

MARKET CODE / OPERATIONAL CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL

Form
version 2.3

Change Proposal reference
(To be completed by the TP Sec.)

MCCP235

Version No.

D.3

PART A — SUBMISSION

A.1. GENERAL DETAILS

A.1.a. TITLE Peer Review Report

A.1.b. COMPANY CMA

Change Proposals must be authorised by the person designated by the signatory to the Market Code Framework / Accession Agreement

A.1.c. AUTHORISED SIGNATURE NAME Neil Cohen

A.1.d. CONTACT NAME Neil Cohen CONTACT EMAIL;
TEL/MOB. Neil.cohen@cmascotland.co.uk
0117 942 3272

A.1.e. ASSOCIATED
MCCP / OCCP

A.1.f. ASSOCIATED
DOCS.

A.1.g. PROPOSED
URGENCY NON-URGENT

A.1.h. REASONS FOR
URGENCY

The CMA CEO will review this information and make a decision as to whether to take this MCCP / OCCP forward as urgent as defined under Market Code Part 8.9.1

A.2. MCCP / OCCP DETAILS		
A.2.a. ISSUE OR DEFECT WHICH THIS MCCP / OCCP SEEKS TO ADDRESS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (b) and 8.8.1 (ii) (b)		
<p>As part of the annual review of Performance Measures for 2018/19, undertaken by the Technical Panel, a Performance Measures Working Group was established. One of the Working Group's objectives was to consider whether some form of peer review of LP performance should be established, as part of the ongoing review of performance.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Working Group was that a form of peer review would be beneficial, and this proposal identifies what changes are required for the Market Code and CSDs to give effect to the form of review that the Working Group has identified.</p>		
A.2.b. DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE MCCP / OCCP AND HOW IT MEETS THE MARKET CODE / OPERATIONAL CODE OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE MARKET DOCUMENTS Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (c) and 8.8.1 (ii) (c)		
General Description		
<p>The peer review should take the form of a Peer Review Report which takes the party specific summary information pertaining to Performance Measures that currently exists and to make this available to all Trading Parties, to support the ongoing performance review process.</p> <p>One additional item of information was also identified for this report; for the R10A and R10B performance statistics, a failure rate should be identified as being the number of meters for which a fail has been registered, as a percentage of the total number of (active) meters registered for WS SPIDs (and Pseudo WS SPIDs) associated to the LP in question, as at the time of the performance measures run date.</p> <p>The preferred approach to providing the Peer Review Report is to build on existing LVI functionality. Currently, all Trading Parties have access to the Market Level Report and the indicative requirements in this CP identify the establishment of an additional option for this report; to break the performance measure outcomes down by each LP, thereby delivering the requirement to display performance outcomes by LP, but with minimum change to existing functionality.</p>		
Principles and Objectives affected CMA Guidance Note GN009 may be referred to for assistance with this section		
PRINCIPLE	AFFECTED (Y/N)	DESCRIPTION
Proportionality	Y	Performance improvement will be enhanced, whilst the creation of the Peer Review Report is incremental against existing functionality.
Transparency	Y	Additional information on LP performance will be afforded by the Peer Review Report.
Simplicity, Cost-effectiveness, and Security	Y	The Peer Review Report builds on existing information and functionality.
Non-exclusivity	N	
Barriers to Entry	N	

Customer Contact	N	
Non-discrimination	Y	The Peer Review Report will facilitate good performance across all LPs.
Non-detrimental to SW Core Functions	N	
MC / OC OBJECTIVES	N	

A.2.c. IMPACT Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d), (f) and (g), and 8.8.1 (ii) (d) and (f)		
CONFIGURED ITEM	IMPACTED (Y/N)	DESCRIPTION
MC / OC	Y	See drafting below.
CSDs	Y	See CSD0302 drafting below.
Wholesale Services Agreements	N	
Licenses	N	
CMA Central Systems	Y	The LVI will need to be modified to create the Peer Review Report.
CMA business processes	N	
Trading Party systems	N	
Trading party business processes	N	

A.2.d. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT
Required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (ii) (d) and 8.8.1 (ii) (d)

The following definition should be added to Schedule 1 of the Market Code:

Peer Review Report	A report, as defined in CSD0302 (Standing Reports and Data Extracts).
--------------------	---

Section 6.2.7 of the Market Code should be modified as follows (red text):

6.2.7 The CMA shall ~~issue a Peer Review Report to Trading Parties, in accordance with CSD 0302 (Standing Reports and Data Extracts) and shall provide a report to the each TP on a quarterly basis setting out the extent to which Trading Parties are meeting or failing to meet the Performance Standards, such report to be prepared on a market level basis and shall not specifically identify individual Trading Parties summarising the Peer Review Report on a market level basis.~~

A new Section 5 should be added to CSD0302, as follows:

5. Peer Review Report

5.1. Introduction

The CMA shall provide the Trading Parties (TPs) with the Peer Review Report which contains information about the success and failure of each LP, in respect of each of the Performance Measures that relate to LPs (excluding R11), as defined in CSD0002 (Performance Measures).

5.2. Timetable and Distribution

The CMA shall provide the Peer Review Report via the LVI for each month, within 2 BDs after publication of the Performance Measures for that month. Each monthly report will be held and be available for three months via the LVI. The CMA shall also provide the above on a secure data storage area for Trading Parties, on request.

5.3. Extraction rules

Each Performance Measure is associated with either

- An LP; or
- SW.

Information is extracted for each Performance Measure in respect of each LP, except for the R11 Performance Measure, for the given month. The following Performance Measures are relevant;

- R1A/R1B – Partial Registrations

- R4A/R4B – New Connection Notifications
- R5A – Connection Notifications for Gap Sites or Connection Change of Use
- R9A/R9B/R9C/R9D/R9E – Late Meter Reads
- R10A/R10B – Missed Meter Reads

5.4. File Structure

Each Peer Review Report has the following filename: peerreview-<yyyy>-<q><mm>.xls. The first line is the header line; subsequent lines contain the detailed information. The report will be formatted to provide failure rates etc for all LPs for each Performance Measure. Options will be provided to allow for either months or quarters to be selected from a selected financial year.

5.5. Detailed Record Content

Field name	Explanation	Type	Notes
Date	Identifies the Financial Year, quarter and/or month for which the failures apply.	Date	yyyy-mm to yyyy-mm for a selected quarter. yyyy-mm for a selected month
Performance Measure	Relevant Measure	String	Rxxaa. Where xx is a number and aa is a letter.
Org Name	Name of the LP	Free text	
D4001 Org ID		varchar (6)	
Failures	Number of failed transactions (including missing transactions for the R9E), except for the R10 (where it is the number of failed meters)	integer	
Transactions	Total number of transactions relevant for the particular Performance Measure for the given month (including the missing transactions for the R9E), except for the R10A (where it is the number of active bi-annually read meters, associated with SPIDs registered to the relevant LP at the run date, excluding those with a status of PDISC or DERE) and the R10B (where it is the number of active monthly read meters, associated with SPIDs registered to the relevant LP at the run date, excluding those with a status of PDISC or DERE).	integer	
Rate	Failures, as a percentage of the Transactions.	Decimal (100,2)	

A.3. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS	
A.3.a. PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE OR LEAD TIME Timescale must not overlap with the period of consultation with the Commission and should take account of the impacts identified in Section A.2.c. Any quoted lead time should commence from date of Approval.	
March 2019	
A.3.b. ANY LIMITATIONS OR DEPENDENCIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION	
A.4. ANY OTHER COMMENTS	

PART B — TP ASSESSMENT			
B.1. ASSESSMENT PROCESS			
B.1.a. ASSESSMENT START DATE	2018-08-01	ASSESSMENT END DATE	2018-08-23
B.1.b. IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT	IA REQUIRED		
B.1.c. CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT	TP CONSULTATION NOT REQUIRED		
B.1.d. ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS (to this Part B)	Indicative URs.		
B.2. ASSESSMENT DETAILS			
B.2.a. CHANGE SPEC AND IMPACT (IF DIFFERENT FROM THAT ORIGINALLY SUBMITTED)			
B.2.b. CMA INTERNAL SYSTEMS IMPACT			
B.2.c. DRAFT LEGAL TEXT (if different from that originally submitted)			
B.2.d. TP ASSESSMENT Taking into account complexity, importance and urgency, and having regard to whether or not such proposal is within the relevant Objectives and Principles as required under Market Code Parts 8.7.1 (v) and 8.8.1 (iv)			

Impact on Principles and Objectives (if different from that originally submitted)	
Cost Estimate	CMA Cost Modelling suggests: £9k
Benefit Estimate (L: < 10k, M: £10k to £100k, H: > £100k)	Improved performance, leading to improvements in settlement accuracy and market churn, Assume: M/H.
B.3. TP DECISION	TP APPROVED
B.4. FINAL TP VIEWS	Unanimously approved at TP Meeting 23/8/18
B.5. PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION DATE	March 2019

WITHDRAWN BY PROPOSER?	No
COMMENTS	
DATE OF WITHDRAWAL	

PART C — COMMISSION APPROVAL

C.1. DATE FINAL REPORT ISSUED TO COMMISSION	2018-09-13
C.2. APPROVAL STATUS	APPROVED CHANGE
C.3. DATE OF APPROVAL STATUS	2018-09-24
C.4. COMMISSION RESPONSE REFERENCE	

PART D — IMPLEMENTATION

D.1. IMPLEMENTATION DATE	28 March 2019
D.2. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS (MC version, CSD versions, CMA Central Systems release number, etc.)	
CS v 5.3 MC v41 CSD0302 v12	