

ELEXON

**Code Change and Development Group:
Meeting 15**

Elexon

16 March 2021

Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

Meeting objectives:

- Conclude discussions on outstanding design actions from consultation responses (aside from those already agreed will be addressed in later deliverables)
- Agree what high-level key messages we want to feed back to respondents/industry, and how
- Gather volunteers for any offline working on Smart & Non-Smart straw man
- Note progress and agree next steps on transition straw man for Advanced market segment
- Note update from ongoing DCC/SEC discussions

Currently re-planning transition deliverable activities:

- Once joint CCDG/AWG subgroup concludes, can repurpose its Friday morning slot for transition offline working – do members still have capacity to support this?



SCR UPDATE



CONSULTATION RESPONSES: UPDATES ON DESIGN ACTIONS

MHHS Appointments Process – respondents’ concerns (1)

Follow-up with respondents established that issues with the core appointments process were largely about implementation

- D0155 process is well established for existing Suppliers who cover the majority of the market
- Allows for contract and service level information to be shared bilaterally without being made public
- Current process is clearly set out step-by-step in BSCPs; detailed design for new process still needed
- Respondents aren’t as wedded to the D0148 process; could be replaced by a Registration notification
- D0205 process is already used by Suppliers to update SMRS – the new process should build on this

General message is “if we were starting from scratch, the CCDG’s process makes sense, but we are not”. Given the greater impact of other elements of MHHS on Suppliers and Agents, respondents felt the appointments process isn’t fundamentally broken today and so it need not be on the critical path for implementation.

Conversely, for new participants, avoiding having to build for a legacy process is less wasteful. If new Registration interfaces are a sunk cost as part of the new target architecture, early adopters should be encouraged to use if from the start.

Is there a compromise where existing participants can use the D0155 for appointments for a transitional period alongside the new process for new entrants and those that would prefer to adopt it? How would such an implementation work?

If so, the D0155 could be retained as an optional (non-Settlement) bilateral notification and the BSC “appointment” process could be considered to begin with the notification of the service identifier into Registration, as the D0205 step achieves today.

MHHS Appointments Process – respondents' concerns (2)

Revisiting the proposal to add Contract Reference (J0048) into Registration Service data:

- Was proposed to allow discontinuation of the D0155 yet many existing users want to retain it anyway
- Not agreed yet how to incorporate Service Reference (J0274) and Service Level Reference (J0275)
- Contract Reference is CHAR(10) and Service Reference and Service Level Reference are CHAR(4)
- Existing J0048 has rules on when to use framework contract when a direct agent contract is in place
- A newly qualified service who wishes to use only the new process may not hold contract info in this way

If the item is introduced purely as a free text 'pass through' with no checks applied in SMRS, could it lead to an increased number of rejections or delayed acceptances for contractual reasons when all other registration data is correct?

In addition to the concerns on the 'core' process, other specific concerns related to:

- Change of Segment process adds complexity and the role of different actors needs to be better understood
- More clarity needed on proposal to split MOP role into MSA/MSS – could further complicate and will impact REC
- Governance of Direct Customer Contract; could be prone to exploitation and disincentivise timely maintenance
- How will the new process allow for erroneous appointments to be corrected once applied in Registration

These concerns are valid but should all be addressed in requirements as the detailed design and processes are developed.

Charging data requirements

Ofgem to provide verbal update at meeting

The issue:

- Holding MPAN & MSN in SMRS, with MPAN & GUID held in DCC SMI (Smart Metering Inventory) risks mismatches between MSN and GUID (should be unique GUID for each MSN).

Volunteer members met on Monday 8 March and clarified:

- MSN is not unique.
- Relationship MPAN-to-MSN-to-GUID is known at the point the meter is fitted.
- Relationships with other inventory (eg. APC) would require checking DCC SMI.

Recommendation to CCDG:

GUID should be added* to the Registration System alongside each MSN

*Note that there is a challenge to populate this for meters already installed.

The issue:

- Metering Service might want to know about physical connections to the meter.

Subgroup clarified:

- ALCS configuration can be queried by Supplier via the DCC but can't see if anything is physically connected.
- ALCS and HCALCS can be labelled, by the Supplier, using a defined list of text entries (SECAS website).
- There are up to 5 switches on a Smart meter (either ALCS or HCALCS).
- Supplier can populate the labels at meter installation or after the event.

CCDG choices:

1. Do nothing
2. Introduce a single Boolean flag indicating the presence of physical connections to the ALCS
3. Something more complex to identify up to 5 possible connections.

The recommendation is therefore to omit this data item from the Registration System because:

- It is unnecessary to investigate all connections to the meter; and
- There would be no real value in having a simple Boolean flag.

Summary of agreed approach:

- For legacy non-smart related Meters the energy associated with the Switched load TPR is defined by the Switched Load Indicator set out in the Valid Measurement Requirement Profile Class Table of MDD.
- For smart Meters that are either non-comms or opted out, we allocated the energy for the related heating load across the 48 Settlement Periods associated with the load shape.
- We agreed in terms of gaming it would be in the interest of customers with smart Meters to allow access to their HH data to achieve the off-peak benefits from their tariff.
- We noted that if communication issues are resolved in a timely manner then the HH data can still be submitted up until the RF Run.

Export Meters with Communications failures

We emailed the respondent (BULB) with the following information:

In your consultation response you commented on Question 6:

We agree that ensuring more export is registered will have most impact to reduce export usage going unsettled. However, in a scenario where the supplier loses communication with the meter, or cannot setup communication with the meter, some provision to still enter data would benefit Bulb. We'd welcome more information or detail on alternatives for the supplier in these situations

The current proposal is that where there is no evidence of Export then the missing data will be estimated as Zero. If a Meter reading can be obtained (e.g. customer read) such that a Meter Advance can be calculated across the missing period then the load shaping process would be used to allocate energy across the missing period. If comms are restored in a timely manner the actual HH data can replace the previous estimated data.

BULB have not come back for further clarification.

SMETS Version data item (1)

The DCC clarified changes to how SMETS releases are now versioned. We are not sure when this item was introduced to MDD or its purpose however it appears on numerous data flows:

- D0089
- D0091
- D0203
- D0204
- D0205
- D0213
- D0217
- D0260

Is it safest to retain this data item in MDD?

The screenshot displays the MRA (Master Registration Agreement Service Company) Data Transfer Catalogue. The page title is "Data Transfer Catalogue - Version: 13". The main content area shows details for the data item "SMETS Version" with the following information:

- Item Reference:** J1839
- Item Name:** SMETS Version
- Item Ownership:** MRA
- Item Description:** Indicates the Supplier's view of the SMETS version of a smart meter.
- Units:** None
- Valid Set:** As defined within Market Domain Data.
- Validation:** As Valid Set
- Domain:** Text
- Logical Format:** [CHAR(8)]
- Physical Length:** [8]

On the right side, under "Available Actions", there are several options:

- Download:** Download icon
- In Flows:** A dropdown menu showing D0089, D0091, D0203, and D0204.
- DTC Version:** 13 (View)
- Version:** 13 (Compare)
- Version:** 13 (Compare)

The left sidebar contains a "Data Transfer Catalogue" menu with the following items: Home, View Data Flows, View Data Items, View Domains, View Annex, MRASCo Model, Search DTC, Contact Us, and Legal.

SMETS Version data item (2)

MIF209 – Providing MPAS with SMETS Version data

MIF 209 highlighted that there was currently no agreed standard for SMETS version data stored in MPAS and validation rules around SMETS Versions and meter types were not clear.

IREG:

- Noted that the current J1839 (SMETS Version) and J0483 (Meter Type) Data Items were introduced or updated at a time when SMETS version information was deemed to be relevant to Registration processes
- Development of the smart metering programme and systems since the introduction of those Data Items may well make the communication of the exact SMETS version between MRA parties irrelevant beyond SMETS version 2
- The potential impact on Registration processes of future SMETS versions would need to be assessed once details of the versions and associated changes were available
- A decision would need to be taken at that time on whether or not any MRA processes would require subsequent changes.

We have been unable to find any record of more recent discussions, but our understanding from speaking to St Clements is that this data item is still being updated periodically but we are unsure of whether it is driving any business processes.

As a precautionary measure, we therefore propose that the valid set (NONE, SMETS1, SMETS2) is frozen and no new values are added, but that we do not remove the item until we understand the full impact on data flows and dependent processes.

Measurement Classes

The CCDG agreed to address the issue of Measurement Classes in transition:

- Need a way to record when an MPAN has migrated: Set MC to Null or better to set to 'X' or 'H' with EFD?
- PAF will flex/change as necessary to cater for TOM requirements.
- Outside CCDG, Ofgem to speak to RECCo about future governance of any BSC data items still needed for billing but not Settlement. Will be kept under BSC till end of transition.

Can the CCDG make a decision on the first bullet:

- Is it better to have an actual value to validate against in SMRS?
- Does an actual value aid tracking during transition?
- Does having a value mean the Measurement Classes still exist in the Target End State even if there is only a single valid value?

Elexon discussed the DCE calculations with the respondent:

- The respondent is now happy with the proposed calculation
- No changes to the approach have been identified
- The CCDG/ AWG subgroup still have to produce the Business Process Model for the Target End State
- A BPM for the current arrangements has been accessed from the original work group.

Consultation conclusions: Key messages for industry

What messaging do we want to feed back to respondents and wider industry? For example, the CCDG:

- Thanks everyone who took the time to provide views
- Is encouraged that the responses confirm its detailed design is consistent with the DWG's preferred TOM and that it has captured all major changes to Industry Codes
- Recognises that further detail will become clearer in its later transition and legal drafting consultations
- Recognises that its work so far / in isolation is not the complete picture for delivering Ofgem's Design & Development Principles, noting AWG's forthcoming consultation on reference architecture
- Recognises its omission of some data items which will be rectified in AWG consultation's master list
- Invites respondents to read the CCDG14 and CCDG15 Headline Reports for its detailed conclusions

What design areas need specific high-level messaging and what can just be addressed through links to the Headline Reports? E.g. appointments process.

For the DWG's consultations, we wrote a short article which we publicised in Newscast, put on the website homepage and DWG page and shared directly with respondents:

- Is this an appropriate approach here too?



SMART & NON-SMART
TRANSITION STRAW
MAN: REQUEST FOR
VOLUNTEERS



UPDATE ON ADVANCED TRANSITION STRAW MAN

Changes since v1.0: The explanatory document and the strawman spreadsheet have been revised following CCDG review and a follow-up meeting with volunteer members. The list of migration tasks has been expanded and comments added against some steps for clarification.

- The main change relates to the previously defined pre-migration CoMC steps, which are now shown as optional steps rather than a mandated CoMC activity.
- If early CoMC activity is desirable, further work will need to be done to understand impacts on Supplier billing systems for smaller non-domestic whole current Advanced customers currently billed using register readings.
- There was also a question of what benefits a two-stage migration process offered over a one-stage process.

Next steps: If the CCDG is happy with the latest version of the strawman, this will be baselined and stored until the equivalent strawmen for the other two segments have been agreed. These plus the overarching sequence showing how the various elements of the TOM will be implemented will be brought to a future meeting for approval to be issued for consultation.



DCC/SEC UPDATE



NEXT STEPS