about there being limits on the number of files due to the way the system are built up, making it harder to manage.

JR advised that the question or concerns will be discussed further into the slide deck.

How will SPC file limits be defined? (Continued Slide)

If Shippers are not utilising their estimated demand/allocation their customer advocate will contact them to discuss ongoing requirements.

- This is to ensure the capacity is fairly split to meet demand and to confirm when the expected volume is going to be processed. Furthermore JB stated that the Shipper utilisation will be continuously monitored to ensure total industry bandwidth is optimised.
- Shipper SPC limits will be at Shipper Short Code Level
  JB explained that this would mean the limit is set per Shipper. Therefore Shippers with multiple Short Codes cannot move allocations from on to the other.

JB then went on to summarise the points mentioned in the slides.

SPC Management Summary (Slide)

JB outlined the best practice for SPC management would involve:
- Planning ahead, letting Xoserve know your forecast volumes of SPC usage.
  This includes any extraordinary non class change usage e.g. meter read frequency changes.
- Update Xoserve if your plans or circumstances change. This can be communicated via customer advocates and other Xoserve routes of communication.
- Please aim to send SPC files as early in the day as possible, to give the opportunity for all files to be processed from all customers who submit their files that day.

JB advised DSG that if files have to be rejected due to exceeding the allocated daily volume, this is proposed to be done using code FIL000124 "file rejected and will not be processed". In addition with accurate forecasts that Xoserve have had so far, Xoserve see no issues being able to handle the required class changes at this moment. However the limit will be implemented to protect the system in case of any unexpected SPC file submissions.

JR informed DSG that this meeting was the last opportunity to engage with customers before ChMC 11th September and to ensure everybody is happy with how the limits will be set.

JR stated it is going to be based on bandwidth that protects the system, and the customers share will be determined by how many Class Changes their forecast dictates are wanted rather than market share. JR explained to DSG that the reason why market share has not been used as some shippers have a larger market share, therefore the distribution is not going to be allocated or shared fairly. JR asked DSG for any alternative suggestions to this method. DSG did not object to this method.

SM raised a point that in the scenario where there will be constraints, how are Xoserve going to manage with customers who assume they will only get half of what they need in allocation, so therefore they double the nomination in hope of a larger allocation to fulfil their needs. David Addison (DA) explained that the point was raised at Mod Panel and there is no way to get around it. DA highlighted a point he raised at the time at mod panel stating,

	Xoserve will monitor what people have requested or stated they will uptake and therefore it is a bit like playing chicken whereby if someone doubles it and Xoserve are to go back and say they can have the capability that month, the next month Xoserve may well constrain them. DA advised that this mechanism/method has not been put through or mentioned at CoMC as Xoserve is hoping that customers will work with them to ensure this does not occur.
CP_V7.0	JR explained to DSG the team have been working at break neck speed to get the scenarios ironed out so that the BER can be taken to ChMC 11th September for approval. JR asked that anyone who is fundamentally opposed to the point made my SM and DA please inform the group. SM added that another item what would need some more clarity is what is to define what is included as BAU to avoid any unexpected submissions.
	Patricia Parker (PP) asked a question for clarification that the SPC file limit is not going to be based on file limits, therefore if Shipper puts forward a suggestion to do 10,000 SPC's a day but they end up doing 10,500. Would the industry volume allow them to submit all of those files for processing or would the excess 500 be rejected outright? JB responded by giving an example that if PP was given 10 files a day which would equate to 10,000 class changes per day if every file is filled. If an 11th file was submitted, it would be rejected as the limit was 10 files and 10,000 records. JB reiterated that these figures are not true files but are used as a simple guide within the example given.
	There was a concern raised by LH around if Shippers state they are doing nothing out of the usual and just BAU activity but then there is some capacity across the industry, the concern is regarding some of the non-class changes being rejected due to the limit. Furthermore LH stated that no knowing the number of files will be allocated and how much people will get. SM also stated that he understands the issue which primarily relates to Class 3 EUC band 01 but asked why customers can't continue to run their business through everything else without the risk of this worrying them.
	SM provided some background in regards to what BAU should be classed as and asked if Xoserve could provide clear definitions as to what is BAU. DA explained that the point raised around it being ring-fenced to Class 3 EUC band 01, DA stated it can't be due to it being a file level, and the sophistication of being able to open the file and assess whether it is a EUC band 01 is not an option available to Xoserve.
	DA suggested the trick around what SM is describing is how Xoserve is able to articulate the existing BAU demand. DA explained that if Xoserve if assigning a limit of files against a user based upon their uptake, then should a set of files be assigned to a user based on their BAU. DA added that on that basis, a customer runs the risk of someone being able to use the assigned BAU allocation towards their submissions that month. For example having SPC allocation of 10 files with 10,000 records within those files and submitting 10,500 records using the allocated 1 BAU file they were given.
	DA stated that he doesn't think BAU will be used to quite a capacity that will impact the volume of SPC activity.
	Brett Court (BC) stated a point to call out is that if customers are not providing forecasts, so Xoserve don't think there is any significant volume of SPC activity, Xoserve will not be looking to restrict. Where there are just normal BAU volumes of SPC files then there would be no reason to restrict. On the other hand BC stated that there will only be restrictions where there are expected to be large volumes throughout the month and therefore need to be cautious around the

CP_V7.0	volumes that are processing through the system. SM gave a suggestion that what if a customer decides to not call out or inform Xoserve of the BAU and submits their SPC files. SM stated that because it has not been called out will it just be classed as BAU. Will this lead to some of the transactions being submitted to be rejected. DA replied by stating that he suspects it will be something that will be okay to get away with at first but if it continues or get to the point where the IS Ops team flag up that there is too much being submitted into the system to process then Xoserve would be communicating with customers to outline that this is not normal activity and asked to declare the submission as BAU if not forecasted. LH asked a question around being able to change Class when picking up sites from different Shippers. LH's asked are those Shippers picking up sites needing to declare those sites to Xoserve. DA stated that it would be great if this could be constrained in some way but also DA stated that Xoserve recognises the same thing suggested by LH. DA stated that this is something Xoserve is not concerned about. DA suggested that Xoserve is hoping that rather than using the re-nomination, customers would in use the SPC; from a processing capability perspective SPC is lighter than nomination. DA asked DSG to recognise people do stuff whereby they can do multiple supply point amendments by doing a re-nomination. Therefore there might be circumstances where they are actually doing the capacity change at the same time the class change, at the same time as the meter frequency change and so on, therefore Xoserve recognise there will be circumstances where it will have to be submitted via a nomination file. DA asked DSG members to please use the SPC where they can. **Shipper Preferred Read Date Slide** JB explained that the Read date is optional, this was to give users the opportunity to specify a date in the calendar month where a read will always be passed for downstream processing. Furthermore the date is given across a customer's whole portfolio, not at Supply Meter Point level. Also if a Shipper batch is submitted with a read present on the Shipper 'Preferred' date then this read will take priority and be passed to read validation stage and, if valid, loaded into UK Link and used in downstream processes. If you would like to set a 'Preferred' read date please contact your Customer Advocate. In addition JB stated that amendments to the 'Preferred' read date are to be submitted to the CDSP a minimum of 10 business days prior to the need date. **Shipper Preferred Read Date (Slide continued)** JB outlined that the Shipper preferred read date cannot be specified

	as "end of the month" as it needs to be a specific date. Furthermore if the date requested is 29th, 30th or 31st, each can only be used in the months in which they occur. Following on from this, an example could be used such as; if the 31st is set as the preferred read date then in September no preferred date will be found in any batch so the last read from each batch will be selected. In addition, if there is not a Shipper 'Preferred' read date specified then the last read in a batch will always be assessed first. 'Last read' means the most recent read date within a batch per Supply Meter Point (as the reads submitted may not be in date order).
CP_V7.0	**Read submission to read validation overview (slide)** The slide has been updated from the last DSG held 27th August 2019. **Shipper transfer scenario (updated slide)** JB explained that when submitting the opening read, that will be processed as normal Incoming shipper submits a 7 day batch that includes an Opening read on the transfer day would be processed as a batch, therefore your opening read will go through and remainder will be treated as a batch. The latest read would be passed to validation and, if passed Valid, this would be marked as U (accepted/uploaded) and the others as A (assured). With opening reads not submitted, that batch will essentially go through current as is processing for validation after D+10 rather than the MOD0700 processing mechanism. At D+11, if the opening read has not been submitted, Xoserve will create the estimate, at which point all those reads will go through the validation and responses issued via the URS. The last point assumes that an opening read is submitted that's not a replacement and so will be rejected, the opening estimate will remain. JB outlined that this is to highlight that if the opening read is not submitted and the batch following that date is, the shipper would get a response for every read in that first batch, not just one from the end. **D+10 Validation: Outside of ownership slide** Simon Harris (SH) provided some clarification to the D+10 validation to DSG. SH stated that the D+10 will be checked to show reads older than D+10 rejected and set… The D+10 validation will be at the very start of the processing of the readings. So a slight disparity might be seen if the readings that were submitted are outside of the Shippers ownership of the meter point. The D+10 provides a visual aid showing that if a batch is submitted with a supply meter point that is not in your ownership, the initial first check will be done to check if it is outside D+10. Therefore in this instance the diagram shows you will get 3 rejected with the rejection to say the read is too old. This will then pass to the read submission check, where reads which are submitted are checked against the Shipper who is registered to that meter point for those read dates. The rest will then be rejected and the process will go no further. **What is defined as a shipper batch slide** JB explained that the Shipper batch is defined as a Cyclic reads for supply meter point in EUC band 01 submitted to the CDSP within a single day via the class 3 UBR file. JB added if multiple UBR files & reads are sent to us for the same Supply Meter Point in the same processing day, then these will be considered a single batch and processed together, meaning only one read will be selected for forward processing regardless of how many UBR files have been sent. JB asked DSG to please note: There may be rare times where Shipper submitted UBR files are not processed right away (due to incidents or catch-ups for other activities/processes etc.), this means that some batches submitted on different days may be merged into a single batch for

processing.

Inner Tolerance Check (Slide)

The inner tolerance will remain 'as is' at go live of MDO0700 for all SMP's. JB added that Xoserve will continue to impact assess on solutions to suspend the ITC for MOD0700 sites, i.e C3 EUC01. Furthermore details on delivery timescales will be shared once they have been defined. JB asked DSG to note that Shippers should be aware that they could see an increased volume of ITC rejections post go live of MOD0700.

Reporting - Impact summary (Slide)

BC explained to DSG that where existing reports use a last read status this will only display reads that are Validated and not those that are assured or unassured. Furthermore the primary impacts to reports are Shipper packs and PARR.

- BC added two majors points to note down

The primary impact to Shipper Packs and PARR reports are;
- PARR impacts will be outlined in the next two slides
- Shipper pack changes will be made to reflect PARR reporting

Report changes are proposed to be deployed by the end of October as they look at M-1 data.

- Small risk that some reporting for the last few days of September 28th-30th, may display erroneous data depending on when Shippers start to submit C3 reading but this will be discussed with PAC.

PARR Reports (Slide)

BC advised there was analysis conducted regarding the PARR reports and after initial assessment, 2 reports were outlined to having possible impacts by the new read status.

These reports are as follows:
- Read Performance
- Meter Read Validity Monitoring

PARR report recommendation (Slide)

BC further explained the recommendation's from Xoserve in regards to the possible impacted PARR reports. BC stated Read performance report will include the new status in order to fairly reflect read performance for shippers submitting anything greater than daily batches. Furthermore the meter read validity monitoring report will exclude the new status, as the report should only display rejected reads.

BC asked DSG to note, reads that are not assured do not have a rejection code.

Cathy asked a question about these two reports being done as counts of the number of meter reads that are rejected. If people are choosing to submit in different frequency rate, whether that would then skew what PAC is looking at. BC responded by saying the first one is a percentage and the second one is a count.

Cathy explained that if there is someone that chooses to submit their reads on a daily basis, one month all reject and another person submits them on a weekly basis and the same principle as the preferred, they will only report 4 rejections while the other party will report 31 rejections. (Please note the figures used are for example only).

Action: BC to take away to gain some understanding on how the point raised regarding the impacted reports and rejections can be worked around.

Detailed Design Change Pack (Slide)

JB explained that the detailed design change pack for XRN4991 was issued out on the 28th August 2019 and closes out today, September 9th 2019. JB advised the responses received and reps are to be discussed at ChMC on 11th September.

	FAQ (Slide)
CP_V7.0	JB advised DSG that the FAQ document has been published to Xoserve.com. To add to that, JB asked DSG that if they require any clarification or additional questions that are not included in the FAQ's so far, then to please contact uklink.manual@xoserve.com.
	JR then asked DSG if there are any questions DSG have in regards to what was discussed and presented at the meeting.
	SM had a question around leaving the meter tolerance on could potentially adversely affect people using the meter staging area. What is Xoserve's timeline for addressing that issue?
	DA responded to SM explaining that there is a view of development effort to be done but the issue Xoserve are facing is the scheduling.
	SM explained that a consequential impact was identified with EUC band 01 but because everything is not being taken into the central systems, what a Shipper might submit, believing that the inner tolerance hasn't been exceeded might actually lead to something actually being exceeded when you contemplate a sub set of the read data. Therefore the solution to that was to suspend the inner tolerance while keeping the outer tolerance operational in relation to EUC band 01. SM asked if this was something that will be conducted at a later date or is this going to be something left for customers to manage. SM further outlined that it could impact performance assurance.
	DA replied that the plan at the moment is that Xoserve is doing the assessment against the Change so that the inner tolerance validation is suspended against EUC band 01. DA explained delivery date cannot be given at this time but would be looking to do this at some point as quickly as possible. Furthermore DA outlined there was mention within the presentation that Xoserve will try and keep an eye on this issue and see if there is any material problem as the result of it. DA stated that he questioned whether Xoserve would be able to do that due to the inner tolerance conversations being conducted with shippers, whereby Shippers think there is an inner tolerance failure and Xoserve does not. DA explained that there are cases where Shippers re-flag and send back their submissions and they go through the system without a problem.
	In addition DA stated that if a marked change is seen when compared to how the performance is working then it would be quite clear to all parties, which would need to be discussed at the performance assurance committee and Xoserve would be the perfect people to go along and discuss the analysis pre and post-performance. Therefore Xoserve should be able to engage with the performance assurance committee and outline the issues that are affecting the industry due to this functionality discussed. However DA stated that Xoserve is very much hoping to get a fix in sooner rather than later.
	Another question was asked that if multiple files are submitted throughout the same day, with the reads being batched up, does that mean that all files will be batched up and treated as one batch? SH replied this is correct. Another question asked on the back of this is the understanding that none of those files will be processed the same day. SH replied to say that no, all will be processed as it will follow normal batch processing. If there are multiple files are submitted throughout the day, those files will be batched and processed 6pm that day, any files submitted after that point will be batched and processed the next day at 6pm.
	DA added that the timing for the batch processing can be found in the UK Link Manual within the file transfer guide.
	A question was asked by Steph around how the C38 will need to be populated.
	SH added that the question has been added and answering within the FAQ's.
	A question raised will be covered in the FAQ regarding meter read frequency with Class 3 will be monthly as the SPA process will not be

CP_V7.0	changing. DA replied if a customer is going for class 3 the meter read frequency will stay as monthly. This was the end of September 9th DSC Delivery Sub Group meeting.
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve ☐ Reject ☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

DSG Date:	16/09/2019
DSG Summary:	James Barlow (JB) presented this agenda item. JB explained that there is a production defect that has been found around the use of class change estimate when moving from class 3 to 4. This read is treated as an estimate for the new class and as an actual for the old. Currently if a valid read is processed for the outgoing class at class change D-1 it is accepted it is accepted and passed to downstream processes. JB explained that there is an error in reconciliation when trying to generate a one day reconciliation between the D-1 Valid read and the Class Change Estimate, also held at D-1. To resolve this issue, JB suggested that where a valid read for Class 3, at Class Change D-1, is passed to validation: - Send U10 to shipper (existing process, no change) - To mitigate the conflict in rec the read will be set as Inactive so not used in downstream processes o Post XRN4991 deployment, if this read is submitted in a batch then associated reads will be set to Assured - This is as is processing for Class Change 4>3 - This will be handled as a production defect and as such status will be maintained in the incident management log. SPC file processing order slide JB explained that Xoserve would like to highlight that when submitting multiple SPC files at the same time, these may not be processed sequentially, therefore should a Shipper have a file limit set and the number of files submitted exceed that limit, it may not be the latest file(s) that is rejected. Furthermore, based on the forecasts received from Shippers, currently no file limits need to be set.
Capture Document / Requirements:	<Insert where appropriate>
DSG Recommendation:	☐ Approve	☐ Reject	☐ Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY

Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2404.2 - RT - JR 1- Preliminary design engagement (PDE)
Comm Title:	XRN 4991 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3 – MOD0700 – Changes to the UK Link Manual – Preliminary Design impacts to UK Link Manual documents
Comm Date:	12/08/2019

Change Representation

Action Required:	For Representation
Close Out Date:	27/08/2019

Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN 4991 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3 – UNC Modification 0700
Change Class:	*Functional – Users to confirm*
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	<Shipper Class A><Shipper Class B><Shipper Class C>
Change Owner:	David Addison / 0121 623 2752 / david.addison@xoserve.com
Background and Context:	Following publication of the 2019/20 Unidentified Gas (UIG) Weighting Factors, Shippers' communications and actions indicate they intend to migrate significant numbers of Supply Meter Points to Class 3. Modification 0700 seeks to ensure that the CDSP has capability to manage the significant increase in Class 3 Supply Meter Point read submissions. This change has been raised to implement the necessary changes to UK Link systems to effect the change. The changes in the Modification seek to minimise the impact on the above Shippers by focusing mitigating actions on End User Category (EUC) Band 1 which covers the majority (circa 99%) of Supply Meter Points.

Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration; Meter Read.
Non-Functional:	Transaction Volume, Performance.
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW, AMT Sybex Marketflow, EFT, IX Gateway, DES, Gemini
User:	Impacts are only currently identified to Shipper Users.
Documentation:	This change pack highlights changes to the following UK Link Manual products: - BD2 - UK LINK IS SERVICE DEFINITION - UKLCD1 - CODE COMMUNICATIONS REFERENCE
Other:	Please specify

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Change Design Description

The design for XRN4991 is still in progress. The Modification described an end to end process, including detail within the Modification that would normally be included within subsidiary documentation such as the UK Link Manual, and not expected to be included within the Uniform Network Code Legal Text. This Change Pack is intended to highlight to Users the proposed changes to the UK Link Manual documentation. A further Change Pack is anticipated to further describe aspects of the design.

Changes to the Code Communications Document can be [found here](#)

The Legal Text for 0700 describes the interactions between Users and the CDSP in order for:
1.   Class Change capacity to be allocated to a User;
2.   for the CDSP to reject any files containing transactions that exceed this allocated capacity; and
3.   for a User to specify a date which the CDSP should, where a Meter Reading is present, seek to validate and in turn use for Offtake Reconciliation.

It is expected that the necessary interactions will be conducted by Email, but the CDSP are still investigating design options to be able to use the standard file level rejection approach. User views are particularly invited whether an email notification by the CDSP that a file has been prevented from processing would be sufficient, or whether a UK Link Communication is required.

We will communicate the detailed process and the email address which will be responsible for each interaction in a subsequent change pack.

Users are reminded that in the immediate short term where they intend to migrate to Class 3, that they should contact their Customer Advocate to discuss available capacity.

CP_V7.0

Changes to the UK Link IS Service Definition can be found here

The document has been updated to remove the daily capacity of 26,000 Supply Point Amendments available to all Users. It is proposed that the daily processing capacity is allocated to individual Users following a User requesting allocation of this capacity. It is proposed that this allocation process is overseen by the DSC Contract Management Committee. The attached presentation describes the proposed process for information.

The presentation document can be **found here**

The document has also been updated to reflect the capacity requested by Users for 19/20 within Class 3 of 5,000,000 Class 3 Supply Meters.

Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	UNC Modification 0700 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3

DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	19/08/2019
Any further information:	It is proposed that these changes are discussed at DSG on 19th August, along with any further design considerations identified.

Implementation

Target Release:	Ad hoc.
Status:	No specific release data has been identified – design on going.

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

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Wales & West Utilities	
	Name:	Richard Pomroy	
	Email:	richard.pomroy@wwutilities.co.uk	
	Telephone:	07812973337	
Representation Status:	Publish		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	WWU believes that the cost of this change should be met entirely by Shippers.		
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	No target date given	

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Funding arrangements will be discussed next Change Management Committee meeting on the 11th September.

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:	Northern Gas Networks
	Name:	Helen Chandler
	Email:	Hchandler@northerngas.co.uk
	Telephone:	07580704123

Representation Status:	Public, not confidential	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	We agree that changes are required to the UK Link Manual in order to facilitate this change. We believe clarity regarding the funding arrangements for this change is still required.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	A implementation date has yet to be proposed for this change proposal.

H1: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Funding arrangements will be discussed next Change Management Committee meeting on the 11th September.

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:	E.ON	
	Name:	Kirsty Dudley	
	Email:	Kirsty.Dudley@eonenergy.com	
	Telephone:	07816172645	
Representation Status:	Comments.		
Representation Publication:	Publish		
Representation Comments:	Based on our calculation of the solution, the projected development time wouldn't see implementation in time for the 2019/2020 gas year, if the solution is to deliver what we believe is intended then delivery needs to be implemented by this date to deliver the benefits proposed. We see this change as an initial facilitating change and further process reviews, including a post implementation review, is required.		
Confirm Target Release Date?	No		See representation comment re dates.

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Current project plan timescales have an implementation date of the 28th September 2019. The only amendment to this is the proposed removal of the inner tolerance check for EUC band 01 (small supply points) that may be implemented at a later date.

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:	Defer	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	-We support the principal of a cap however are you saying that every with the removal of the daily capacity that we cannot send ANY class change requests without prior agreement? I think there should be a baselined defined max daily capacity by default allocated to each shipper not sure how this would be allocated. - FRJ would be better as this follows all other flow processes	
Confirm Target Release Date?	No	No target date provided

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Regarding clarification on the submission of Class Change amendments, Shippers will receive an allocation that will consider standard BAU processing as well a projected migration plans. There will also be a process to allow Shippers to request additional capacity if needed and will be assessed accordingly.

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:	Total Gas & Power
	Name:	Louise Hellyer
	Email:	louise.hellyer@totalgp.com
	Telephone:	01737275638
Representation Status:	Comments	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	With reference to the proposal and the associated documents, we have a few comments and areas for clarification. We are also using this as an opportunity to raise questions we have. Code Communications Document: Please clarify; the below comment has been entered as a footnote on page 7. It reads like the D+10 deadline is only applicable to the SSP class 3 site but we expected this would apply to all class 3 sites? Following the implementation of UNC Modification 0700, 'processing' of Non Opening Class 3 Meter Readings for Small Supply Points will include the writing to the staging table within the UK Link system where such Meter Readings shall be collated into Batch Periods by the CDSP. For the avoidance of doubt, where a deadline is specified within the UNC in relation to Meter Readings related to these Supply Meters – e.g. D+10 where D is the Read Date (M5.8.2(b)) – the receipt time stated above also applies. Code Communications Document: We couldn't open up the Code Communications specification. There is a further change there we would have liked to look at. Regarding capacity of supply point amendments: It is noted that within the MOD there is a limitation (which we do not believe is correct) on restricting amendments only on class changes to SPC3. This does not appear to be how the change request is covering this. It appears possibly that the change proposal is limiting all supply point amendment files, but this is not full clear and it needs to be. The amendment process can be used for other changes as well but there has been no communication of any limiting or request for projection numbers on the other changes. Please confirm the full details & timeframes needed by the DSC Contract Management Committee for the allocation process. (Does the information need to be provided 5 working days before the meeting?)	

	Quite rightly the presentation talks about the need to avoid people blocking capacity and then not using it. We should though also consider that if not all capacity is requested that more flexibility on days should be allowed. The way it is stated implies if you wanted to do a small number, e.g. 30 amendments in the month, you would be required to submit one a day as a daily limit. This is not a pragmatic approach to management and would massively increase shipper workload over sending 30 in one day. Would a minimum issued (upon request) daily allowance be a way to manage this? i.e. no requester is ever given a daily limit below 30? Which if some needs to be shared out then given in a more useful way i.e allow to be requested within a week timeframe? Or withhold some volume for small file capacities on all days? If there are rejections on amendments does the shipper then not get to resubmit but have to wait for the following month? Or possibly longer if they do not get the information in time to submit to the meeting?
CP_V7.0	

Quite rightly the presentation talks about the need to avoid people blocking capacity and then not using it. We should though also consider that if not all capacity is requested that more flexibility on days should be allowed. The way it is stated implies if you wanted to do a small number, e.g. 30 amendments in the month, you would be required to submit one a day as a daily limit. This is not a pragmatic approach to management and would massively increase shipper workload over sending 30 in one day. Would a minimum issued (upon request) daily allowance be a way to manage this? i.e. no requester is ever given a daily limit below 30? Which if some needs to be shared out then given in a more useful way i.e allow to be requested within a week timeframe? Or withhold some volume for small file capacities on all days? If there are rejections on amendments does the shipper then not get to resubmit but have to wait for the following month? Or possibly longer if they do not get the information in time to submit to the meeting?

File Rejection:
User views are particularly invited whether an email notification by the CDSP that a file has been prevented from processing would be sufficient, or whether a UK Link Communication is required.

We would not be comfortable with an email rejection process. This has a lack of automation within it. It makes it too easy for the information to go missing or not noticed during holiday or personnel change. We believe file rejection should be supported by a UK Link Communication.

Will it be that the full file would be rejected, not just the excessive sites within the file? Again a point more for clarification and avoidance of doubt in the documentation.

UK Link IS Service Definition:
In the UK Link IS Service Definition how have you picked the number for the 2019-20 design maximum volume? I believed we do not know the maximum limit currently? Also if this is relating to the new design should this be reflected of the fact that this is now Class 3 is not split with AQ band 1 and 2-9 separate? If it is a projection of usage of the system why has the number reduced and not increased?

In Daily Peak transactions there are no figures for 19/20 meter readings – are the volumes going to be published and when? We assumed this should be reflective of the anticipated changes.

Process Limits:
Do we have confirmation if there is also a limit on the amendment implementation date? i.e. we have to limit the number of requests sent in on the 20th of the month but if people don't just use the minimum term and request files over multiple days to take effect on a set date would this cause an issue for the system?

Is it ensured that even with the scale up on AQ bands 2-9 and changes to band 1 that the Amendment Invoice Supporting information files will be able to manage this?

CP_V7.0	Site Classification: What AQ will be used for validations/classification of the site? Current Rolling AQ or the Rolling AQ applicable at the time of the Read, or the Rolling AQ at the time of submission of the read? It will be possible for a read to be sent in with an AQ below the AQ band 1 threshold but go above before validation (depending on clarification of the times). Or vice versa. We need full clarity on which way this will be to managed to ensure our systems are built to correlate as internal systems need to understand when read response files will not be received. Read Processing: Additional clarity on when reads are processed is needed; for all EUC bands. Again we are now looking at a process where reads will be held for a period of time before response file are sent out. Will this be the same for all AQ bands or will response file speed differ? Will all AQ bands go into the holding table? Will AQ band 2-9 reads be processed as soon as they are received? Could preferred reads be processed immediately on receipt to ensure Shippers are not delayed on getting status of this read as they intend to then use it with billing? Over a week delay could have other internal impacts. If the preferred read is rejected what method is applied to pick the next read? If there is no preferred in the at week file, what method is used to pick the read Xoserve validate? Consistency would be ideal here but understand it needs to be balanced with ensuring non validated reads are not able to be "created". Currently read submission window is 25+10 days from read date. Is it going to change? If the reads will be batched weekly, if we submit a valid read for example 3 weeks after read date, and there was no valid read for that week, will it be validated and used as an actual (and response sent)? What if there is a read for that week but for another day (other than preferred read date), will the newly submitted read for a preferred day be validated and response sent? If the preferred read is rejected due to tolerance, can it be still re-submitted within 25+10 days, with an override flag or clocking depending on rejection reason? Additional: We would like to see more clear time frames around how long it is expected that this workaround would be needed till the enduring and full service solution can be delivered. Concern on timeframes and how all industry participants are fully aware of the technical aspects of the solution and that it is not "Rushed" but delivered in time. We feel that there are still a lot of technical points that need to be answered.

Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

CP_V7.0

H1: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Please see below response/clarification to the questions raised within your representation. We have published an FAQ on the MOD0700 (Class 3) area of the Xoserve.com website that may provide additional clarification to a number of points raised. Code Communications Document: D+10 validation rule is only applicable to Supply Meter Points covered under MOD0700, which will be Supply Meter Points in EUC Band 01 (Small Supply Points), all other Supply Meter Points will not be covered under MOD0700 and therefore have their reads processed as BAU. Regarding capacity of supply point amendments: These details are still being worked through with additional clarify being provided within the Detail Design Change Pack issued out on the 28th August and the FAQ's referenced above. File Rejection: Your preferred mechanism for file rejections have been noted and will feed discussions at the next Change Management Committee meeting on the 11th September. UK Link IS Service Definition & Process Limits: More details for these elements of the change will be picked up at the extraordinary DSG on the 9th September 2019. Site Classification: This question was fed into the FAQ's that have now been published. The AQ used in read tolerance is the AQ value effective at the read date of the read being validated. Read Processing: For the answers to the questions raised in this section please refer to the Detail Design Change Pack issued out on the 28th August and the FAQ's referenced above, this breaks down the process end to end in detail. Additional: It is not yet known how long the interim solution is due to be in place for. Work is ongoing in this space looking at system optimisation and performance. More details will be provided as soon as they become available.

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:	SSE
	Name:	Megan Coventry
	Email:	megan.coventry@sse.com
	Telephone:	02392277738
Representation Status:	Neutral	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	For the process of communicating rejections to shippers, our preference would be for the CDSP to use the standard file level rejection approach rather than email. This is because the use of email would require more manual process for shippers.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Your preference has been noted and will be discussed in the next Change Management Committee meeting on the 11th September.

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:	ScottishPower
	Name:	Claire Roberts
	Email:	Clairelouise.Roberts@Scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	01416145930
Representation Status:	Approve	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	The PARR needs to be assessed to determine if they will continue to measure compliance with the UNC700-amended performance obligation.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. PARR impacts are currently being discussed and will be communicated in due course (aiming for 9th September Extraordinary DSG).

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

Change Management Committee (ChMC) Change Pack Summary

Communication Detail

Comm Reference:	2415 – CS – PO
Comm Title:	XRN 4991 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3 - MOD0700
Comm Date:	28/08/2019

Change Representation

Action Required:	For Representation
Close Out Date:	9th September 2019

Change Detail

Xoserve Reference Number:	XRN 4991 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3 – UNC Modification 0700
Change Class:	*Functional – Users to confirm*
ChMC Constituency Impacted:	All Shipper Classes
Change Owner:	David Addison - Service Development Manager 0121 623 2752 david.addison@xoserve.com Simon Harris - Concept Development Specialist 0121 623 2455 simon.harris@xoserve.com
Background and Context:	Following publication of the 2019/20 Unidentified Gas (UIG) Weighting Factors, Shippers' communications and actions indicate they intend to migrate a significant number of Supply Meter Points to Class 3.

	Modification 0700 seeks to ensure that the CDSP has capability to manage the significant increase in Class 3 Supply Meter Point read submissions. This CP has been raised to implement the necessary amendments to UK Link systems to effect the change.
CP_V7.0	
	The changes in the Modification seek to minimise the impact on the above Shippers by focusing mitigating actions on End User Category (EUC) Band 1 which covers the majority (circa 99%) of Supply Meter Points.

Change Impact Assessment Dashboard (UK Link)

Functional:	Supply Point Administration, Meter Read Submission, Reporting
Non-Functional:	Transaction Volume, Performance
Application:	SAP ISU, SAP BW, AMT Sybex Marketflow, EFT, IX Gateway, DES, Gemini
User:	Impacts are only currently identified to Shipper Users
Documentation:	- BD2 - UK LINK IS SERVICE DEFINITION - UKLCD1 - CODE COMMUNICATIONS REFERENCE - UNC VALIDATION RULES
Other:	None

Files				
File	Parent Record	Record	Data Attribute	Hierarchy or Format Agreed
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Change Design Description

This Change Pack aims to give an overview of the solution being implemented to satisfy MOD0700 via XRN4991.

Class Change Process
Modification 0700 has given the CDSP the power to limit the number of Supply Point Changes that can be processed where integrity of the system may be compromised. To facilitate this, each Shipper shall receive an 'allocation' which will be the maximum number of 'Supply Meter Point Amendment Requests' (.SPC) files that can be submitted to the CDSP in a single day.

This 'allocation' shall be monitored and SPC files <u>may</u> be rejected if the Shipper breaches their daily allocation and the system capacity is close to being reached. It is not guaranteed that SPC file(s) will be rejected if a Shipper breaches their daily allocation, but Shippers will be notified where a file has been rejected; however the mechanism of how this notification will occur has not yet been defined (Email or UK Link Communication (IX)).

Shippers can request additional capacity for specific days if they feel it necessary to do so based on projected migration of Supply Points to Class 3 product. Additional capacity can be requested via your Customer Advocates and should be at least 5 business days prior to the

need date. All increased capacity requests shall be considered and accommodated where possible.

Allocations and Maximum System Capacity are still being looked into but will be communicated out once defined.

Read Submission Stage
Modification 0700 specifies that Class 3 read submissions for Supply Meter Points in EUC band 01 should be carried out in weekly (7 day) or less batches. This means that a 'Class 3 Read' (.UBR) file should contain a maximum of 7 cyclic readings per Supply Meter Point to be submitted to the CDSP, fewer readings can be sent within a batch but ideally 7 reads should be provided where possible to help with the smoothing of reads processed through to UK Link core systems.

All cyclic EUC 01 reads contained within Shipper batches will be subject to D+10 validations. Where reads contained within a Shipper batch are older than D+10 (D Read Date) then these will be rejected back to the Shipper within the standard 'Unbundled Meter Read Response' (.URS) file (U02 Unbundled Read Rejection & S72 Rejection Details), all other reads within the Shipper batch will be considered for the Read Selection stage.

All readings submitted via UBR files that are not covered under MOD0700 rules are passed directly to the Read Validation stage (bypasses the Read Selection stage) and processed as BAU. These include the following…
   2- Replacement Reads
   3- Opening Readings
   4- Readings for Supply Meter Points within EUC Bands 2-9

As well as reads not covered under MOD0700 rules, reads within a Shipper batch that have a through the zero (TTZ)/ round the clock (RTC) not equal to 0 will be passed (once passed through D+10 validation) directly through to Read Validation stage to mitigate potential future read failures. If this is the case, an additional read from the Shipper batch will still be considered for Read Selection stage.

Please note that although not all reads within a Shipper batch will be selected to move forward for processing, all reads must still be validated and assured by the submitting Shipper as per current processing.

Read Selection Stage
It has been agreed that a single read will be taken from a Shipper submitted batch of readings to be passed through to downstream processing within UK Link. The standard read selection process will take the last read within a Shipper batch to be passed for read validation.

A Shipper can specify a 'preferred' date in a calendar month on which to take priority over the standard read selection process, this 'preferred' date and any amendments to it should be communicated via the Customer Advocates. The 'preferred' date can be any date within a month, but please note that if this date is the 29th, 30th or 31st of the month, some months will not have an opportunity for any submitted batch to have a 'preferred' read for selection. If a Shipper batch contains a read for the Shipper 'preferred' date then this read shall automatically be selected and passed to the Read Validation stage and overrides the standard read selection.

It is requested that a 'preferred' read date (if required) is specified to us by the 6th September

2019 to ensure it is set up for Go-Live. Any updates made to the Shipper 'preferred' date post Go-Live will need to be passed to the Customer Advocates as soon as possible, more details regarding timings for updating this 'preferred' date will be provided closer to the Go-Live date.

If the Shipper 'preferred' read does not pass validation and is rejected back to the Shipper (via .URS file) then another read within the Shipper batch will be selected using the standard read selection process (last read within the batch).

If no Shipper 'preferred' read is present in a Shipper batch, the standard read selection process will kick in and the last read will be selected in the first instance, if this fails validation and is rejected back to the Shipper (within URS file) then the next read closest to the last read will be selected.

Only two attempts will be made to identify a reading to pass through to UK Link systems, not all reads in the batch will be processed and validated. Further information on this is contained within the Read Validation Stage.

For clarity, the only Class 3 EUC 01 reads that will be responded to via the URS file will be following:
1.   Reads failing D+10 validation (rejected)
2.   Selected reads that fail standard read validation (rejected)
3.   Reads that pass the Read Validation Stage (to be loaded into UK Link for further processing) - (accepted)

All other reads that have not been selected and have been assigned a status of 'assured' / 'unassured' will not be responded to via URS file.

Read Validation Stage
Once a read has been selected from a Shippers batch, it will undergo standard read validation as if it was processed today. If it passes validation it will be accepted into UK Link for downstream processing and all other reads within the Shipper batch are set to an 'assured' status to feed Shipper Read Performance reporting.

If the read does not pass validation then it is rejected back to the Shipper and another read is selected from the same Shipper batch. If this second read passes validation it will be accepted into UK Link for downstream processing and all other reads within the Shipper batch are set to an 'assured' status (excluding the first rejected reading) to feed Shipper Read Performance reporting.

Only two attempts to select a read from a Shipper batch will be carried out, so if both the selected reads from the Shipper batch fail validation they will both be rejected back to the Shipper and all other reads within the Shipper batch are set to an 'unassured' status to feed Shipper Read Performance reporting. If this occurs then the Shipper can re-submit the batch again with appropriate amendments, but please note, this may result in additional reads failing the D+10 read validation rule prior to being considered for read selection.

Inner Tolerance Read Validation
Proposal for removing the inner read tolerance validation for EUC1 reads is currently in progress/assessment and would look to mitigate potential issues surrounding the mismatch on the reads being validated to calculate consumption (Shipper submissions are day to day reads, CDSP are looking at 7 day periods). Any potential solutions are thought to not be ready for the main implementation of XRN4991 but may be introduced at a later date if

monitoring of read rejections indicates a requirement for the suspension of the inner read tolerance (EUC1 only).

Additional Information
In a Class Change scenario (from 1/2/4 to 3) estimate reads for the Class Change effective date is carried out straight away and issued out to Shippers accordingly. If this read is inaccurate the Shipper can submit a Replacement Reading to replace the estimate read. As this is done via flagging the read as a Replacement within the UBR file, this read takes priority and is not classed as MOD0700 so will be processed as BAU.

In a Shipper Transfer scenario, if the incoming Shipper provides an Opening Reading within their batch then this will be classed as non-MOD0700 and be processed as BAU and will be used to satisfy the Transfer Effective Read. If no Opening Reading is provided within the incoming Shipper batch then this (and any others received) will be held until the Transfer Effective Read is fulfilled by a CDSP estimated, RGMA or Opening reading (BAU). Once fulfilled then the held batches will be processed, however they will be processed as a collective so only one read will be allowed to be accepted from all the held batches submitted.

Check to Check Reconciliation will be based on the prevailing volume where a Cyclic Read has been received, however where the read within the check to check period has been marked as Assured or Unassured then this period will be based on Allocated Volumes. Where a Cyclic Read has been provided for the check read date but is not the read selected from the batch for processing, then the reconciliation profile for the last period within the check to check reconciliation will be based on allocated (deemed) volume rather than the prevailing volume. Once a Check Read has been processed, the Deemed profile is set and cannot be amended and this may not follow actual offtake for the days covered, so it is advised that any Check Read submitted aligns where possible to accepted reads within UK Link to ensure any reconciliations are based on prevailing volumes.

Downstream Processes
No impacts on downstream processes have been identified as part of the solution for MOD0700. However please be aware that Reconciliation Supporting Information files will contain daily variances within the AML/ASP files but this is BAU and would happen regardless of MOD0700.

Reporting impacts are currently being looked into to highlight reports that may be impacted by the introduction of new internal read statuses. The main area of impact will be Read Performance and Meter Read Validity PARR reports. A full list of impacted reports will be provided to DSG as soon as they are available.

Associated Changes

Associated Change(s) and Title(s):	UNC Modification 0700 - Enabling large scale utilisation of Class 3

DSG

Target DSG discussion date:	02/09/2019

CP_V7.0

Any further information:	None

Implementation

Target Release:	Ad hoc (28/09/2019)
Status:	Pending ChMC approval

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

Section H: Representation Response

H1: Change Representation

(To be completed by User and returned for response)

User Contact Details:	Organisation:	Gazprom Energy
	Name:	Alison Neild
	Email:	alison.neild@gazprom-energy.com
	Telephone:	01618290039
Representation Status:	In Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	We have a number a queries on the solution (1) Please can you confirm the reason for the validation being D+10 calendar days, is there potential for this to be D+10 business days? (2) Please confirm what will happen if a read with a TTZ not equal to 0 fails validation. With an unbundled Read Rejection be sent and all others set to 'Unassured'? (3) When last read in a batch is picked, is this the last U14 in the file or the read with the latest read date, as my understanding is that the reads are not always in order in the file?	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Please see below response/clarification to the questions raised within your representation: 1. As Class 3 is daily read it expected that these reads are delivered within 10 days of their occurrence hence the use of calendar days. Also, this is aligned with the pre MOD0700 validation where reads must be submitted by the 10th day of (M)onth+1 i.e. last day of the month + 10 days. N.B. Xoserve do process reads on non-business days 2. Reads with a TTZ > 1 will be processed outside of the MOD0700 functionality and processed in addition to reads selected from the batch. As such they do not impact the status of any other reads within the shipper batch 3. The "last read" taken from a shipper batch will be the that with

	the latest read date

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:	Northern Gas Networks
	Name:	Helen Chandler
	Email:	HChandler@northerngas.co.uk
	Telephone:	07580704123
Representation Status:	N/A	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	NGN has no comments regarding daily class change allocations, batch submissions or read selection and validation as these are Shipper impacting processes.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation

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:	Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA)
	Name:	Shelley Rouse
	Email:	shelley.rouse@gemserv.com
	Telephone:	+4402070901059
Representation Status:	Comments on behalf of the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA).	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	The Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) support the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) in its work. A significant part of this role involves, using the data provided in the 520a Performance Assurance reports (PARR) to monitor industry performance against the requirements of the UNC. Improving meter read performance, particularly in class 2 and 3 is currently high on the PAC agenda with performance improvement actions already being taken. Maintaining a suite of accurate reports is vital for the PAC to continue its work. Whilst the PAFA do not believe it is appropriate for them to comment on the change proposal itself we would like to provide feedback on the potential impact of this change on the PARR reporting. PARR reports 2B.5 Meter reads and 2B.6 Meter read validity monitoring are two of the suite of 10 PARR reports that could be impacted by the implementation of XRN4991. 2B.5 currently provides PAFA with a view of the percentage of a Shippers portfolio accepted vs the expected number of reads in a given month. This enables us to assess read submission performance against the read submission requirements in the UNC. 2B.6 enables the PAFA to monitor the percentage of meter reads that are failing validation for each Shipper across the product classes. The implementation of UNC700 and this subsequent change proposal will alter the expected number of reads for PC3 EUC01 and introduce 'assured reads' into the process. There will also be changes to the meter read validation process that are not currently recognised in the PARR reports including the introduction of 'non-assured' reads. PAFA have met with the CDSP to discuss the potential impacts of the XRN4991 on the PARR, implementation dates and possible reporting improvements.	

	PAFA welcome this engagement and would like to continue working with the CDSP throughout this process to ensure that the PARR remain fit for purpose.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation

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:	ScottishPower
	Name:	Claire Roberts
	Email:	Clairelouise.Roberts@scottishpower.com
	Telephone:	01416145930
Representation Status:	Support	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	We are in support of the XRN but would like clarity on the below points: SPC files may be rejected if daily allocation is breached - Shippers will be notified where a file has been rejected. Mechanism of how this notification will occur has not be defined, when will this be confirmed. Long term preferred option would be via IX rather than e-mail but appreciate the urgency to have the XRN implemented. Inner Tolerance Read Validation - This will be active at Go Live, with the potential of increased rejections when do the CDSP anticipate to review this and engage with the Industry.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve's Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation. Please see below response/clarification to the questions raised within your representation: - Where a shipper sends an SPC in excess of their daily allowance the file will be rejected using the FRJ file and rejection code FIL000124 File rejected and will not be processed - The impact assessment for disabling the Inner Tolerance Validation is ongoing and the CDSP will update parties as soon as this is finalised. During this time the CDSP will continue to monitor the level of rejections

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:	Total Gas & Power
	Name:	Louise Hellyer
	Email:	louise.hellyer@totalgp.com
	Telephone:	01737275638
Representation Status:	Comments	
Representation Publication:	Publish	
Representation Comments:	We are in general support of the change but would like to take the opportunity to reiterate a concern that with the limits applied on Supply point amendment files that it is ensured that normal business on non affected processes, like SOQ changes, are not declined. Due to a file limit rather than records it is more of a challenge. We can see how Xoserve are looking to be pragmatic within this area which is appreciated.	
Confirm Target Release Date?	Yes	«h1_userDataAlternative»

H1: Xoserve' s Response

Xoserve Response to Organisations Comments:	Thank you for your representation, Customer Advocates will continue to work with shippers to understand their demand and, with best endeavours, set limits to ensure that that demand can be processed

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

Version Control

Document

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
1	With DSG	12/08/2019	Xoserve	Updated with initial ChMC outcome
2	With DSG	15/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 5th August 2019
3	With DSG	30/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 19th August 2019
4	With DSG	30/08/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from Extraordinary DSG 27th August 2019
5	With DSG	05/09/2019	Xoserve	Updated with August Change Pack, Reps and Responses.
6	With DSG	11/09/2019	Xoserve	Updated with Extraordinary August Change Pack, Reps and Responses.
7	With DSG	16/09/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 2nd September 2019
8	With DSG	19/09/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 9th September 2019
9	With DSG	24/09/2019	Xoserve	CP updated with discussions from DSG 16th September 2019

Template

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)	Remarks
3.0	Superseded	17/07/2018	Emma Smith	Template approved at ChMC on 11th 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 12th December 2018.
6.1	In Draft	26/03/2019	Richard Johnson/ Alison Cross	The following minor changes were made: - Inclusion of an All 'Impacted Parties' option in A2 - Justification section added to section A2 - Change Description

					replaced with Problem Statement in section A3 - Remove 'X' in Release information (sections A3, A5, A7, C1 and G8) - Updated Service Line and UK Link impacts and funding section (A6) to include further detail - Amended questions 3 and 4 in section B - Added Service Line/UK link Assessment in section D - Removed Section A5
6.2	For approval	14/05/2019	Alison Cross		Following review at DSC Governance review group re-added Change Description text box
7.0	Approved	13/06/2019	Richard Johnson		DSC Governance Review Group changes to the template approved at Change Management Committee on 12th June 2019

Appendix 1

Change Prioritisation Variables 35%

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 Driver Type	☐ CMA Order ☒ MOD / Ofgem ☐ EU Legislation ☐ License Condition ☐ BEIS ☒ ChMC endorsed Change Proposal ☐ SPAA Change Proposal ☐ Additional or 3rd Party Service Request ☐ Other*(please provide details below)*
Please select the customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered	☒Shipper Impact ☐iGT Impact ☐Network Impact ☒Xoserve Impact ☐National Grid Transmission Impact
Associated Change reference Number(s)	**4991**
Associated MOD Number(s)	
Perceived delivery effort	☐ 0 – 30 ☒ 30 – 60 ☐ 60 – 100 ☐ 100+ days
Does the project 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*	☐ Yes *(If yes please answer the next question)* ☒ No

CP_V7.0

identifier' – includes MPRNS.	
A Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) will be required if the delivery of the change involves the processing of personal data in any of the following scenarios:	☐ New technology ☐ Vulnerable customer data ☐ Theft of Gas ☐ Mass data ☐ Xoserve employee data ☐ Fundamental changes to Xoserve business ☐ Other *(please provide details below)* *(If any of the above boxes have been selected then please contact The Data Protection Officer (Sally Hall) to complete the DPIA.*
Change Beneficiary *How many market participant or segments stand to benefit from the introduction of the change?*	☐ Multiple Market Participants ☒ Multiple Market Group ☐ All industry UK Gas Market participants ☒ Xoserve Only ☐ One Market Group ☐ One Market Participant
Primary Impacted DSC Service Area	
Number of Service Areas Impacted	☐ All ☐ Five to Twenty ☒ Two to Five ☐ One
Change Improvement Scale? *How much work would be reduced for the customer if the change is implemented?*	☒ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low
Are any of the following at risk if the change is not delivered?	
☐ Safety of Supply at risk ☐ Customer(s) incurring financial loss ☐ Customer Switching at risk	
Are any of the following required if the change is delivered?	
☒ Customer System Changes Required ☒ Customer Testing Likely Required ☒ Customer Training Required	
Known Impact to Systems / Processes	
Primary Application impacted	☒BW ☒ ISU ☐ CMS ☒ AMT ☐ EFT ☐ IX ☐ Gemini ☐ Birst ☐ Other *(please provide details below)*
Business Process Impact	☒AQ ☒SPA ☐RGMA ☒Reads ☐Portal ☒Invoicing ☐Other *(please provide details below)*
Are there any known impacts to external services and/or systems as a result of delivery of this change?	☐ Yes *(please provide details below)* ☒ No
Please select customer group(s) who would be impacted if the change is not delivered.	☒ Shipper impact ☐ Network impact ☐ iGT impact ☒ Xoserve impact ☐ National Grid Transmission Impact
Workaround currently in operation?	
Is there a Workaround in operation?	☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes who is accountable for the workaround?	☐ Xoserve ☐ External Customer ☐ Both Xoserve and External Customer
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?	☐ Low *(easy, repetitive, quick task, very little risk of human error)* ☐ Medium *(moderate difficult, requires some form of offline calculation, possible risk of human error in determining outcome)* ☐ High *(complicate task, time consuming, requires specialist resources, high risk of human error in determining outcome)*

CP_V7.0

Change Prioritisation Score	35%