

CP Assessment Report

CP1434 'Amend the three digit numeric Line Loss Factor Class (LLFC) Id to an alphanumeric LLFC Id'

ELEXON



Committee

Supplier Volume Allocation Group

Recommendation

To be determined

Implementation Date

30 June 2016 (June 2016 Release)



Contact

David Kemp

020 7380 4303

david.kemp@elexon.co.uk



Contents

1	Why Change?	2
2	Proposed Solution	4
3	Impacts and Costs	5
4	Implementation Approach	7
5	Potential Alternative Solutions	8
6	Initial Committee Views	11
7	Industry Views	12
8	Subsequent Committee Views	15
9	Recommendations	17
	Appendix 1: Glossary & References	18

About This Document

This document is the Change Proposal (CP) Assessment Report for CP1434 which ELEXON will present to the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) at its meeting on 2 June 2015. The SVG will consider the proposed solution and the responses received to our further Request for Information (RFI) before forming a view on whether CP1434 should be approved.

Due to the implementation costs exceeding the SVG's delegated authority, if the SVG wishes to approve CP1434, it will need to recommend its implementation to the BSC Panel. The Panel would then make the final decision at its meeting on 11 June 2015.

There are five parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, and proposed implementation approach. It also explains previous views on the proposed changes and the potential alternative solutions raised.
- Attachments A and B contain the proposed redlined changes to deliver CP1434.
- Attachment C contains the full responses received to the CP Consultation.
- Confidential Attachment D contains the responses to the original RFI.

The responses to the further RFI will be published and circulated to the SVG separately ahead of the meeting, as this consultation will not close until 29 May 2015.

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 1 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

1 Why Change?

What is a Line Loss Factor Class?

A Line Loss Factor Class (LLFC) Identifier (ID) is a three digit numeric code. Distribution System Operators (DSOs) use LLFCs to group particular customer types and voltage levels (low, high and extra-high) together for allocating Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charges. There are currently 999 LLFCs (excluding '0') available to each DSO.

What is the issue?

For any DSO that operates in more than one Grid Supply Point (GSP) Group, different LLFCs are also needed to identify its different charges in each area. Should a DSO operate in all 14 GSP Groups, 999 LLFCs (an average of 71 per area) may be insufficient to cover all combinations of network connections across all voltage levels.

Rapidly increasing extra-high voltage (EHV) generation customers, which are usually registered specific Line Loss Factors (LLFs) through a site-specific LLFC, has meant that the number of available LLFCs has been quickly reducing for some DSOs.

Many industry participants are currently developing a broad range of low carbon and smart grid innovations, including the smart metering roll out, which will potentially require significantly more LLFCs to identify additional charging and payment tariffs. The introduction of Third Party Access to unlicensed (private) distribution networks to offer customers competitive supply requires DSOs to facilitate provision of Metering Systems. This requires unique LLFCs to ring-fence such networks for market trading.

The current limitation of available LLFCs therefore needs to be resolved. The risk of not doing so means a temporary workaround solution will be needed until an enduring solution is in place. This may impose additional billing and administration costs on BSC Parties. If an enduring solution is not achieved, DSOs may have to seek long term workaround solutions, which will impose higher costs and inefficiencies as well as increase business risks.

What discussions have been held previously?

Two potential solutions to the issue were assessed by the [Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum \(DCMF\)](#) Methodologies Issue Group (MIG) in 2012. These two solutions were:

- **Integer solution:** Expand the number of digits in the LLFC ID to four or five, thereby increasing the total number of LLFCs per DSO to 9,999 or 99,999 respectively.
- **Alphanumeric solution:** Amend the LLFC ID to be a three digit alphanumeric ID (consisting of combinations of the digits 0-9 and the capital letters A-Z excluding I and O), thereby increasing the total number of LLFCs per DSO to 39,304.

The assessment concluded that the costs of the central system changes for the integer solution would be significantly more than for the alphanumeric solution. However, neither solution was progressed further at that time.

Previous consultations issued in 2009 and 2010 by the Electricity Networks Association and the Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) had also considered

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 2 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

this issue. These also included a third potential solution of allowing multiple distributor IDs (i.e. allow distributors to have multiple Market Participant Identifiers (MPIDs)) to increase the supply of LLFC IDs. No change was progressed as a result of these consultations. ELEXON subsequently wrote an information paper to the SVG on the topic in 2011 ([SVG121/06](#)).

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 3 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

Proposed solution

Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSEPD) raised [CP1434 'Amend the three digit numeric Line Loss Factor Class \(LLFC\) ID to an alphanumeric LLFC ID'](#) in February 2015, proposing to implement the alphanumeric solution put forward in 2012.

CP1434 proposes to amend the format of the LLFC ID from a three-digit integer value (INT(3) format) to a three-digit alphanumeric ID (CHAR(3) format). These IDs would consist of combinations of the digits 0-9 and the capital letters A-Z excluding I and O). It would therefore increase the total number of LLFCs per DSO to 39,304.

The Proposer believes that it is necessary to extend the current limit of 999 LLFCs to allow all market participants to trade in the electricity market without restriction. The electricity supply, generation and distribution markets are developing rapidly to facilitate greater innovation and competition, increasing access to new entrants. The Proposer therefore considers that increasing the number of LLFCs available would promote competition in supply and distribution.

Proposed redlining

The proposed changes to BSC Procedure (BSCP) 509 Appendix 1 'MDD Entity Change Request Forms' and BSCP509 Appendix 2 'MDD Change Request Entity Validation' to deliver the CP1434 solution can be found in Attachments A and B respectively.

3 Impacts and Costs

Central impacts and costs

CP1434 will require updates to the Supplier Volume Allocation Agent (SVAA) system, the Market Domain Data (MDD) database, the Non Half Hourly Data Aggregator (NHHDA) database and the 'Pool Application' of the Performance Assurance Reporting and Monitoring System (PARMS) as well as document updates.

Central Impacts	
Document Impacts	System Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none">BSCP509 Appendix 1BSCP509 Appendix 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SVAA systemMDD systemNHHDA'Pool Application' of PARMS

The total implementation cost will be approximately £200k. As this cost is above the SVG's delegated authority of £150k, as set out in its Terms of Reference, then should the SVG wish to approve the CP, it will need to recommend its implementation to the Panel. The Panel would then make the final decision. If the SVG elects to reject the CP, then it can do so without referring the matter to the Panel (assuming that its decision is unanimous).

Changes will also be required to the Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) to amend the J0147 'Line Loss Factor Class Id' data item, which is currently used in 15 DTC data flows. ELEXON would raise the necessary DTC CP if CP1434 was approved.

Participant impacts and costs

CP1434 will impact Suppliers and DSOs. This will include impacts on DSOs' and Suppliers' billing and registration systems to facilitate changes to the Meter Point Administration Number (MPAN) (but not the core 13-digit MPAN as this does not reference the LLFC) plus changes to validation systems. There will also be associated changes to documents and reporting requirements.

Party Agents, including Supplier Meter Registration Agents (SMRAs) and Unmetered Supplies Operators (UMSOs), will be impacted due to the changes to the J0147 data item. These will require system changes and amendments to associated documents.

Only a few respondents to the CP1434 CP Consultation provided indicative costs, which ranged up to £100k, but it was clear that the number of systems impacted would mean significant costs for participants.

Participant Impacts	
Participant	Impact
Suppliers	System changes will be required to implement the solution, along with changes to associated
Distribution System Operators	

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 5 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

Participant Impacts	
Participant	Impact
Data Aggregators	documents.
Data Collectors	
Meter Operator Agents	
Supplier Meter Registration Agents	
Unmetered Supplies Operators	

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 6 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

4 Implementation Approach

Recommended Implementation Date

CP1434 is proposed for implementation on **30 June 2016** as part of the June 2016 BSC Systems Release. The Proposer, who originally sought implementation on 1 April 2016 as a Standalone Release, supports this.

When would changes need to be made by?

[BSCP128 'Production, Submission, Audit and Approval of Line Loss Factors'](#) requires DSOs to undertake an audit of their LLFCs before the start of each BSC Year. The BSC Year commences on 1 April, and the LLF Audit commences six months prior to this, with DSOs' initial submissions needing to be with ELEXON by 30 September.

In order for a generic LLFC¹ to be included in the LLF Audit, it must be registered in MDD when the DSO sends its initial submissions to ELEXON on 30 September. Therefore, any changes to the LLFC ID structure must be in effect sufficiently in advance of this date to allow any new generic LLFCs to then be registered in MDD in time. In practice, this means that, to allow new generic LLFCs to be effective for a given BSC Year, any changes to the structure of LLFC IDs must be implemented no later than the June BSC Systems Release of the preceding BSC Year.

At this stage the earliest such Release that can be targeted is the June 2016 BSC Systems Release. This would make the new LLFCs available to use for generic LLFs from 1 April 2017 and for Metering System specific LLFs from June 2016.

Lead times for CP1434

The lead time for the central system changes is approximately seven months.

The DTC change to the J0147 data item will require 30 Working Days for impact assessment and no less than six months to implement, equating to eight months or longer in total.

Participants who responded to the CP1434 CP Consultation indicated a range of lead times up to around 12 months for them to implement their system changes. It is this lead time that is driving CP1434's cut-off decision date, meaning a decision is necessary by the end of June 2015 in order to implement CP1434 in the June 2016 Release should it be approved.

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 7 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

¹ Metering System specific LLFCs can be introduced as mid-year submissions.

5 Potential Alternative Solutions

During the progression of CP1434, some participants expressed support for longer integer LLFCs or extra distributor MPIDs over the proposed alphanumeric solution.

As it has been several years since these were originally considered by the industry (and since they were not assessed in detail at that time), we are seeking high-level information on the impacts, costs and lead time of each of these proposed options both centrally and from the wider industry. This will assist the SVG in making a decision on whether the CP1434 proposed solution is the most cost-effective solution to the issue.

The industry consultation will close on 29 May 2015. We will publish the responses received from industry participants on the [CP1434](#) page of our website on 1 June 2015, and will circulate these to SVG Members at the same time.

Longer integer LLFCs

Under this solution option, the LLFC ID would be extended to be a five-digit integer (INT(5) format), thereby increasing the total number of LLFCs per DSO to 99,999.

Central impacts and costs

The central impacts and costs of this solution are being assessed by ELEXON, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper. It is expected that the same documents and systems would be impacted as the CP1434 proposed solution.

As under the proposed solution, changes would also be required to the DTC to amend the J0147 data item, which is currently used in 15 DTC data flows.

Participant impacts and costs

Information on the participant impacts and costs are being sought, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper. It is anticipated these would be similar to that of the CP1434 proposed solution.

One respondent to the original CP1434 CP Consultation had noted that costs for them would be minimal as their systems are already set up to accommodate longer integer values. This would likely be the same for any other organisation whose systems have been set up in a similar fashion.

Lead times

The lead times for the central system changes and for participants are being assessed by ELEXON, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper. It is expected that these would be similar to that of the CP1434 proposed solution.

Multiple Market Participant Identifiers

This solution option would allow a DSO to register a second MPID when it runs out of LLFCs under its original MPID, thereby gaining a further set of 999 LLFCs. This would be similar to a Supplier registering multiple MPIDs. The DSO could repeat this as and when it runs out of LLFCs under the MPIDs it has already registered. There are a total of 456,976 MPIDs available, of which only 614 have been taken to date.

This option would have no impacts on the LLFC ID, which would remain unchanged as a three-digit integer, giving DSOs 999 LLFCs per MPID registered.

Central impacts and costs

The central impacts and costs of this solution are being assessed by ELEXON, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper.

Participant impacts and costs

Information on the participant impacts and costs are being sought, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper.

Potential consequential impact on the Distributor Short Code

While this option would not impact the format of the LLFC ID, it may have consequential impacts on the Distributor Short Code (DTC data item J1310 'Distributor Business Id') and how this is used. This Short Code is currently a two-digit integer, giving 100 available codes in total, of which 23 have been used (numbers 10-29 and 97-99).

Under the DTC the J1310 data item is only used in the D0269 'Market Domain Data Complete Set' and D0270 'Market Domain Data Incremental Set' data flows as an optional data item, and this code has no use under the BSC. However, unlike the LLFC ID, this code forms the first two digits of the core 13-digit MPAN and so may impact participants' systems.

Whether and how there will be an impact will depend on whether participant systems can allocate more than one MPID to a particular Short Code:

- If it is possible for all relevant participants' systems to allocate multiple MPIDs to a single Short Code then no changes to the DTC data item itself will be needed. However, this may cause issues elsewhere where multiple instances of the same LLFC ID via different MPIDs are mapped to the same Short Code with no reference to which MPID the LLFC originated from².
- If it is not possible for all relevant participants' systems to allocate multiple MPIDs to a single Short Code then it is likely that the available Short Codes would run out in time if enough DSOs were to register enough additional MPIDs, each with a unique Short Code. This may mean a change to this data item's format is required at a later date, such as more digits and/or inclusion of alphabetical characters.

² For example: A DSO registers two MPIDs 'ABCD' and 'BCDE' and maps both to the Short Code '51'. It then registers LLFC ID '123' under each MPID. For any databases that use only the Short Code and the LLFC ID, it may not be possible to ascertain which LLFC 123 is being referred to and hence which LLF values to use. This may also create duplicate LLFC/Short Code combinations in the relevant databases.

This will have consequential impacts on any system using the core 13-digit MPAN, as these MPANs would either be made longer or made alphanumeric.

Information is being sought from the relevant participants on this potential impact.

Lead times

The lead times for the central system changes and for participant are being assessed by ELEXON, and the results will be presented to the SVG when it considers this paper.

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 10 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

SVG's initial views

We first presented CP1434 to the SVG at its meeting on 3 March 2015 ([SVG169/06](#)), prior to the CP Consultation being issued.

The SVG had no initial comments at this stage and did not request additional questions to be asked in the CP Consultation.

7 Industry Views

This section summarises the responses received to the CP Consultation. You can find the full responses in Attachment C.

Summary of CP1434 CP Consultation Responses ³				
Question	Yes	No	Neutral/ No Comment	Other
Do you agree with the CP1434 proposed solution?	12	5	0	1
Do you agree that the draft redlining delivers the intent of CP1434?	12	4	1	0
Will CP1434 impact your organisation?	17	0	0	0
Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing CP1434?	17	0	0	0
Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach for CP1434?	9	8	0	1
Do you have any further comments on CP1434?	2	15	0	0

Comments on CP1434 and potential alternative solutions

Of the 17 respondents, 12 were in agreement that the alphanumeric solution proposed by CP1434 should be progressed. One respondent highlighted that the limit on the number of LLFCs limits Parties from implementing innovative solutions that would require more LLFCs, prevents Parties from growing and impacts DSOs' ability to operate in the market. Other respondents, though not directly impacted by the issue, recognised the need to implement a solution and so were supportive of CP1434.

The five respondents who disagreed with CP1434 did all agree that something needed to be done. However, they noted the high costs associated with CP1434 and believed further solution development and assessment was needed. Three respondents noted the option to expand the number of digits. One of these believed this to be the logical solution and noted that their systems were already set up to accommodate this. The other two believed this solution needed to be examined further in case costs would be lower.

This alternative solution had been assessed by the DCMF MIG in 2012, which had concluded that extending the numeric integer would be significantly more costly than amending to an alphanumeric solution, as some participants believed existing LLFC IDs would need leading zeroes to be introduced. In practice, an integer format field does not require leading zeroes. Despite this, some organisations may have chosen to store LLFCs as a fixed length field and therefore to add leading zeroes, although this can cause

³ One response included separate views from the organisation's Supplier and distribution businesses, with opposing views on the proposed solution and implementation approach. For these two questions, we counted the respondent twice, and so the total responses for these questions add up to 18, not 17.

validation issues when flows are sent. Nevertheless, it was for this reason that the Proposer chose to put forward the alphanumeric LLFCs solution under CP1434.

Comments on the alphanumeric format

One respondent had sought clarification on what currently happens with one- and two-digit LLFC IDs (LLFCs 1-99). Another had asked for clarification on whether CP1434 is mandating upper case characters only.

The Data Transfer Service (DTS) Handbook, which includes guidelines for what characters are available, allows character format fields to include spaces, special characters and both lowercase and uppercase characters, which is appropriate for items such as addresses. However, we believe that it is not appropriate to have LLFC IDs with spaces or lowercase characters as this could cause confusion. LLFC IDs will therefore be formed only of the digits 0-9 and the capital letters A-Z excluding I and O, and we have clarified the redlined text accordingly.

Other comments

One respondent suggested that a full impact assessment across all parties is needed. We note that this is the intent of the CP Consultation, which is issued to all Parties and Party Agents. We received a significant number of responses to the CP Consultation from a range of impacted roles, and so we do not see the need for further impact assessment of the CP1434 solution.

The respondent also suggested that there should be a review of the existing DUoS tariffs, with a view to rationalising them before undertaking changes to increase the number even further. Before raising CP1434, the Proposer had advised that DSOs have already carried out rationalisation and that the change is being driven by the significant number of enquiries into Third Party Access that will require a substantial number of new LLFC IDs.

One respondent suggested that other options other than amending the LLFC ID format should be looked at, which could include an assessment of whether site specific LLFCs are required, changing the charging methodology or even changing DSO systems.

Comments on the proposed redlining

We received three specific comments on the proposed redlined changes to BSCP509 Appendix 1, which were all clarifications to the text. We have included these amendments in the draft redlining in Attachment A. There were no comments on BSCP509 Appendix 2.

Comments on the CP1434 Proposed Redlining: BSCP509 Appendix 1		
Location	Comment	ELEXON's Response
MDD entity Id 63, valid MTC/LLFC/SSC/PC	Line Loss Factor Class Id is still referenced as Integer (3), this should be Character (3).	Amended.

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 13 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

Comments on the CP1434 Proposed Redlining: BSCP509 Appendix 1

Location	Comment	ELEXON's Response
MDD Entity Id 17 Line Loss Factor Class Id (page 15)	The data type/length description should say "3 alphanumeric characters". The valid values for this in brackets in the red line draft of "(0-999)" have been replaced with a valid data set of "(3)" which should be removed.	Amended.
MDD Entity Id 17 Examples (page 15)	The second example needs to be changed. It shows an LLFC Id of "0". A three character alpha numeric code would now be appropriate in this example.	Amended.

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 14 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

SVG's views

The SVG considered CP1434 and the responses received to the CP Consultation at its meeting on 28 April 2015 ([SVG171/05](#)).

The SVG noted the views of some respondents to the CP Consultation that alternative options to CP1434 had not been sufficiently considered, and felt more assessment was needed. In particular, respondents had flagged the option to expand the number of digits in the LLFC ID to a four or five digit integer form, with one respondent noting this would be cheaper for them to implement. SVG Members highlighted the high implementation cost associated with CP1434, and felt that more work was needed to confirm if this was the most cost-effective solution. It was at this point that one Member raised the further solution option of allowing DSOs to register multiple MPIDs.

However, an SVG Member commented that the Proposer of CP1434 was the only organisation to have taken any solution to this issue forward. They felt that the Proposer had put forward clear rationale as to why DSOs need a solution, and that doing nothing was not an option. The SVG noted that it needed to assess whether CP1434 would better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives when compared with the current baseline (i.e. with doing nothing).

The SVG noted that DSOs have been working to rationalise and re-use redundant LLFCs. However, one Member considered that DSOs could put in place pragmatic contingency workarounds to mitigate any risk in the short-term while the industry discussed the best long-term solution. For example, DSOs could allocate the same Metering System Specific LLFC to multiple Metering Systems, allocating them an LLFC that was 'about right'. Other Members highlighted that new sites are initially allocated a 'generic' LLFC until sufficient information can be gained to calculate suitable site-specific LLFCs, and observed that many Metering System specific LLFCs currently appear to use generic values.

A majority of Members were not convinced of the case for change or by the view that doing nothing was not an option. They commented that they had insufficient understanding of the risks posed by the issue, the consequences of DSOs running out of LLFCs and the timescales in which a solution needed to be put in place. They felt that this had not been sufficiently articulated under CP1434 for them to be able to make a decision on whether approving this solution was better than rejecting it.

The SVG, by a majority of eight to two, concluded that it needed further information on the following areas before it could make a decision on whether CP1434 should be approved:

- When will DSOs run out of LLFCs under the existing limit of 999 LLFCs per DSO?
- Why would DSOs run out of LLFCs?
- What would be the consequences of DSOs running out of LLFCs and could these impacts be mitigated in the short-term?
- Which of the solutions would be the most cost-effective way to address this issue?

SVG Members believed it would be beneficial to establish a CP Workgroup to answer these questions, accepting that this approach would rule out the possibility of implementing CP1434 in the June 2016 Release.

As the SVG's decision to defer was not unanimous, CP1434 was presented to the BSC Panel.

BSC Panel's views

The BSC Panel considered CP1434, the responses received to the CP Consultation and the SVG's conclusions at its meeting on 14 May 2015 ([Panel 239/08](#)).

The Panel noted a separate three Working Day RFI that ELEXON had issued to DSOs between the SVG meeting and the Panel meeting. This RFI had sought further information on the questions posed by the SVG, to assist the Panel in making its decision on CP1434. The information from this RFI had been collected on the basis that it would be seen only by the SVG and the Panel, and these responses can be found in Confidential Attachment D. Panel Members felt that the information that had been obtained from this was very useful and went a long way to answering the SVG's questions.

The Panel concluded that it would be more pragmatic to issue a public RFI to a wider audience for a longer duration, to seek further information on the SVG's questions. The SVG would then consider these responses at its next meeting. This would allow an informed decision to be made on CP1434 before it became too late to implement it in the June 2016 Release should it be approved.

Next steps

The lead time for the CP1434 solution is approximately 12 months. For this to be included in the June 2016 Release, so that DSOs can use the expanded set of LLFCs from 1 April 2017, a decision needs to be made by the end of June 2015.

The second RFI seeks answers to the questions posed by the SVG. These responses will be presented to the SVG at its meeting on 2 June 2015, where the SVG will form a view on whether or not CP1434 should be approved. Should the SVG be unable to make a unanimous decision or, due to the central implementation costs for CP1434, should the SVG wish to approve CP1434, the BSC Panel would then make the final decision at its meeting on 11 June 2015.

9 Recommendations

We invite you to:

- **NOTE** the responses to the Request for Information;
- **AGREE** that the Request for Information responses answer the questions raised by the SVG at SVG171;
- **AGREE** that the proposed changes to BSCP509 Appendix 1 (incorporating comments from the CP Consultation) and BSCP509 Appendix 2 deliver the intention of CP1434; and
- **DETERMINE** whether CP1434 should be approved or rejected (noting that, if in favour of approval or if not unanimous, the SVG will need to make a recommendation to the Panel for final decision at its meeting on 11 June 2015).

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 17 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

Appendix 1: Glossary & References

Acronyms

Acronyms used in this document are listed in the table below.

Acronyms	
Acronym	Definition
BSCP	Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure (<i>Code Subsidiary Document</i>)
CP	Change Proposal
DCMF	Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum
DCUSA	Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (<i>industry Code</i>)
DSO	Distribution System Operator (<i>BSC Party</i>)
DTC	Data Transfer Catalogue
DTS	Data Transfer Service
DUoS	Distribution Use of System (<i>charge</i>)
EHV	Extra-high voltage
GSP	Grid Supply Point
ID	Identifier
LLF	Line Loss Factor (<i>value</i>)
LLFC	Line Loss Factor Class
MDD	Market Domain Data (<i>database</i>)
MIG	Methodologies Issue Group
MPAN	Meter Point Administration Number
MPID	Market Participant Identifier
NHHDA	Non Half Hourly Data Aggregator (<i>Party Agent</i>)
PARMS	Performance Assurance Reporting and Monitoring System
RFI	Request for Information
SMRA	Supplier Meter Registration Agent (<i>Party Agent</i>)
SVAA	Supplier Volume Allocation Agent (<i>BSC Agent</i>)
SVG	Supplier Volume Allocation Group (<i>Panel Committee</i>)
UMSO	Unmetered Supplies Operator (<i>Party Agent</i>)

DTC data flows and data items

DTC data flows and data items referenced in this document are listed in the table below.

DTC Data Flows and Data Items	
Number	Name
D0269	Market Domain Data Complete Set
D0270	Market Domain Data Incremental Set

SVG172/04

CP1434

CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 18 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015

DTC Data Flows and Data Items	
Number	Name
J0147	Line Loss Factor Class Id
J1310	Distributor Business Id

External links

A summary of all hyperlinks used in this document are listed in the table below.

All external documents and URL links listed are correct as of the date of this document.

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
2	Distribution Charging Working Groups page on the Energy Networks Association website	http://www.energynetworks.org/electricity/regulation/distribution-charging/distribution-charging-working-groups.html
3	SVG121 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/svg-121
4, 8	CP1434 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1434/
7	BSCPs page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc-related-documents/related-documents/bscps/
11	SVG169 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/svg-169/
15	SVG171 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/svg-171/
16	Panel 239 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/bsc-panel-238/

SVG172/04

CP1434
CP Assessment Report

26 May 2015

Version 2.0

Page 19 of 19

© ELEXON Limited 2015