

4.7 Issue Form

Issue Form - BSCP40/04	Issue Number 67 <i>(mandatory by BSCCo)</i>
Issue Title <i>(Mandatory by originator)</i> Meter Timeswitch Code for Smart Meters	
Issue Description <i>(Mandatory by originator)</i> <i>SSE have identified that the Meter Timeswitch Codes available are not appropriate for Smart Meters, especially considering that a SMETS compliant Smart Meter can be operated in credit or prepayment mode and change configuration. SSE are looking to raise this as an issue so that there can be an industry agreement on what the correct MTC is for a SMETS compliant meter that will be recognised by Supplier, MOP, DNO, DC and Settlements.</i>	
Justification for Examining Issue <i>(Mandatory by originator)</i> <i>The Meter Timeswitch Codes available were defined before Smart Metering was introduced into the industry. As such, Smart Meters are yet to be considered with regards to what would be an appropriate MTC. Assumptions appear to have been made across the industry and as a result, it is not clearly identifiable that a site has a Smart Meter installed through looking at the top line of the full MPAN (which includes the MTC, Profile Class and Line Loss Factor). The rules for updating the MTC are out of date and do not apply to SMETS compliant electricity meters in so much as they cannot account for a Smart Meter that can be both in credit or prepayment mode and on any Time Pattern Regime / Tariff</i>	

Potential Solution(s) *(Optional by originator)***Option 1 – Do nothing**

Allow suppliers to pick from existing MTCs for Smart Meters based on those they feel are appropriate. The benefits of this are that there would be no cost and no effort required to implement.

One possible drawback is that which MTC is appropriate would be open to interpretation and could lead to misalignment of Market Domain Data. If this is deemed to be the correct option then the purpose of the MTC would be negated as it would make Smart Metering indistinguishable from legacy/heritage metering

Doing nothing is likely to impact upon DNOs and DCs rather than Suppliers, therefore their input into the decision making process will be critical.

Option 2 – Introduce a limited number of MTCs for SMETS compliant Smart Meters

Create new MTCs that could be used for SMETS1 or SMETS2 compliant Smart Meters. They should be supported across the country, they should indicate that a meter can be operated in both credit and prepayment mode and they should indicate that the meter is programmable. It should also be identifiable through the MTC whether there are any associated MPANs (in order to identify sites with two meters / dual element meters). Time Pattern Regime IDs should not be identifiable through the MTC as Smart Metering opens up a vast array of options with Time of Use tariffs of which there simply may not be enough free MTCs to cope with.

In order to support the above, a new MTC Meter Type ID and MTC Meter Type Description may need to be introduced that indicates a meter is a SMETS1/2 compliant Smart Meter. A new MTC Payment Type ID and MTC Payment Type Description which indicates a Smart Meter capable of being in either credit or prepayment mode may also be required.

The benefits of option 2 include minimal cost and effort to introduce a small number of MTCs. Assuming all parties agree to this, it will make a Smart Meter identifiable through the top line of the MPAN. The disadvantages of option 2 include the effort required by suppliers to undertake retrospective action to apply the MTC to SMETS compliant meters already installed.

Option 3 – Ensure there is a full suite of MTCs to cover potential Smart Meter tariffs

As option 2 for all fields except a unique MTC should be created for each possible Time Pattern Regime to cover all the possible variations of Time Patterns. The benefits are that any party could accurately determine which Time Pattern/Tariff a customer is on from looking at the MTC alone. The disadvantages are that the number of MTCs required to cover all possible Time Patterns may be overwhelming, especially when Time of Use tariffs are more widely utilised by suppliers in increasingly innovative ways to get the most out of Smart Metering. The key risk is that suppliers actually run out of MTCs due to the sheer number of possibilities.

Summary

SSE believes option 2 delivers a practical means of identifying a Smart Meter through the top line of the MPAN without overburdening the MTC catalogue. As such, option 2 is SSE's preferred option.

Although SSE are bringing this issue to the table as a Supplier, an assessment from DNOs and other market participants is encouraged to ensure that the options suggested do not break existing processes.

For options 2 and 3, it will need to be considered that retrospective action will need to be taken to correct MTCs for SMETS1/SMETS2 meters that have been installed before this solution is implemented. With this in mind, it is worth considering that a reasonable timeframe is given for MTCs to be updated.

Proposer's Details

<i>Name</i> Neil Mace
<i>Organisation</i> SSE
<i>Email Address</i> Neil.mace@sse.com
<i>Telephone Number</i> 07792253321
<i>Date</i> <i>16/01/2017</i>

4.8. Issue Form Guidelines

These guidelines are to be used to assist in the completion of the Issue Form, contained in Appendix 4.7. The guidelines state who should complete each item on the form and whether it is mandatory or optional. They also give a brief description of the information that should be given for each item. For further guidance please contact your BCA / PACA. Once completed this form should be submitted to BSCCo for inclusion on the relevant Panel Committee agenda.

- **Issue Number** –mandatory to be completed by BSCCo once the proposed issue has been received. This is a unique number.
- **Issue Title** – mandatory and is completed by the originator at the time the issue is raised. This should be unique where possible.
- **Issue Description** – mandatory and is completed by the originator. The description should include as much detail as possible of the issue being encountered.
- **Potential Solution(s)** - optional by originator – This is to be completed where the originator has potential solutions that they want to be discussed as part of a potential solution to the issue.
- **Justification for Examining Issue** – mandatory by originator – details of the business case for examining the issue. This section should also include a brief assessment of the risk associated with leaving the problem/issue unresolved, in terms of materiality and probability of occurrence.
- **Proposer's Details** – mandatory completion by originator – the name, organisation, email address and telephone number of the proposer.