**Change Request Form**

## Change Request details

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request details |
| Change Request Title | Remove ELEX REP-005 and include LLF details as part of ISD catalogue |
| Change Request Number | CR033 |
| Originating Advisory / Working Group | DRG |
| Risk/issue reference |  |
| Change Raiser | *Rashmi Radhakrishnan, HELIX WP3* | Date raised: | *17/10/2023* |

***For further guidance on how to complete this document please see the supporting Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants. The guidance will support raising a change and responding to a change request via Impact Assessment. The Change Raiser should consider sharing the draft Change Request Form with impacted programme parties, prior to submission to PMO. The guidance, as well as other key documents are referenced below and can be found via the MHHS website.***

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| MHHS Change Request Form Guidance for Programme Participants |
| MHHS Change Control Approach |
| MHHS Governance Framework |
| Ofgem’s MHHS Transition Timetable |

### Part A – Description of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser when raising the Change Request.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part A – Description of proposed change |
| **Issue statement:**In TOM, Line Loss Factor (LLF) process is a new streamlined process identified with a hybrid solution combining the benefits of Salesforce and Azure to process LLF Data. However there are some ambiguity within the Design Artefacts around how ISD should be publishing LLF Data.In the MHHS BRS10 document, the requirement from MHHS is to publish the full ISD dataset on the BSC Website in a manner that is available to the public access. The data will be available in 3 separate grouping1. LLF data 2. Master Settlement timetable 3. ISD data including UMS data However, the MHHS ERI011B ECS report document states that Line Loss Factors' specifics for Market Participants will be provided by Elexon as part of the ISD publication in the name of ELEX-REP-005The LLF data referenced in MHHS BRS10 and ELEX REP 005, as mentioned in MHHS ERI011B, are identical but bear different names leading to confusion and ambiguity. Helix WP3 has identified this ambiguity and would like MHHS to make relevant Design artefact changes to bring more clarity. |
| **Description of change:**REP-005 and the LLF data referenced in the design artifacts are essentially one and the same. Helix aims to meet their requirements by adhering to the specifications outlined in the Transition BRS010. To accomplish this, MHHS needs to take the following changes into consideration.1. Remove the mention of ELEX REP 005 from MHHS ERI011B ECS report document
2. To enable the ISD to release Line Loss Factor (LLF) data, the LLF data must be integrated into the MHHS EDI021 ISD Entity Specification document. (detailed below entity details)
3. MHHS then align the Transition and End State Design Artefacts to reflect this change i.e All effected Design Artefacts (BRS010, ERI011B ECS report and EDI021 ISD Entity Specification ) to be updated.

The below attached details to be included in the ISD EDI021 to publish the LLF data to be part of the ISD catalogue.      **ISD Entity Id L1 – SVA Line Loss Factors**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Participant Id | LLF Id | Calendar Date | Period | Value |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Column Name** | **Data Type/Length** | **Other Information** |
| Market Participant Id1 | 4 characters | Mandatory  |
| LLF Id2 | 3 characters | Mandatory  |
| Calendar Date | Date | Mandatory  |
| Period3 | Up to 2 characters | Mandatory  |
| Value | Num(4), 3 decimal places | Mandatory  |

1The valid set of values is contained in the ISD table Market Participant Role (ISD Entity Id 45) & SVA Market Participant Id should only allow Market Participant’s with Role Code = ‘R’ 2The valid set of values is contained in the ISD table Line Loss Factor Identifier (ISD Entity Id M3)3Should be in the range 1-50 (1-48 normally, 1-46 or 1-50 for clock change days)**Example**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Participant Id | LLF Id | Calendar Date | Period | Value |
| NEED | 111 | 2023-04-01 | 1 | 1.035 |
| NEED | 111 | 2023-04-01 | 2 | 1.055 |
| NEED | 111 | 2023-04-01 | 3 | 1.045 |
| NEED | 111 | 2023-04-01 | 4 | 1.025 |

**ISD Entity Id L2 – CVA Line Loss Factors**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Participant Id | MSID | Calendar Date | Period | Value |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Column Name** | **Data Type/Length** | **Other Information** |
| Market Participant Id1 | 4 characters | Mandatory  |
| MSID | 4 characters | Mandatory  |
| Calendar Date | Date | Mandatory  |
| Period2 | Up to 2 characters | Mandatory  |
| Value | Num(4), 3 decimal places | Mandatory  |

1The valid set of values is contained in the ISD table Market Participant Role (ISD Entity Id 45)2Should be in the range 1-50 (1-48 normally, 1-46 or 1-50 for clock change days)**Example**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market Participant Id | MSID | Calendar Date | Period | Value |
| NEED | 1212 | 2023-04-01 | 1 | 1.035 |
| NEED | 1212 | 2023-04-01 | 2 | 1.055 |
| NEED | 1212 | 2023-04-01 | 3 | 1.045 |
| NEED | 1212 | 2023-04-01 | 4 | 1.025 |

 |
| **Justification for change:**Without an ISD entity ID, it is not possible to associate the LLF data with any table specified in the ISD EDI021, rendering the processing of the necessary LLF values unattainable. This will Streamline data access for industry participants. |
| **Consequences of no change:**There is a potential lack of clarity amongst Participants around how they are going to receive LLF data  |
| **Alternative options:***Opting for inaction was considered another alternative, but during DRG meeting 10, the industry stakeholders reached a consensus to proceed with the proposed change.*  |
| **Risks associated with potential change:**There is a risk that the LLF publication requirement, as outlined in various MHHS documents contain ambiguities that could lead to incorrect interpretations, thereby affecting industry stakeholders' ability to access LLF details.While the program faces no risks from not implementing this change, the change itself offers the prospect of process improvement and an opportunity to rectify MHHS design artefacts. |
| **Stakeholders consulted on the potential change:**This change was presented at the Design Resolution group meeting on September 18, 2023, where three options were presented. The industry participants unanimously agreed with the option outlined in this change*.* |
| **Target date by which a decision is required:** |      31/10/2023  |

### Part B – Initial Impact of proposed change

**Guidance *– This section should be completed by the Change Raiser before being submitted to the MHHS PMO.***

***Please document the benefits of the change and to delivery of the programme objectives***

|  |
| --- |
| What benefits does the change bring |
| This CR will ensure that the Transition and End State Design Artefacts accurately represent how LLF Data are published. The implementation of this change by MHHS anf Helix WP3 promises both process improvement and enhanced clarity.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Objective | Benefit to delivery of the programme objective |
| To deliver the Design Working Group’s Target Operating Model (TOM) covering the ‘Meter to Bank’ process for all Supplier Volume Allocation Settlement meters |       |
| To deliver services to support the revised Settlement Timetable in line with the Design Working Group’s recommendation |       |
| To implement all related Code changes identified under Ofgem’s Significant Code Review (SCR) |       |
| To implement MHHS in accordance with the MHHS Implementation Timetable |       |
| To deliver programme capabilities and outcomes to enable the realisation of benefits in compliance with Ofgem’s Full Business Case |       |
| To prove and provide a model for future such industry-led change programmes | Yes  |

**Guidance *– Please document the known programme parties and programme deliverables that may be impacted by the proposed change***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Impacted areas | Impacted items |
| Impacted Parties |      WP3, MHHS |
| Impacted Deliverables | The MHHS Design team must revise the requirements to eliminate any ambiguity and reissue the relevant MHHS Design Artefacts in the upcoming change releases. |
| Impacted Milestones | *<Ofgem’s MHHS Transition Timetable is linked above>* |

**Note *– Please refer to MHHS DEL174 Change Request Guidance for Programme Participants for information on how to score the initial assessment.***

|  |
| --- |
| Initial assessment |
| Necessity of change |  | Expected lead time |  |
| Rationale of change |  | Expected implementation window |  |
| Expected change impact |  |  |  |

**Guidance *– Please include a reference and link to any additional documentation which the change relates to.***

|  |
| --- |
| Change Request to be read in conjunction with: |
| **Title** | **Reference** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment

### Note – *This section will be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

### *All Impact Assessment responses will be considered public and non-confidential unless otherwise marked. If there are any specific elements of the response (e.g. costs) that are confidential, please mark the specific sections as confidential rather than the response as a whole. The MHHS Programme will publish all Impact Assessment responses and redact any confidential information as noted.*

**Guidance – Programme Participants are required to:**

**Respond with ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’, deleting as appropriate. If the respondent agrees, they can provide additional evidence to further support the assessment. If the respondent disagrees or abstains, they should provide a detailed rationale as to why.**

**Add any additional effects that have not already been identified. In doing so, they should provide as much detail as possible to allow a robust assessment to be made.**

**Proceed to Part C.2 for Impact Assessment Recommendation response once completed.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.1 – Summary of Impact Assessment (complete as appropriate) |
| **Effect on benefits***This CR will ensure that the Transition and End State Design Artefacts accurately represent how LLF Data are published. The implementation of this change by Helix WP3 promises both process improvement and enhanced clarity* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree**  |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on when a benefit will be realised; who will realise the benefit; the extent to which the benefit will be realised.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the benefit will be delayed by X weeks; the change means Y population will also realise the benefit.* |
| **Effect on consumers***Streamlined data access for industry participants.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree**  |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on service delivery to consumers; will there be a cost impact to consumers; will there be a choice impact to consumers?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. what is the scale of the effect? Will the effect be permanent?* |
| **Effect on schedule***The Helix WP3 team has reviewed this forthcoming change, and it is currently in the pipeline. Importantly, it will not impact any other schedules within WP3. Yet to get this impact assessed from different WPs.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree**  |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the schedule/milestones be directly impacted; will the schedule/milestones be indirectly impacted.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will delay the project by X days; the change will require additional resource to complete (though detail resource in resource section); the delay can/cannot be recovered by condensing Y activity.* |
| **Effect on costs** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.**Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will the change cause a loss of income; will the change cause additional cost; will the change cause a reprofiling of cost?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. whether it is capital or operating expenditure that will be affected; what period costs will be affected in; what the rough order of magnitude of the cost impact will be and if organisation will be able to absorb it?* |
| **Effect on resources** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will there be an impact on tools or equipment; will there be an impact on staff capacity; will there be an impact on staff skills or capability?* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will require X additional staff for Y period of time; the change requires Z training or support.* |
| **Effect on contract***Change Raiser to provide initial impact assessment.* |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. whether there will be an impact on contracts with sub-contractors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with vendors; whether there will be an impact on contracts with regulators/ESO.* *Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the changes will require new contracts to be created; the changes will variations to existing contracts; the changes will affect ability to meet contract requirements.* |
| **Risks**There is a risk that the LLF requirement, as outlined in various MHHS documents contain ambiguities that could lead to incorrect interpretations, thereby affecting industry stakeholders' ability to access LLF details.While the program faces no risks from not implementing this change, the change itself offers the prospect of process improvement and an opportunity to rectify MHHS design artefacts. |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection. Where possible, Impact Assessment respondents to identify and describe any further impacts.* *Impact Assessment respondents should consider and provide detail of any additional effect e.g. will existing risks be affected; will new risks be created?**Where possible, contextual information should be included e.g. the change will affect the likelihood of a risk occurring, the change will affect the impact the risk would have, the change will require additional controls and mitigation.* |

### Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation

### Note – *This section must be completed initially by the Change Raiser and then by Programme Participants as part of the full Impact Assessment.*

**Guidance – The primary reporting metric of the Impact Assessment is the recommendation response. The consolidated response will be presented to the relevant governance group(s) and decision maker(s) with the totals for ‘Agree’, ‘Disagree’ or ‘Abstain’. As such, please ensure this section is completed before the form is returned to MHHS PMO. Provide detailed rationale and evidence in the commentary field.**

|  |
| --- |
| Part C.2 – Impact Assessment Recommendation (mandatory) |
| **Recommendation***Change Raiser to provide initial recommendation.***It is recommended by the Change Raiser the change is approved.** |
| *<Delete as appropriate>:* **Agree Disagree Abstain** |
| *Impact Assessment respondents to add supporting commentary to support their selection.* |

**Impact assessment done by:** <Name>

**Guidance*: If you are a third party responding on behalf of another Programme Participant, please state this in your response.***

**Impact assessment completed on behalf of:** <Name>

### Part D – Change approval and decision

**Guidance*: The approvals section will be completed by the MHHS PMO once the Impact Assessment has been reviewed.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part D - Approvals |
| **Decision authority level**<Based on the impact assessment, state who is required to make a decision concerning this change> |

**Guidance** - ***This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO and Change Owner following the review of the impact assessment and decision reached by the SRO.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part D – Change decision |
| Decision: |       | Date |       |
| Approvers: |       |  |  |
| Change Owner: |       |
| Action: |       |
| **Changed Items** | **Pre-change version** | **Revised version** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Part E – Implementation completion

**Guidance *- This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process.***

|  |
| --- |
| Part E – Implementation completion |
| Comment |       | Date |       |

**Guidance *– The Closure Checklist in MHHS DEL175 Change Log must also be completed by MHHS PMO at this stage.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|      Checklist Completed | Completed by      |
| Yes/No |  |

**Guidance – *This section will be completed by the MHHS PMO at the end of the post-implementation process and should be* used to add any appropriate references of the change once it has been completed.**

|  |
| --- |
| References |
| **Ref** | **Document number** | **Description** |
|       |       |       |
|       |       |       |