

Section C: DSG Discussion

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	20/02/2023		
DSG Summary:	PO presented this agenda item. PO provided a brief overview of the Change which can be viewed within the meeting slide deck.		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		

C1: Delivery Sub-Group (DSG) Recommendations

DSG Date:	20/11/2023		
DSG Summary:	<p>PO provided background to this Change Proposal, which is currently out for Solution Change Pack consultation, advising that this is to improve the IGT Supply Meter Point New Connection process by enabling the CDSP to accept related amendments from IGTs and ensuring that the relevant parties have the information they need to support accurate and timely changes to Shipper and Supplier Registration details to adjust those related amendments accordingly.</p> <p>PO talked through the customer requirements as detailed on slide 18 and asked for feedback from DSG representatives so that this could be used to further support the development activities. No questions were raised at this stage.</p> <p>PO provided the HLSO solution title to 'Amend the validations in UK Link and generate comparison dataset's 'explaining these are not fully defined. PO explained that the trigger is, when the IGT needs to send new contact information and notify any previous shipper of changes to details as and when the team is made aware from the developer, that, there is a change to the contracted shipper supply details, IGT would then notify the old shipper, that actually they are no longer the elected shipper against those meter points and they would also notify the new shipper that those details had related to them and their portfolio and the new shipper would then respond to the IGT through the agreed through the</p>		

PSR process that exists between shippers and IGTs and explained this would go back to IGT and then the IGT would look to notify CDSP of the new shipper details explaining the key features and changes to the existing process as follows:-

- Enables CDSP to accept IGT Meter Point Amendment requests, as supplied via the .IMA file, regardless of the presence of CSS Registration Activity
- Enables CDSP to trigger notifications to Old and New Shipper via existing AES and DES file interfaces pointing to the swim lane for CDSP steps S5.1, S5.2 and S5.3 pointing out to introduce these steps, and pointed out the three outputs to IGTs, Old Shippers, previous shippers to notify that we are aware they have been unappointed and the New Shipper to be appointed to the meter points and look to notify the IGT
- Enables Shipper details to be recorded and stored within CDSP systems.
- The final Step 7 which is existing detail, so as and when meter information is installed.
- If that meter information is in is undertaken by an IGT, then they'd look to notify the respective new shipper of the meter installation details.
- Step 8.1 would be the trigger for the new shipper to register their details and potentially with this, the central switching partner and then those details would flow back through CDSP systems and onto the corresponding IGT.
- Supports the capability of additional monitoring and reporting activities to take place between impacted parties where datasets are not aligned. PO noted that Step 7
- Within the Solution Change Pack, it has been confirmed that several 'Could Have' requirements, relating to Retail Energy Code arrangements, are not being met - A corresponding REC Modification would be required to specify the solution that the CDSP would be responsible to deliver. PO explained that what we are not proposing in this change, at this stage is for CDSP having functionality to

override registration data in Central Switching Systems. (CSS) but what we have said, is that this can be progressed if a corresponding Rec Modification is introduced and then any associated solution CDSP would look to support as an obligated party under those solutions.

PO advised that the extent of the solution, will allow the right parties to have the information in, CDSP systems and it allows the data, to be made available to monitor and report upon, so that any discrepancies can be highlighted and to effectively incentivize or improve alignment of data across the estate.

PO advised that the solution to Amend the validations in UK Link, and to generate comparison datasets, has been confirmed as medium impact to the existing process performed by the CDSP, with relative low impacts to IGT and Shippers who also interface with the process.

The solution has been identified as potentially aligning with either a Major release or being delivered as an Adhoc release, that could be delivered outside of the release schedule if needs be. The cost is unlikely to be less than £165,000 but probably no more than £209,000. PO went on to explain that this is more of a succinct overview of the details of the solution change pack, but much more information in that solution change pack is available online and in the change pack that has been issued, PO asked if anyone had any questions.

KD requested clarification on the current volumes of impacted MPRNs that relate to this change. PO advised that this has been discussed with IGT's, and presently it is understood to be in the low thousands (e.g. approx. 1000 MPRNs). This is based on information received from the IGTs during the change development phase. PO went on to explain that there are scenarios whereby large volumes of MPRNs could be impacted by misaligned Shipper / Supplier details – e.g. in the event that developer changed their contractual agreements on mass. KD went on to challenge the peak cost (£206,000) in relation to the impacted meter point that would benefit from the change (approx. 1000). PO explained that the solution identified is scalable to the current and potential future needs. KD asked if this is a new problem or existing to which PO confirmed that it is a problem that has existed for several years. KD agreed and said it has been around for a while noting that it was previously referred to as gazumping, and asked from a Code perspective, whether any changes to the IGT UNC have been identified. PO explained that IGT UNC is not impacted by the proposed changes, with the solution effectively allowing the IGTs to send in existing files with these being accepted following changes to CDSP validation logic. PO confirmed that the IGT UNC

does not describe these processes at a technical level. KD asked if the solution intends to replace the PSR process. PO clarified that there was no intention to replace or alter the way in which the PSR process works between IGTs and Shippers. PO explained that it is this change seeks to resolve the discrepancies between the IGT and CDSP datasets, which in turn intend to support Shippers in maintaining registration data alignment and reducing instances where incorrect Shipper and Supplier details are recorded across industry datasets. KD asked to be reminded of which DSC Service Line and what charging percentages are proposed for the change.

PO advised that the proposed charging arrangements for the change are 50%-50% between Shippers and IGT, and that is what has been agreed at ChMC at the initial proposal stage back in February 2023 ChMC when this was raised. KD voiced concerns that the solution appeared costly for the low volumes of MPRNs it would support.

PO explained that no alternative CDSP solutions have been identified to address the requirements to which this change seeks to remedy. KD queried whether the change is being driven by what IGTs need from it and whether any implications have been identified for Shippers. PO confirmed that it is expected that this will benefit Shippers, as it will allow Shippers to receive the relevant flows that they would ordinarily receive from the CDSP, and will help them identify if they have been appointed or de-appointed from relevant IGT MPRNs within CDSP systems - which is a feature of the current process that Shippers do not currently receive. It also allows for any gaps between IGT PSR records to be actioned, alongside providing the Shipper with the necessary data to undertake registration activities with their contracted Supplier – i.e. the change intends to support Shippers in maintaining their portfolio as accurately as possible. KD asked whether any of the misaligned meter points within the volumes mentioned were within a company's own group portfolio. PO confirmed that the volumes mentioned are understood to be outside of group portfolios (i.e. genuine examples where of different Shipper companies holding incomplete or inaccurate IGT MPRN registration details. KD requested clarification on this to support the analysis that they need to undertake.

Kundai Matiringe (KM) asked KD if she could please elaborate on what she is asking for. KD confirmed, if a shipper has multiple short codes and are moving their portfolio within their organisation then that may lead to differences in registered Shipper details. KM clarified that she would take this action away to confirm. Sarah Brown (SB) later introduced herself to the group and confirmed that as the operational lead for BUUK the way in which inter-

	<p>organisational IGT MPRN changes is carried out is separate to the logic and functionality that this change would provide IGTs. SB went on to confirm that the volumes mentioned would all be from one shipper to another, as group licence changes (such as those recently progressed with EON) being managed separately. KD queried whether a historic report, developed to identify differences in registered Shipper vs Elected Shipper, was still in circulation. PO said he was unsure and would have to take this question as it may have been a transitional activity and would look to confirm. PO welcomed KDs comments and input on the change pack from parties and one or two companies and what it is achieving. PO advised in terms of next steps on this change proposal, it has been issued as part of the November Change Pack out for consultation with Shippers and IGTs as part of the November 2023 Change Pack for representation. Closing date is 27th November 2023 and recommended reviewing this change to DSG attendees. Dedicated sessions have been arranged to walk IGT customers through the content of the HLSO in next few weeks and if this solution is supported and approved in the December ChMC, the change will then progress into detailed design phase. KD asked if Shippers had been invited to this, PO advised that it was specifically for IGTs but more than happy to walk through to Shippers, and advised the coverage of Shipper representatives at DSG is welcomed given the difficulty in arranging Shipper meetings of late due to changes in representatives in those groups.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Action: PO to confirm the status of Registered Shipper vs Elected Shipper reporting.</p>		
DSG Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	<input type="checkbox"/> Defer
DSG Recommended Release:	Release X: Feb / Jun / Nov XX or Adhoc DD/MM/YYYY		