

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME BMRS User Group Meeting 8

Meeting number 2015/08

Date of meeting 04 June 2015

Classification Public

ATTENDEES

Zaahir Ghanty	ELEXON
Tomos Edwards	ELEXON
Stephen Thompson	ELEXON
Mahesh Gogtay	ELEXON (part of meeting)
Steve Wilkin	ELEXON (part of meeting)
Peter Frampton	Ofgem
Graham Bunt	EDF
Tom Bowcutt	Centrica
Paul Coates	RWE npower
James Smith	RWE npower
Paul Bradley	VPSL
Tony Osborne	DataGenic
Kowshik NS	DataGenic
Andy Howden	CGI
Aily Armour-Biggs	Utilidex
William Hulse	Cognizant
Michael Oprych	Innovex
Karen Sanders	Contigo

APOLOGIES

Nick Haines Good Energy

1. Introduction

1.1 The meeting was focussed on the following areas:

- BMRS Phase 2 Testing

HEADLINE REPORT

- ACER's Consultation on REMIT
- Actions Update
- AOB

2. BMRS Phase 2 Testing

- 2.1 Mahesh summarised the scope and key dates for Phase 2 of BMRS and walked through the Participant test document
- 2.2 The scope included the retrieval and verification of raw data, excluding physical data, by using API and Data Push. Zaahir noted that a table has been made available in the User Guide, which will clarify what data can be expected in the testing for Phases 2 and 3.
- 2.3 Mahesh indicated the dates available for testing. Participant testing will take place between 11-30 June with the exclusion 24 June due to scheduled stress testing. Dedicated support for participants will be provided on the 12, 25, 26, and 29 June.
- 2.4 Graham Bunt noted lessons learnt from REMIT testing, indicating that it has been delayed due to the lack of a dedicated market participant test environment. Furthermore, Graham said that the current testing model was appropriate for only a few days testing, while access to dedicated environment would be more appropriate for longer periods.
- 2.5 ELEXON confirmed that test environment for the new platform has been available since beginning of the year and CGI replied that the environment was offline for the previous 2 weeks due to Data Migration activities and this will be back up the following week.
- 2.6 Action: ELEXON to investigate whether a test environment can be made available on an enduring basis.
- 2.7 Mahesh asked users interested in participating in testing to send their contact details to the following email address releases@elexon.co.uk. The same email address can be used for queries that arise during testing. ELEXON are looking to get more participants involved in testing.
- 2.8 Zaahir stated that he has sent the API and Data Push User Guide to participants, however XSDs are still unavailable. These will be made available on the ELEXON Portal.
- 2.9 Action: ELEXON to make XSDs available on the Portal
- 2.10 Zaahir enquired how many participants intended to use the Data Push service following testing. EDF said that they would need to get an understanding within the context of REMIT Push and TIBCO first. The Data Push service may be an option to explore. Tony Osborne stated that DataGenic would be testing the service rigorously and may use Data Push in earnest depending on needed changes.
- 2.11 Tony also had asked whether the push feed would be available 24/7 and if it will mirror TIBCO. ELEXON replied yes to both, noting that the data will be in a different structure to TIBCO; i.e. XML. Finally, ELEXON informed that all data from July will be available in the API guide including data from March 2016. Zaahir noted that REMIT and Transparency data availability is not clear in the guide and confirmed that they are available in the data push from July.
- 2.12 Centrica would like a joined up test environment with National Grid and ENTSO-e. Also, Centrica need the platform to be available prior to testing. CGI replied that it was offline for the previous 2 weeks due to Data Migration activities and will be made available from the following week
- 2.13 Graham noted delays of around 8 minutes between submission of REMIT messages and receiving the acknowledgement notifications. This causes confusion about when parties can trade. Paul Coates noted that he has not been experiencing delays but was not going through MODIS and was using the Portal API to

HEADLINE REPORT

submit REMIT messages. It is possible that this is causing delays in submission. Tom also noted delayed responses for Centrica while using the MODIS platform. Centrica have made enquiries about this, although have not heard back on work being done yet. Zaahir highlighted that although the bottleneck appears to be with MODIS, it will be necessary to work with National Grid to confirm where the bottleneck lies on the end-end process.

- 2.14 Action: Zaahir to talk to Kam about the delays in the receipt of REMIT acknowledgement from the MODIS platform.

3. ACER Consultation

- 3.1 Steve Wilkin provided an introduction of the REMIT Common Schema Consultation Paper, encouraging a discussion with participants. The areas discussed were the proposed data fields, schema consultation questions, and the ACER's proposals for provision of a web feed.

Data Fields

- 3.2 The consultation included 3 schemas, with two that would be applicable to BMRS (a third concerning gas). It was noted also that a web feed is required legally.
- 3.3 Zaahir stated a preference for one schema with a provision to have other types of messages. For non-asset parties the 2nd schema is not needed.
- 3.4 Graham stated that it would be interesting for parties to gain a view of impact of ACER's proposal for ELEXON and National Grid. Zaahir noted that there will be a need to change some XSDs, ELEXON Portal, BMRS and MODIS depending on mandatory fields.
- 3.5 Tom suggested that it may be useful for parties for ELEXON to manipulate participants' data to comply with the schema. However, ELEXON stated that it would not be keen on modifying Parties' data because of liability issues and because it is Market Participant's data. Furthermore, Paul indicated that the common schema applies to all Market Participants if they use their own website as a contingency. Users will need to publish any fields included in the schema on their own websites according to Article 10. Participants agreed that they would need to talk to compliance to clarify this. [Post meeting note – ACER has published the 6th edition of REMIT Q&As, which appears to shed some light on this – ELEXON will review for interactions with this consultation and share thoughts.]
- 3.6 Therefore, the user group agreed that it was important to have a schema that was suitable for all concerned. Users asked whether a timescale has been proposed; currently there is not. ELEXON have already informed ACER of time constraints due to governance and will continue to do so. [Post meeting note – the REMIT Q&As now set out timelines for ACER data collection from platforms (7 October 2015) and Market Participant websites (7 April 2016). We haven't read far enough yet to tell whether they are proposing standardisation from those dates though and will oppose if they are.]
- 3.7 Users discussed responses to the consultation and how best to align ELEXON and parties' responses. It was agreed that ELEXON would respond, informing users of the draft response before it was sent. Parties will then respond in their own right, to support ELEXON's response if they wish and/or voicing their own concerns.
- 3.8 Action: Steve to share ELEXON's draft response with Participants.
- 3.9 Steve took the User Group through the data fields that ACER has proposed to be included in both schemas.
- 3.10 The following fields prompted little or no discussion:
- Message ID [1];
 - Update ID (ELEXON already comply) [2];

HEADLINE REPORT

- Event Status (ELEXON already have this – different values proposed by ACER) [3]. The ELEXON response will propose to ACER that the “Accepted Values” are defined so that their use is clear to Market Participants; or that they use the BMRS set!;
 - Message Type (accepted values are new) [4a];
 - Type of Event (new field for ELEXON) [5];
 - Event Start/Stop (End time is a better name than Stop – ZAG) [15 & 16];
 - Remarks (ELEXON equivalent - related info) [17]; and
 - Market Participant (new field for ELEXON) [19].
- 3.11 The Affected Asset field [6a] is a new field for ELEXON. The distinction between this and Asset ID is that it provides information in a free text format that is more intuitive and understandable i.e. participant name.
- 3.12 The EIC Code field [7a] was discussed by users, with the group agreeing that EIC codes need standardising in the GB electricity market. Furthermore, users would prefer the schema to include a field for BMU Id, as the data needs to be searchable by this.
- 3.13 The Fuel Type field [8] contains values that are different to those currently used by participants and overlook some distinctions. For instance, there is no distinction between CCGT and OCGT generators. Graham suggested proposing new accepted values for the whole of Europe. Alternately, there could be other fields within the schema where these distinctions could be captured, although free text is not ideal as it risks loss of standardisation.
- 3.14 Action: ELEXON to explore possibility of including additional fuel types (or providing a means of adding further detail in another field).
- 3.15 ELEXON noted that the Bidding Zone [9a] field is relative to Europe rather than the UK and is happy with this field.
- 3.16 Users had some queries regarding the Unavailable [10a], Available [11a], and Nominal [12a] fields. They were unsure whether this was duplicated on ETR. It was noted that these fields were complex and needed distinguishing. It was the understanding of the user group that Available = Nominal – Unavailable. Therefore, wanted to know whether all fields were necessary.
- 3.17 Action: ELEXON to seek clarification on Available, Unavailable and Nominal fields from ACER.
- 3.18 Users queried the need for two different times in the Published [13] and Decision Time [14] fields. They saw the Decision Time as a controversial parameter as it is not always identifiable when a decision is made. Users needed more clarity and guidance on the meaning of this parameter.
- 3.19 Action: ELEXON to seek clarification on Decision Time field.
- 3.20 ELEXON queried whether the BMRS (as a multi-use platform) had to cater for all Accepted Values codes in the ACER registration code [18] field or only some. It was the understanding of all that the accepted values included possible codes rather than mandatory codes.
- 3.21 Peter explained that the Carbon Permit [20] field was an optional field for parties that want to make it available to MAR. Zaahir asked whether this brings an obligation on ELEXON from MAR.

Schema Consultation Question (Box 1)

- 3.22 Users noted that that it was important to map across current data fields to the schema. This could be included in free text fields. Users also noted that BMU Id's are included in the schema; an optional Local Asset Id field was preferred to the use of a free text field in this case. Users reiterated the importance of this

HEADLINE REPORT

data field as it needs to be searchable by BMU Id. Paul noted that Germany use EIC Codes and their own local name on the EEX site.

- 3.23 Questions 2 and 3 had been covered in discussions on the Data Fields. ELEXON agreed to put in a response to the consultation to ACER based on this feedback.

Implementation of Web feed (Box 2)

- 3.24 ACER currently recommends that RSS and ATOM feeds are used for web feeds. ELEXON and the majority of participants objected to the nomination of a specific technology in the consultation. Stephen Thompson discussed the shortcomings and risks to BMRS should RSS be incorporated. Clients do not use RSS, RSS and ATOM are incompatible technologies, and RSS is not instant (every 20 minutes). ELEXON proposed a Push service rather than Pull, to which, Centrica supported. RWE did not support RSS technology due to the lack of authentication which could make the platform vulnerable to abuse, e.g. frequent polling of the platform
- 3.25 Action: ELEXON to write a strong opposition to RSS technology and recommend a Push service or use of authenticated web service to retrieve information.
- 3.26 Steve notified members of the ACER consultation deadline (11am UK time on 26 June).
- 3.27 Furthermore, users noted that the plan for implementation seems unclear at present would like clarification from ACER. ELEXON has notified ACER of the need for a modification and the timelines associated with this. [But see post-meeting note about timetable in the most recent REMIT Q&As published by ACER.]
- 3.28 Action: ELEXON to circulate the draft response of the consultation to Users.

4. Actions Update

- 4.1 Zaahir provided an Update on the transparency User Group. This included discussions on data downloads, data quality and improvement to the Web UI. The feedback was that the data downloads did not seem usable at this stage. Also, there are concerns about the documentation currently provided, ENTSO-e are currently reviewing data gaps and will be providing a RAG status.
- 4.2 Action: Zaahir to circulate ENTSO-e review on data gaps.
- 4.3 Other action updates informed users of improvements to the Electricity Data Summary page based on feedback from the previous User Group. Also, Steve will continue to update the user groups and monitor the impact of European Network Codes on BMUs.

5. AOB

- 5.1 The user group discussed the extension of the ELEXON Portal to include transparency messages. Zaahir has updated the ISG. Also, CGI are providing a formal impact assessment. ELEXON would like users to formally comment on the change.
- 5.2 Users asked ELEXON whether any Java would be used in the new BMRS pages. Zaahir told users that there would be no Java applets, however JavaScript would be included.

6. Actions Summary

- ELEXON to investigate whether a test environment can be made available on an enduring basis.
- ELEXON to make XSDs available on the Portal
- Zaahir to talk to Kam about the delays in the receipt of REMIT acknowledgement from the MODIS platform.
- Steve to share ELEXON's draft response with Participants.

HEADLINE REPORT

- ELEXON to explore possibility of including additional fuel types (or providing a means of adding further detail in another field).
- ELEXON to seek clarification on Available, Unavailable and Nominal fields from ACER.
- ELEXON to seek clarification on Decision Time field.
- ELEXON to write a strong opposition to RSS technology and recommend a Push service or use of authenticated web service to retrieve information.
- ELEXON to circulate the draft response of the consultation to Users.
- Zaahir to circulate ENTSO-e review on data gaps.