

CP1466 'Removing SMETS compliant Meters from the scope of BSCP601'

ELEXON



Contact

Paul Cave

020 7380 4003

Paul.Cave@elexon.co.uk



Contents

1	Why Change?	2
2	Solution	3
3	Impacts and Costs	5
4	Implementation Approach	6
5	Initial Committee Views	7
6	Industry Views	8
7	Final Committee Views and Decision	10
	Appendix 1: Glossary & References	14

About This Document

This document is the Final Change Proposal (CP) Report for CP1466 which ELEXON has published following the final decision from the Panel to approve CP1466.

The Assessment Report for CP1466 was presented to the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) and Imbalance Settlement Group (ISG) on 1 November 2016 and 22 November 2016 respectively. The SVG approved CP1466, however the ISG rejected CP1466. Section 4.4.1¹ of the SVG Terms of Reference (ToR) and the ISG ToR, states that if a matter is required to be voted upon by two (or more) Panel Committees, and those Committees have conflicting views, then the matter shall be reverted to the Panel for final decision.

There are four parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, and approved implementation approach. It also summarises the SVG's, ISG's and Panel's views on the proposed changes and the views of respondents to the CP Consultation, along with the final decision to approve this change.
- Attachment A contains the CP1466 proposal form.
- Attachment B contains the approved redlined changes to deliver the CP1466 solution.
- Attachment C contains the full responses received to the CP Consultation.

¹ [SVG Terms of Reference](#) / [ISG Terms of Reference](#), 4.4.1 'Notwithstanding paragraph 5.5, where a matter is required to be voted upon by two or more Panel Committees and those Panel Committees have a conflicting view when determining the matter then such delegated matter shall revert back to the Panel for final decision.'

CP1466

Final CP Report

15 December 2016

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 15

© ELEXON Limited 2016

1 Why Change?

Settlement Reform Advisory Group recommendations

The [Settlement Reform Advisory Group](#) (SRAG) identified a number of changes required to facilitate elective Half Hourly (HH) Settlement for Data Communications Company (DCC) enrolled smart Meters.

The SRAG presented its report to the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) Panel in February 2016 ([BSC Panel 249/13A](#)). The Panel noted that changes would be raised to progress the SRAG recommendations, including this CP.

What is the issue?

The SRAG recommended changes to [BSC Procedure \(BSCP\) 601 'Metering Protocol Approval and Compliance Testing'](#) to remove the requirement of protocol approval and Code of Practice (CoP) compliance testing, for Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (SMETS) compliant Metering Equipment. There are currently two versions of SMETS; [SMETS1](#) and [SMETS2](#). Suppliers are responsible for compliance testing with the SMETS.

Protocol approval

The method of communication with SMETS2 Meters will be via the DCC infrastructure, and will be common for all Meters serviced by the DCC Communication Service Providers (Arqiva and Telefonica). As such, the requirement for protocol approval for communication with SMETS2 Meters is redundant.

Currently the HH data from SMETS1 (foundation) Meters will be collected by Smart Metering System Operators (SMSO) on behalf of Suppliers, although it is anticipated that the DCC will enrol SMETS1 Meters in the future. The SRAG recommended that protocol approval requirements should also be removed for communication with SMETS1 Meters, to limit the barriers to elective HH Settlement for these Meters. In the CP1466 Assessment Report, ELEXON believed that removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters could pose a risk to Settlement, as it is possible that not all SMETS1 Meters will be enrolled in the DCC. However, it was clarified at the SVG meeting on 1 November 2016 ([SVG189/05](#)), that protocol approval requirements apply to Half Hourly Data Collectors (HHDCs). However, in the case of SMETS1 Meters, HHDCs will not be reading the Meters. Therefore, the current protocol approval process in BSCP601 is not applicable for SMETS1 Meters and provides no assurance.

Compliance testing

At present, smart Metering Equipment must be compliance tested twice: under the SMETS and under BSCP601. CoP compliance testing under BSCP601 is only required for Meters settled on a HH basis. Therefore, CoP compliance testing for SMETS Metering Equipment could be a potential barrier to moving Meters to HH Settlement.



What was the SRAG?

The SRAG was a group established by the BSC Panel to help develop solutions to address small scale Settlement issues related to the balancing arrangements. At BSC Panel 249 the SRAG was stood down.



SMETS1 vs SMETS2

SMETS1 is the minimum standard a foundation smart Meter must meet to be eligible for adoption by the DCC. SMETS2 Meters are enrolled in the DCC from installation. The main difference between SMETS1 and SMETS2 Meters is the security model they use and their communication method.



Protocol approval

Applicants who wish to collect data from an Outstation must demonstrate that their Installation can communicate appropriately using the device's protocol. A protocol, in the context of an Outstation, is the set of rules governing the communication of data between the Outstation and any other device connected to it. It is usually designed by the manufacturer of the Outstation.

CP1466

Final CP Report

15 December 2016

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 15

© ELEXON Limited 2016

Approved solution

[CP1466 'Removing SMETS compliant Meters from the scope of BSCP601'](#) was raised by ELEXON on 18 May 2016.

This CP will include a statement in BSCP601 Section 1.1 'Scope and Purpose of the Procedure' to specify that the BSCP does not apply to SMETS compliant Metering Equipment. Excluding SMETS compliant Metering Equipment from the scope of BSCP601 removes protocol approval for communication with SMETS compliant Metering Equipment and the requirement of CoP compliance testing such Metering Equipment. For the avoidance of doubt, this only removes the compliance testing requirements; it does not remove the requirement for this Metering Equipment to be CoP compliant. By removing SMETS compliant Metering Equipment from the scope of BSCP601, any Metering Equipment that complies with a future version of SMETS will also be exempt from protocol approval and CoP compliance testing.²

The statement referring to SMETS in BSCP601 Section 3.4.22 'Level 1 Passwords' introduced by [CP1450 'Security Requirements for CoP10 Metering Equipment'](#) is also removed as part of CP1466. As the requirement for compliance testing is removed, the exception in relation to the SMETS security arrangements is no longer relevant.

Proposer's rationale

Suppliers are having Meters built that comply with the SMETS and Ofgem is seeking to remove barriers to elective HH Settlement; as set out in Ofgem's ['Elective half-hourly Settlement: conclusions paper'](#).

Protocol approval will not be required for SMETS compliant Meters because the method of communication with the Meter will be common for all SMETS Meters serviced by the DCC Communication Service Providers. Ofgem is also seeking to remove barriers to elective HH Settlement for SMETS1 Meters. Therefore it was proposed that protocol approval for communication with SMETS1 Meters is also removed. A further rationale to remove protocol approval from SMETS Meters was discussed at the SVG (SVG189/05). The SVG noted that protocol approval is a redundant process for SMETS Meters, as HHDCs will not be collecting readings from them. Therefore, protocol approval for SMETS Meters can be removed with minimal risk to Settlement.

Removing CoP compliance testing for Metering Equipment compliant with the SMETS, removes the need for multiple compliance tests and a potential barrier to elective HH Settlement. Compliance with the SMETS mitigates the risk of removing CoP compliance testing.

Approved redlining

Attachment B contains the approved changes to BSCP601 to deliver CP1466.

The consulted redlining included a Housekeeping Change. The intention of the Housekeeping Change was to reflect the changes to the CoPs introduced by [P266](#)

² The requirements for future versions of SMETS may require reconsideration of testing requirements for Settlement purposes e.g. if a SMETS version with Meter variants using Current Transformer was introduced.

[‘Improving the allocation of Reactive Power flows between Import and Export Metering Systems’](#). However, ELEXON has since identified that the Housekeeping Change may be material and an improved solution has been proposed. Therefore, we have withdrawn the Housekeeping Change from the CP1466 redlining.

3 Impacts and Costs

Central impacts and costs

CP1466 requires a change to BSCP601. No central system changes are required and there will be no impact on BSC Agents.

Central Impacts	
Document Impacts	System Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none">BSCP601	<i>None</i>

The central implementation costs for CP1466 will be approximately £240 (one ELEXON Working Day) to implement the document changes.

BSC Party & Party Agent impacts and costs

Participant impacts

The changes to BSCP601 are document changes only. There is no anticipated impact on Suppliers, however there may be a small impact on HHDCs.

Suppliers are already required to ensure smart Metering Equipment meets the SMETS requirements. For this reason, the change does not impose any additional costs or impacts on Suppliers.

HHDCs will need to communicate with the Supplier to determine if a Meter is SMETS compliant. If a Meter is not SMETS compliant, the HHDC will need to carry out protocol approval.

In response to the CP Consultation, four of the eight respondents indicated that they would not be impacted by CP1466. The other four respondents indicated that CP1466 would impact them. Of these respondents:

- one respondent noted only small procedural impacts;
- one respondent noted that if a Meter was not SMETS compliant, protocol approval is required; and
- two respondents noted that they would need to introduce a process to identify if a Meter is SMETS compliant.

BSC Party & Party Agent Impacts	
BSC Party/Party Agent	Impact
HHDC	Additional communication required to determine if a Meter is SMETS compliant.

Participant costs

Four of the eight respondents to the CP Consultation confirmed that they would incur no costs in implementing CP1466. The four other respondents noted that they would only incur small costs.

4 Implementation Approach

Approved Implementation Date

CP1466 is approved for implementation on **23 February 2017** as part of the February 2017 BSC Systems Release.

This Implementation Date meets the expectations of Ofgem on the progression of changes relating to elective HH Settlement, as set out in Ofgem's ['Elective half-hourly Settlement: conclusions paper'](#).

As part of the CP Consultation, seven of the eight respondents agreed with the Implementation Date. One respondent noted that it did not support the implementation approach, on the basis of disagreement with the proposed solution – see Section 6 for further explanation.

SVG's initial views

The SVG considered CP1466 at its meeting on 2 August 2016 ([SVG186/05](#)).

An SVG member queried why ELEXON are trying to facilitate elective HH Settlement prior to the DCC Go-live and how CP1466 will help facilitate elective HH Settlement. ELEXON indicated that there are a number of SMETS1 Meters already in place and removing the requirement of CoP compliance testing removes a barrier to elective HH Settlement. Furthermore, ELEXON noted that protocol approval is not required for SMETS Meters that will be adopted by the DCC.

ISG's initial views

The ISG considered CP1466 at its meeting on 23 August 2016 ([ISG184/04](#)).

An ISG member had concerns whether this change should apply to SMETS1 Meters. The ISG member noted that while the CP is appropriate for a DCC enrolled Meters, the change should not apply to SMETS1 Meters until they are adopted by the DCC.

An ISG member queried how protocol approval and compliance testing was a barrier to elective HH Settlement, and how CP1466 would remove this barrier. ELEXON noted that at present smart Meters must be CoP compliance tested under BSCP601, in addition to the SMETS. ELEXON noted that the Meters in scope of this change will be compliant with either SMETS1 or SMETS2, so compliance testing with the BSC is a duplication in effort of SMETS compliance testing. Therefore, this change will avoid the need for multiple compliance tests.

ELEXON noted that there is a risk that SMETS1 Meters may not be adopted by the DCC, therefore the removal of protocol approval for these Meters could be seen as a risk. However, it was clarified at the SVG ([SVG189/05](#)), that protocol approval requirements apply to HHDCs. However, in the case of SMETS1 Meters, HHDCs will not be reading the Meters. Therefore, protocol approval for SMETS Meters can be removed as a redundant process.

6 Industry Views

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

Summary of CP1466 CP Consultation Responses				
Question	Yes	No	Neutral/ No Comment	Other
Do you agree with the CP1466 proposed solution?	7	1	0	0
Do you agree that the draft redlining delivers the intent of CP1466?	8	0	0	0
Will CP1466 impact your organisation?	4	4	0	0
Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing CP1466?	4	4	0	0
Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach for CP1466?	7	1	0	0
Do you have any further comments on CP1466?	1	7	0	0

Comments on the CP

Proposed solution

Seven of the eight respondents to the CP Consultation agreed with the proposed solution. Two of these respondents noted that this would remove the duplication of compliance testing. One respondent noted that the solution supported the proposer's justification.

One respondent did not agree with the proposed solution. They agreed with removing compliance testing for SMETS1 and SMETS2 Meters and removing protocol approval for SMETS2 Meters. However, the respondent did not agree with removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters. They noted that the rationale for removing protocol approval for SMETS Meters is the Meters have a common communication method, i.e. via the DCC. However, the respondent believed that this rationale was not true for removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters. They noted that the DCC will eventually service SMETS1 Meters, but believed this would not be imminent. The respondent believed that the scope of protocol approval should include SMETS1 Meters while data-retrieval systems, apart from the DCC, service SMETS1 Meters. The respondent believed that removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters introduces a risk that data-retrievers do not ensure their systems can remotely connect to SMETS Meters.

The respondent suggested removing compliance testing for SMETS1 and SMETS2 Meters, and only removing protocol approval for SMETS2 Meters. They believed that data-retrievers should still be subject to protocol approval for any system they use to remotely connect to Meters (not through the DCC) – whether SMETS or not. The respondent noted that once the DCC has integrated SMETS1 Meters, a further change could be raised to remove protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters.

ELEXON noted in the CP1466 Assessment Report that removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters poses a small risk to Settlement. This is because the market share for SMETS1 Meters is relatively low. Therefore, the materiality of any risk is limited. However,

it was clarified at the SVG ([SVG189/05](#)), that protocol approval requirements apply to HHDCs. However, in the case of SMETS1 Meters, HHDCs will not be reading the Meters. Therefore, protocol approval for SMETS Meters can be removed as a redundant process.

Identifying a SMETS Meter

One respondent questioned how HH Agents will ascertain if a Metering Equipment type is SMETS compliant. ELEXON notes that the Smart Energy Code (SEC) has a [Certified Products List](#) on their website which should fulfil this purpose.

Comments on the proposed redlining

All eight respondents agreed with the proposed redlining.

The SVG considered CP1466 at its meeting on 1 November 2016 ([SVG189/05](#)).

Removing Protocol Approval for SMETS1 Meters

ELEXON noted that the removal of protocol approval for SMETS1 compliant Meters could pose a low risk to Settlement. SVG challenged this assumption on the basis that there are 1.5 to 2 million SMETS1 Meters installed so the risk could be high. ELEXON noted that protocol approval is only applicable to HH Metering Systems and so removing protocol approval would only affect smart Meters that are settled HH. An SVG Member estimated that the number of smart Meters settled HH is around 50,000 Metering Systems.

Although the SVG initially asked for further clarity on potential numbers, it recognised that HHDCs will not be retrieving HH readings directly from SMETS1 Meters. Instead, Suppliers will obtain the readings using the services of an SMSO. The five SMSOs currently providing this service are all retrieving Non Half Hourly (NHH) readings from 1.5 to 2 million SMETS1 Meters using the relevant protocols. Retrieving HH data from these Meters should pose minimal additional risk because SMETS1 Meters are not subject to the same complexities as the HH Metering Equipment for the larger sites, i.e. the sites for which protocol approval was designed.

An SVG member also raised concerns about interoperability for SMETS1 Meters, but the SVG acknowledged that these were existing issues, relating to communication methods and commercial challenges, and that protocol approval would not help to resolve them.

The SVG agreed with this explanation, and noted that protocol approval is not necessary for SMETS Meters. An SVG Member noted that the issue and rationale for the change was not clearly presented in the CP1466 Assessment Report. ELEXON noted it will improve the clarity of the paper for the Final CP Report.

Removing SMETS2 Meters from the scope of BSCP601

An SVG Member raised a concern about the timing of the CP given delays to the DCC Go-Live date and asked whether the CP implementation date should be deferred or linked to the DCC Go-Live. ELEXON noted that Ofgem's aspiration is to remove barriers to elective HH Settlement in the shorter term. By the proposed implementation of June 2017, any prospective Metering Systems for elective HH Settlement are likely to have SMETS1 rather than SMETS2 Meters. So the shorter-term driver for change is removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters. As such implementation of CP1466 is not contingent on the installation of SMETS2 Meters. These are likely to be installed from early 2017.

Final decision

The SVG:

- **AGREED** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSC Procedure (BSCP) 601 for CP1466 following the CP Consultation;
- **APPROVED** the proposed changes to BSCP601 for CP1466;

- **APPROVED** CP1466 for implementation on 23 February 2017 as part of the February 2017 BSC Systems Release; and
- **NOTED** that CP1466 would also be presented to the ISG on 22 November 2016 for decision.

ISG's final views

The ISG considered CP1466 at its meeting on 22 November 2016 ([ISG187/01](#)).

The ISG agreed with removing CoP compliance testing for SMETS1 and SMETS2 Meters. The ISG also agreed with removing protocol approval for SMETS2 Meters, as they will be serviced by the DCC. However, most ISG Members had concerns with removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters, and there being no alternative processes for SMETS1 Meters that provide assurance.

An ISG Member questioned how it is known that protocol approval is not needed for SMETS1 Meters. ELEXON responded that CP1469 'Changes to support the implementation of the SRAG's recommendations' will introduce new processes for SMETS Meters. CP1469 creates processes for the Supplier to collect Meter readings, and pass these to the HHDC. Therefore, protocol approval for a HHDC with a SMETS Meter is not necessary, as it will not be collecting data from the Meter. ELEXON noted that the SVG approved CP1469 on 4 October 2016 and it will be implemented on 29 June 2017.

An ISG Member questioned if there is assurance that a party can read a SMETS1 Meter, if the requirement of protocol approval is removed. ELEXON noted that a Supplier may not always be able to read a SMETS1 Meter via its SMSO, and if this occurs they have a few options. Either they replace the Meter with one they can remotely read, move the customer to NHH Settlement using the new CoMC processes defined in [CP1474 'Updating the CoMC processes to facilitate the elective HH Settlement of SMETS Meters'](#), or fix any communications issues that prevent the Meter from being read.

An ISG Member believed that protocol approval removes a barrier to HH Settlement. The ISG Member added that protocol approved provides assurance to the Supplier that when acquiring or wanting to service a SMETS1 Meter, there is communications. ELEXON responded that the Meter manufacturer's protocol could be used to extract HH data from the Meter but there is no obligation on the Meter manufacturer to apply for protocol approval. ELEXON noted that Suppliers are currently collecting HH data from SMETS Meters without having an approved protocol. An ISG Member noted that Suppliers would be deterred if they had to buy expensive software to read a SMETS1 Meter remotely. The ISG Member also noted that it would reflect poorly on the Supplier if they couldn't read SMETS1 Meters remotely. The ISG Member believed that by removing the requirement of protocol approval, it removes the option for another Supplier to read the Meter, creating a barrier to elective HH Settlement. ELEXON questioned if this situation differed to a SMETS1 Meter being read NHH, where the Supplier will still be using whatever protocol they have to read the Meter remotely. ELEXON noted that on change of Supplier, the new Supplier would still require a protocol to read the Meter, regardless of whether it's taking NHH or HH reads.

An ISG Member noted that if CP1466 removes the requirement for protocol approval by the HHDC, it is not clear if there is an equivalent process being added, e.g. that might apply to another BSC Party or Party Agent. ELEXON clarified that protocol approval for SMETS Meters is being removed because, in accordance with CP1469, HHDCs won't collect reads from SMETS Meters. Therefore, protocol approval for SMETS Meters is being

removed as a redundant process as HHDCs will not be reading SMETS1 Meters. SMETS Meters will be read by either an SMSO or the DCC, which are not BSC Parties or Party Agents. Therefore, as it stands, the BSC cannot put obligations for protocol approval on non-BSC parties. The ISG Member noted that if this is the case, the Supplier should require protocol approval. ELEXON responded that it would be down to the Supplier to manage its data-retrievers.

Six ISG Members raised objections to CP1466 for the following reasons:

- removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters poses a potential risk to Settlement;
- the rationale states that protocol approval is not needed for SMETS2 Meters as the method of communication is common for all SMETS2 Meters serviced by the DCC. However, the rationale was not clear regarding SMETS1 Meters that are not serviced by the DCC; and
- There are too many reservations to not refer this to the Panel.

One ISG Member abstained from the vote.

Final decision

The ISG has:

- **REJECTED** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSC Procedure (BSCP) 601 for CP1466 following the CP Consultation;
- **REJECTED** the proposed changes to BSCP601 for CP1466;
- **REJECTED** CP1466 for implementation on 23 February 2017 as part of the February 2017 BSC Systems Release; and
- **NOTED** that CP1466 was approved by the SVG on 1 November 2016.

Panel's final views

The Panel considered CP1466 at its meeting on 8 December 2016 ([261/09](#)).

CP1466 was presented to the SVG and the ISG for decision, as they jointly own the impacted BSCP601. The SVG approved CP1466 on 1 November 2016 ([SVG189/05](#)); however the ISG rejected CP1466 on 22 November 2016 ([ISG187/01](#)). As outlined in the Committee's Terms of Reference, when the decision is split across Committees, the decision is reverted to the Panel.

A Panel Member expressed frustration that CP1474 was brought to the Panel for decision. They noted that the Committees only disagreed on removing protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters. ELEXON and another Panel Member explained that the CP will remove protocol approval as a redundant process. The ISG do not want to remove this process until there is another in place that will provide assurance. However, the SVG's view is that the process should be removed, and a Party could raise a CP to put a new process in place to provide assurance if they wished.

A Panel Member noted that they also sit on the ISG, and stated that the ISG issue was that SMETS1 Meters had not yet been adopted by the DCC. The ISG was concerned that if

protocol approval for SMETS1 Meters was removed, Settlement could be affected. Another Panel Member noted that Settlement data will not change as a result of removing this from BSCP601 and in any case the data was not material.

Ofgem noted that removing SMETS Meters from the scope of BSCP601 is part of a package of recommendations from the SRAG. Ofgem and ELEXON noted that the BSCP is for HH Metering Systems, which were historically larger sites serviced by a HHDC. ELEXON noted that leaving SMETS1 Meters in the scope of BSCP601 would not address the ISG's concerns. This is because readings from SMETS1 Meters are taken by SMSOs, as opposed to HHDCs. BSCP601 only places obligations on HHDCs; therefore keeping SMETS1 Meters within the scope of BSCP601 provides no assurance. This could only be addressed if a BSC Party raised a subsequent change.

A Panel Member noted that it appeared the ISG had misunderstood the intention of the CP. The Panel Member asked if any action was being taken to address the issue that the ISG had identified.

ELEXON explained that a consultation by the DCC on its adoption of SMETS1 Meters was ongoing; it noted that it currently does not believe that this is an issue and is awaiting feedback from industry.

A Panel Member noted that ELEXON will be unable to enforce obligations on SMSOs, as they are not BSC Parties. Therefore it may be outside the remit of ELEXON or the BSC Panel.

Another Panel Member sought assurance from ELEXON that the changes to BSCP601 would not affect Settlement. ELEXON clarified that the metered data would be validated against a maximum permissible energy limit per half hour to prevent large erroneous values entering Settlement.

A Panel Member asked if SMSOs would be obliged to comply with the DCC regulations. ELEXON noted that this is currently not clear. Another Panel Member noted that several independent Suppliers are concerned about the various issues around the DCC and they have formed a Working Group to discuss this.

Final decision

The Panel has:

- **NOTED** that the SVG approved CP1466 on 1 November 2016, but the ISG rejected CP1466 on 22 November 2016;
- **APPROVED** CP1466 for implementation on 23 February 2017 as part of the February 2017 BSC Systems Release;
- **AGREED** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSCP601 for CP1466 made following the CP Consultation; and
- **APPROVED** the proposed changes to BSCP601 for CP1466.

Appendix 1: Glossary & References

Acronyms

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

Acronyms	
Acronym	Definition
BSC	Balancing and Settlement Code (<i>Industry Code</i>)
BSCP	BSC Procedure (<i>Code Subsidiary Document</i>)
CoP	Code of Practice (<i>Code Subsidiary Document</i>)
CP	Change Proposal
DCC	Data Communications Company (<i>Licensed industry body</i>)
HH	Half Hourly
HHDC	Half Hourly Data Collector (<i>Supplier Agent role</i>)
ISG	Imbalance Settlement Group (<i>Industry Panel sub-Committee</i>)
NHH	Non Half Hourly
SEC	Smart Energy Code (<i>Industry Code</i>)
SMETS	Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specifications (<i>Industry document</i>)
SMSO	Smart Meter System Operator
SRAG	Settlement Reform Advisory Group (<i>Industry expert group</i>)
SVG	Supplier Volume Allocation Group (<i>Industry Panel sub-Committee</i>)
ToR	Terms of Reference

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	SRAG page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/group/settlement-advisory-reform-group-srag/
2	SRAG Report to the Panel	https://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/27_249_13A_SRA_G_Report_PUBLIC2.pdf
2	BSCP page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc-related-documents/related-documents/bscps/
2	SMETS1 policy on the government website	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/smart-metering-implementation-programme-technical-specifications

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
2	SMETS2 consultation on the government website	https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/smart-metering-equipment-technical-specifications-second-version
3	CP1466 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1466/
3	CP1450 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1450/
3, 5	Elective HH Settlement conclusions paper on the Ofgem website	https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/elective-half-hourly-settlement-conclusions-paper
6	SVG186 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/svg-186/?from_url=https://www.elexon.co.uk/events-calendar-item/svg-186/
6	ISG184 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/isg-184/?from_url=https://www.elexon.co.uk/events-calendar-item/isg-184/
8	Certified Products List page on the SEC website	https://www.smartenergycodecompany.co.uk/sec/certified-products-list
11	CP1469 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1469/
11	CP1474 page on the ELEXON website	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1474/