



SPAA and DCUSA TRAS Request for Information

Proposed TRAS Programming Manual Updates

Executive Summary:

Since the Theft Risk Assessment Service (TRAS) was implemented, several issues with the programming manual have been identified and added to the TRAS issues log. The TRAS Expert Group (TEG) is seeking to understand the impact on SPAA and DCUSA Parties, should these changes be implemented.

These issues and the proposed solutions are therefore detailed in the attached Request for Information (RFI).

Parties are invited to submit responses using the attached proforma to Energy-TRAS@electralink.co.uk no later than **23 December 2016**.

Summary of Issue

Since the Theft Risk Assessment Service (TRAS) was implemented, several issues with the programming manual have been identified and added to the TRAS issues log. These issues and the proposed solutions are detailed below. Attachment 1 and 2 shows the suggested redline changes in the programming manual.

1. Consumption File: Annual Consumption:

The current wording of 'Annual Consumption' in the programming manual is ambiguous and could mean that suppliers populate this field differently which would distort the overall segmentation model.

In particular, the description sets out the guidance for population which does not reflect other industry practice. It is proposed that this guidance should be replaced with a reference to the rules for calculating annual consumption for inclusion within bills, which is contained within the 'Definitions' page of the Gas and Electricity Supply Licences.

Solution: Update the Annual Consumption field in the consumption file to:

- remove the sentence: *'The figures should be calculated for the account number provided (i.e. calculated over the time that person has been responsible for paying the bill at that address with this supplier)';*
- remove the bullet point: *'HH monthly consumption to be provided for the months where this information is available only'* and
- replace the bullet points specifying the rules for completion with a reference to the 'Definitions' page of the Gas and Electricity Supply Licence.

Questions 1 and 2 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the Annual Consumption description.

2. Outcome File: Tampering Report Source

The options and description for the Tampering Report Source in the programming manual are similar to the Theft Lead Source and it is not clear what this information is being used for.

Solution: The list should be updated to reference the Revenue Protection Officer, Meter Operator, Network Operator. The name Tampering Report Source should also be amended to reflect that this should be the person who confirmed the tamper i.e. Tamper Confirmation Source.

In addition, the name 'Theft Lead Source' should be changed to 'Theft Report Source'.

Questions 3 - 5 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the Tampering Report Source/Theft Lead Source description and names.

3. Consumption File: Meter Status RGMA codes

The RGMA Gas code for Meter Status data item in the Consumption File should reference A0037 (Asset Status Code) instead of A0077 (Meter Point Status Code).

Solution: Update this field to 'A0037' and update the list of permitted values to those referenced in the A0037 as set out below. It is noted that a change to the SPAA and DCUSA TRAS Schedule will also be required to reflect this change.

Values:

AC - Active
CA - Capped
CD – Closed
CL – Clamped
DM – Damaged
FA – Faulty
IN - Inactive
LI – Live
OP – Open
OT – Other not Codified
PD – Phone Line Down
UN - Unknown

Questions 6 and 7 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the RGMA Gas code for the Meter Status data item.

4. Consumption File: Meter Status

There is no need for an 'unknown' code for electricity as all meters will be either energised or not.

Solution: remove 'unknown' from the list of permitted values.

Questions 8 and 9 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the electricity permitted values for the Meter Status data item.

5. Outcome File: Descriptions for the permitted values for the 'Current Investigation Code'

The Gas Theft Investigation Incentive Scheme (GTIIS) Change Proposal is based on the submission of acceptable outcomes by Suppliers. The GTIIS working group noted the importance of consistency in the interpretation of the outcomes and the need to define the minimum requirements for each. For instance, if a supply point is reported as under investigation, the Supplier must at least initiate a desk top review or site visit. It is proposed that these requirements should be included in the programming manual and/or the SPAA and DCUSA TRAS Schedule regardless of whether the GTIIS CP is approved. This is to promote a consistent approach by Suppliers when selecting the codes within the Outcome Files they submit.

Additionally, a discard code should also be included to enable Suppliers to close a Qualified Outlier without initiating an investigation; however, as a minimum they must complete a desktop review.

Solution: Include the following definitions within the programming manual and/or the TRAS Schedules:

A - Not started – A TRAS generated Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced lead has been received by the Supplier but a review has not been initiated for a single Supply/Metering Point

B - Under investigation – An investigation into a TRAS generated Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced theft lead has been initiated, which at a minimum must include (but not be limited to) either the undertaking of a desk top review into Supply/Metering Point consumption data or the arrangement of a site visit in accordance with SPAA/DCUSA Theft Codes of Practice.

C - Confirmed theft – An investigation into a TRAS generated Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced lead has been completed in accordance to the SPAA/DCUSA definitions of Confirmed Theft.

U - Unproven suspicion of theft – An investigation into a TRAS generated Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced theft lead has been completed, which at a minimum must include (but not be limited to) the undertaking of a site visit.

N - No theft – An investigation into a TRAS generated Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced theft lead has been completed, which at a minimum must include (but not be limited to) the undertaking of a site visit.

L - No longer supplied – The Supply/Metering Point has either changed Supplier or a

Supply Point Withdrawal has been submitted for the Supply Point, since the Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced theft lead was generated.

D – Discard – The Supplier has chosen not to investigate the Qualified Outlier or non TRAS sourced theft lead, which at a minimum must include (but not be limited to) the completion of a desktop review.

Questions 10 - 13 seek industry views on the proposed descriptions of the Current Investigation Code permitted values.

6. Outcome File: Theft Report Source Reporting

The programming manual only allows one theft reporting source per outcome submission. However, in practice there may be several reports in relation to a single theft investigation e.g. there could be a TRAS Qualified Outlier, an ETTOS tip off and a report from a third party e.g. Gas Transporter. The TEG is seeking views on a consistent approach for providing outcomes across Suppliers. At the moment there is no clear direction on how to submit and this needs to be addressed.

Potential Solutions:

1. To have a maximum of 3 outcome rows per MPAN/MPRN – TRAS / ETTOS / 3rd party

This approach allows Suppliers to fulfil the TRAS / ETTOS obligations of providing the information to the TRAS Service Provider and also recognises any 3rd party work the Supplier has completed. The 3rd party options would be grouped so selection would be a single '3rd Party' option regardless of how many are received e.g. Third Party, Police would be classed as 1 outcome and the TEG would decide on the priority order for the selection of the other option for that data item.

2. To have a maximum of 1 outcome per MPAN/MPRN

The creation of Theft Report Source hierarchy selection where the 1st identified (ETTOS / 3rd Party) gets fed into the TRAS and then followed by the TRAS Outliers. If you have multiple sources, then if it is an ETTOS and a TRAS you only respond with the ETTOS information. The rationale for this is that outcomes which are from people/visits should be fed in above those of analytics. Currently the ETTOS text obligates parties to feed in all contacts so if the group chose this option the ETTOS text would also be impacted if the hierarchy sees anything prioritised above it.

3. To extend the field to allow multiple outcomes to be recorded.

This option would require changes to Supplier and TRAS systems; so was not favoured by the TEG.

Question 14 seeks industry views on the options for reporting multiple sources within the Outcome File.

7. Supply Address Data

In version 4.1 of the programming manual, a mismatch has been identified between the J codes provided for the submission of electricity address data and the RGMA codes provided for the submission of gas address data.

In addition, the TRAS Service Provider has confirmed that it can receive address data in any of the address data fields so it is not necessary for address field 1 to be mandatory.

Solution:

- RGMA Codes within the supply address block to be amended to reflect the J codes; and
- All address fields to be amended to conditional, based on the condition that at least the number, street and postcode are provided.

Questions 15 and 16 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the supply address conditionality and Gas RGMA codes.

8. Email Address Length

It has been proposed that the length of email address fields should be amended from 50 to 250 to prevent long email addresses from being truncated. This change was not implemented in version 4.1 of the programming manual due to concerns that this would require Suppliers to complete system changes to amend their TRAS data submissions. The TEG agreed to include a question within the RFI to understand whether Supplier's system would be impacted by this change.

Solution: Amend the field length for email addresses from 50 to 250 characters.

Note – *this change has not been included in attachments 1 and 2 due to the number of changes required to the start and end positions as the email field lengths are extended.*

Questions 17 and 18 seek industry views on the proposed changes to the email address length.

RFI Questions

<u>Number</u>	<u>Question</u>
1	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the annual consumption description? If not, please provide rationale.
2	How long would you require to implement the proposed changes to the annual consumption description?
3	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Tamper Report Source name and description? If not, please provide rationale.
4	How long would you require to implement the proposed changes to the Tamper Report Source description?
5	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Theft Lead Source name? If not, please provide rationale.
6	Do you agree that the RGMA Code for the Meter Status field should be amended from A0077 to A0037? If not, please provide rationale
7	How long would you require to implement the proposed changes to the RGMA Code for the Meter Status field?
8	Do you agree that the electricity permitted value of 'Unknown' for the Meter Status data item should be removed
9	How long would you require to implement the proposed change to remove the electricity permitted value of 'Unknown' for the Meter Status data item?
10	Do you agree with the proposed definitions of the permitted values for the current investigation codes? If not, please provide rationale.
11	Do you agree with the introduction of the new 'Discard' code? If not, please provide rationale.
12	Do you believe that these definitions should be included in the TRAS Schedule within the SPAA and DCUSA Codes?
13	How long would you require to implement the proposed definitions of the permitted values for the current investigation codes?
14	Please provide your views and rationale on the proposed solutions for reporting theft outcomes where there have been multiple sources.

15	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the supply address RGMA Codes? If not, please provide rationale.
16	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the address conditionality? If not, please provide rationale.
17	Do you agree with the proposed change to increase the length of the email address fields from 50 to 250 characters?
18	How long would you require to implement the proposed increase in the length of the email address fields from 50 to 250 characters?
19	Do you have any additional comments to make?

Respondent Requirements

Suppliers are invited to review attachment 1 and 2 and provide any comments on the proposed changes in the attached proforma.

Comments should be provided to Energy.TRAS@electralink.co.uk by close of business **Friday 23 December 2016**.

Information received through this RFI will be reviewed by the TEG at its next meeting and a change to the programming manual will be progressed where necessary.

Should you have any queries or questions, please contact Fungai Madzivadondo on 0207 432 3008, or via email at energy-tras@electralink.co.uk.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Response Form Including Proposed Changes to the Residential TRAS Programming Manual

Attachment 2 – Response Form Including Proposed Changes to the Commercial TRAS Programming Manual

Attachment 3 – Response Form