CP Assessment Report

CP1524 'Improving the communication methods in the fault rectification process'

Contents

1 Why Change? 2
2 Solution 4
3 Impacts and Costs 7
4 Implementation Approach 9
5 Initial Committee Views 10
6 Industry Views 12
7 Recommendations 17
Appendix 1: Glossary & References 18

About This Document

This document is the Change Proposal (CP) Assessment Report for CP1524 which ELEXON will present to the Imbalance Settlement Group (ISG) and Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) at their meetings on 3 March 2020 and the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) at its meeting on 26 March 2020. The Committees will consider the proposed solution and the responses received to the CP Consultation before making a decision on whether to approve CP1524.

There are three parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, and proposed implementation approach. It also summarises the ISG, SVG and PAB's initial views on the proposed changes and the views of respondents to the CP Consultation.
- Attachment A contains the proposed redlined changes to deliver the CP1524 solution.
- Attachment B contains the full responses received to the CP Consultation.

Committee

Imbalance Settlement Group, Supplier Volume Allocation Group, Performance Assurance Board

Recommendation

Approve

Implementation Date

24 June 2021 (June 2021 Release)

Contact

Matthew Woolliscroft

020 7380 4165

BSC.change@elexon.co.uk

Matthew.woolliscroft@elexon.co.uk

ISG227, SVG229, PAB230

CP1524
CP Assessment Report

25 February 2020

Version 1.0

© ELEXON Limited 2020

1 Why Change?

What is the fault rectification process?

The fault rectification process is used where a fault is identified with Metering Equipment that prevents accurate Metered data being entered into Settlement. Faults are usually identified by the Data Collector (DC) or Supplier, who then raise the fault with the Meter Operator Agent (MOA) to investigate and resolve.

As the Agent assigned to a Metering System, the MOA has overall responsibility for maintaining the Metering Equipment. However, in some instances, it may require support or additional information from the Supplier or Licensed Distribution System Operator (LDSO), particularly where faults occur on Metering Equipment owned by the LDSO.

Ensuring that identified faults are resolved efficiently and in a timely manner is essential to making sure that only accurate Metered data is used in the Settlement calculations.

The Fault Investigation Review Group

Following a Technical Assurance of Performance Assurance Parties audit conducted by ELEXON in 2013, it was found that the fault investigation process described in the BSC documentation was not enabling the effective resolution of identified faults and could be improved to be more efficient. The report found that:

- the timescales for fixing faults were unclear; and
- insufficient guidance was provided on which party involved in the faults process was responsible for each step.

Following the audit finding, a group of industry experts came together as the Fault Investigation Review Group (FIRG) to review the faults process and propose changes. The FIRG met throughout 2015 and produced a list of recommendations for improvements to the faults process. However, at the time, due to the amount of ongoing change (particularly the large scale Commissioning changes under P283 'Reinforcing the Commissioning of Metering Equipment Processes' that used much of the same resource) these recommendations were not immediately progressed.

Issue 73

Issue 73 'Review of fault management and resolution timescales' was raised by SSE on 12 October 2018.

The Issue Group was established to review the recommendations of the FIRG, and determine whether any amendments should be made to the proposed solutions to ensure that changes were still reflective of best practice. The Issue Group also considered when the LDSO should take responsibility for resolving faults to ensure the responsibilities were clear for all involved. The Issue Group recommended three CPs to progress changes to the fault rectification process. This CP seeks to implement changes to the way Metering Equipment fault updates are communicated.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

What is the issue?

The process of sending of the D0005 'Instruction on Action' Data Flow to provide an update on the fault status is not well defined. BSCP514 prescribes:

- an initial D0005 being sent by the MOA to the Half Hourly DC or Supplier (depending on who raised the fault) 5 Working Days (WD) after the fault was raised to provide an update on the resolution of the fault.
- if the fault remains unresolved, a second D0005 is sent by the MOA 10WD later to provide a further update.
- following this, the MOA is required to update the Half Hourly DC (or Supplier) of the status of the fault 'as appropriate' and on a 'regular basis'. These timescales are not defined in the BSCPs and so it is unclear how often an update should be given after the initial 15WD. Furthermore, the audit finding noted that, in some cases, responses were being sent inappropriately and as a means to meet the 15WD requirement.

Where multiple faults are identified and multiple D0001 'Request Metering System Investigation' flows are raised on a single Metering System, the sending of a D0002 'Fault Resolution Report or Request for Decision on Further Action' to close a fault can create confusion as to which fault has been rectified. Many MOAs have informed ELEXON that some systems will close the oldest open fault on a site and some will close the latest by default. This requires some manual intervention to ensure the right fault is closed, and can lead to new D0001s needing to be raised, which starts the defined timescales again.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

2 Solution

Proposed solution

Communication flows

The CP1524 solution will update the processes describing how fault updates are provided to allow greater flexibility. The intent is that this would encourage meaningful updates to be provided rather than updates to meet BSC timescales as found in the audit process. With each update, the MOA should advise the Half Hourly DC (or Supplier) when it expects to provide its next update on the fault. To ensure that this does not unnecessarily extend the time that faults are left open, the Supplier will be able to challenge the Expected Action Date if it thinks action should be taken sooner than proposed by the MOA. This will create a cyclical process for updates to be provided over the lifetime of the fault.

CP1526 'Introduction of Service Level Agreements for rectifying fault on Metering Equipment' seeks to review the service levels associated with fault rectification to ensure they are both realistic and robust.

To support the CP1524 solution, a new suite of data flows will created under the Data Transfer Catalogue to be used in the rectification of faults on Half Hourly Metering Systems, replacing the D0001, D0002 and D0005 for Half Hourly faults.

The new flows will be created for the existing Half Hourly market, and the process for rectifying faults on Non Half Hourly Metering Equipment will not change as a result of CP1524. However The Issue Group recommended that the process be supportive of Advanced Meters. To support this, a footnote will be added to the Non Half Hourly fault rectification process to highlight that the new process may be used for Non Half Hourly Advanced Meters, with agreement of all involved parties.

The Issue Group noted that, in many cases, fault rectification flows for Non Half Hourly Metering System Identifiers are used as job booking flows to confirm Site visit details with the MOA rather than a request to investigate. As such, the additional complexity of the CP1524 solution was not required.

Identifiers

The introduction of a Unique Fault Reference, will improve the end to end tracking of faults. The Unique Fault Reference will be added to the new suite of data flows and will provide a consistent reference over the lifetime of the fault. This will ensure that where multiple faults are raised on the same Half Hourly Metering System, the correct fault is closed when resolved. As the Unique Fault Reference will take the form of a field in the proposed new data flows, this will be implemented through associated Data Transfer Catalogue Change Proposals.

Fault Category

A categorisation of the type of fault will also be created. This categorisation will be based on the type of Metering Equipment that is faulty and the different variations of fault that can occur on these types of Metering Equipment. This will allow parties to better direct faults at an earlier stage in the investigation process, which should ultimately lead to a more timely rectification of faults.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

The categorisation of faults will also make root cause analysis easier when identifying the most common types of faults occurring in the industry as well as the average time it takes to rectify different types of fault.

Change of Agent or Change of Supplier

In addition to clarifying and improving the communication flows used in the fault rectification process, this CP will add clarification to the prescribed Change of Agent, Change of Supplier, and concurrent Change of Agent and Supplier processes to ensure that the relevant parties are aware of any open faults when the Supplier or Agent changes. The conventions will follow other information that is passed between participants on Change of Supplier or Change of Agent such that:

- On a change of MOA, the Supplier will inform the new MOA of any open faults;
- On a change of Half Hourly DC, the MOA will inform the incoming Half Hourly DC of any open faults when it sends the Meter Technical Details;
- On a concurrent change of Supplier and agent, the outgoing MOA will pass details of open faults to the incoming MOA, who will then inform the incoming Supplier and Half Hourly DC as necessary.

The passing of fault data mirrors how Meter Technical Details are passed between participants on the above events, and within the same timescales for consistency. This will ensure that even where involved parties change while a fault is being investigated, there will remain a consistent narrative over the lifetime of the fault to better facilitate the efficient rectification of faults on Metering Equipment.

Proposer's rationale

This change will improve communications between Parties and Party Agents by removing the duplication of D0001 flows being sent to raise a fault that has been incorrectly closed, and creating bespoke flows for interparty communications in the fault resolution process. This will enable updates to be more clearly transferred between Parties and Party Agents in relation to fault investigations. The changes proposed will address the issues raised by the BSC Auditor from 2010-12 and will address points raised during the Technical Assurance check in 2013, and implement the recommendations of the Issue 73 Workgroup.

Proposed redlining

CP1524 will require amendments to:

- BSCP502 'Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS';
- BSCP514 'SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS';
- BSCP537 Appendix 1 'Self Assessment Document (SAD)'; and
- BSCP537 Appendix 2 'Testing Requirements'.

Redlined changes to these documents can be found in Attachment A.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

***Please note**: As we are proposing three new data flows, in order to reduce confusion in the draft redlining they are referred to as DAXYX, DAXYY and DAXYZ. The actual numbering of the data flows will be assigned by the Master Registration Agreement Service Company approximately 2 months before the Implementation Date and will follow the standard 'DXXXX' format (e.g. D0170 or D0215) format. DAXYX, DAXYY and DAXYZ are used as placeholders in the BSC Configurable Items to allow the ISG, PAB and the SVG to approve it before the actual flow numbers are available. The version of these BSC Configurable Items that become effective on the Implementation Date will contain the actual flow numbers.*

© ELEXON Limited 2020

3 Impacts and Costs

Central impacts and costs

Central impacts

Central Impacts	
Document Impacts	System Impacts
• BSCP502 'Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS' • BSCP514 'SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS' • BSCP537 Appendix 1 'Self Assessment Document (SAD)' • BSCP537 Appendix 2 'Testing Requirements'	• None

In addition to CP1524 a Data Transfer Catalogue Change Proposal will be raised to implement the new flows to facilitate the solution. These Data Transfer Catalogue changes will also be needed to support CP1525 'Improving the involvement of the LDSO in the fault resolution process'.

Impact on BSC Settlement Risks
CP1524 will impact on Settlement Risk 005 'A fault with SVA Metering Equipment is not resolved, such that metered data is recorded incorrectly or cannot be retrieved'. The Proposed changes will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the fault rectification process, which in turn will help mitigate this risk.

CP1525

CP1525 is one of the three CPs recommended by the Issue 73 Group. It seeks to enhance the involvement of LDSOs in the fault rectification process by clarifying responsibilities for rectifying faults on LDSO owned Metering Equipment and providing a formal method for faults to be raised with the LDSO.

Central costs

The central implementation costs for CP1524 will be approximately £2280 to implement the necessary document changes and update relevant guidance documents.

BSC Party & Party Agent impacts and costs

Party and Party Agent Impacts

CP1524 will impact parties involved in the Half Hourly fault resolution process by implementing a new suite of flows to provide updates and clarifying responsibilities of those involved in the process.

BSC Party & Party Agent Impacts	
BSC Party/Party Agent	Impact
Suppliers	CP1524 will amend the way parties provide updates on the rectification of faults with Metering Equipment.
Half Hourly MOAs	
Half Hourly Data Collectors	

© ELEXON Limited 2020

14 respondents to the CP consultation identified organisational impacts that would result from CP1524. These impacts largely related to implementing changes to working practices and systems to support the proposed changes. Some respondents commented that the required changes would be relatively minor to ensure their training processes were up to date; others commented that they would require significant system changes to process the new data flows.

Some respondents noted positive impacts that included the increased visibility of faults data they would receive following the change.

Party and Party Agent costs

Of the respondents that identified impacts arising from CP1524, 13 respondents to the CP1524 consultation commented that they would incur costs as a result of CP1524. These costs ranged from being described as medium to significant. The majority of respondents that identified costs specified that these would be one off costs. Of those who provided approximate figures, these were in the region of £80,000-£100,000. Most respondents that identified costs commented that stated figures combined the costs of implementing CP1524, CP1525 and CP1526.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

4 Implementation Approach

Recommended Implementation Date

The recommended Implementation Date for CP1524 is **24 June 2021** as part of the June 2021 BSC Release. This Implementation Date will allow sufficient time for the associated Data Transfer Catalogue CP and new data flows to be fully developed and implemented. This will also align with the recommended Implementation dates for CP1525 and CP1526.

The majority of consultation respondents agreed with the proposed implementation approach for CP1524, agreeing that the lead time was sufficient for industry participants to prepare their processes and systems for the change. More detail on respondents views on implementation can be found in Section 6.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

5 Initial Committee Views

SVG's initial views

The SVG considered CP1524 at its meeting on 7 January 2020 (SVG227/06).

An SVG Member did not believe the current processes hamper the effective resolution of faults on Metering Equipment. They believed that instances of fault rectification data flows being sent as a means to meet the Service Level Agreements in the BSCPs (but where complete rectification had not necessarily been completed) would be a breach of the BSC, and should result in non-compliances. ELEXON noted that current BSC timescales and Service Level Agreements focused on the sending of data flows rather than the complete rectification of the fault. ELEXON advised that some confusion arose from differing opinions on what constituted a resolution, giving the example of a Meter being temporarily changed to 'hand held read', rather than an enduring remote solution as a valid rectification.

On the perceived ambiguity of responsibilities in the process, the Member believed that the BSCPs were clear that all responsibilities lay with the appointed MOA. The Member did not believe that there was sufficient benefit in defining new processes and accompanying data flows, instead believing that adding some of the proposed data items to the existing data flows would have the same result. ELEXON noted it had drafted the proposed processes based on the solution developed by industry participants through Issue 73 in response to findings from both the BSC Auditor and previous assurance checks. The changes seek to ensure visibility and clarity for the industry. ELEXON agreed to ask market participants, through CP consultation, whether they agree the proposed new process for providing updates on Half Hourly faults would be more effective than just adding data items to the existing data flows used in the Half Hourly faults process.

The majority of respondents agreed that the proposed process change would be more effective at ensuring the timely rectification of all faults than just adding new data items to the existing flows and processes. More detail on respondents' views on this can be found in Section 6.

ISG's initial views

The ISG considered CP1524 at its meeting on 7 January 2020 (ISG225/03).

An ISG Member questioned whether there would be any changes to the process for resolving Non Half Hourly faults. ELEXON responded that the process was tailored towards Half Hourly Advanced Meters, but noted that the proposed changes included provisions to allow its use for Non Half Hourly faults by agreement of all involved parties. The Member commented that some proposed data items such as Unique Fault Reference would benefit the Non Half Hourly process. ELEXON noted this but commented that the Issue 73 Group had identified that data flows were used primarily as job booking flows in the Non Half Hourly market rather than as a method for providing updates and so had chosen not to include this in the scope of the solution.

PAB's initial views

The PAB considered CP1524 at its meeting on 19 December 2019 (PAB227/06).

© ELEXON Limited 2020

The PAB queried whether the proposed solution would be applicable to all Half Hourly Metering Systems or whether it would differ between Measurement Classes. ELEXON noted the processes developed by the Issue 73 Group are tailored towards Half Hourly Advanced Meters, rather than specific Measurement Classes. The proposals have been based on the existing Half Hourly market and would not be suitable for smart Meters without changes.

PAB members questioned the rationale for the differences between how fault data is passed to the incoming party on a change of MOA and a concurrent change of MOA and Change of Supplier. ELEXON responded that the proposed processes follow the existing processes for how other data items such as the Meter Technical Details are passed in such events.

A PAB Member sought reassurance that the proposed solution was complete and would not have any unintended consequences. ELEXON asked this as part of the CP consultation. The responses to this can be found in Section 6.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

6 Industry Views

We received 15 responses to the CP Consultation, which are summarised below. You can find the full responses in Attachment B.

Summary of CP1524 CP Consultation Responses				
Question	Yes	No	Neutral/ No Comment	Other
Do you agree with the CP1524 proposed solution?	10	5	0	0
Do you agree with the proposed solution for how faults should be passed to the incoming part on a Change of Agent or Change of Supplier?	12	3	0	0
Do you agree that the draft redlining delivers the intent of CP1524?	11	4	0	0
Do you believe that the implementation of CP1524 will lead to any unintentional operational challenges or risks arising?	11	4	0	0
Will CP1524 impact your organisation?	14	0	1	0
Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing CP1524?	13	1	1	0
Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach for CP1524?	10	5	0	0
Do you agree the proposed process changes will be more effective at ensuring timely rectification of faults than adding new data items to the existing flows and processes?	10	5	0	0
Do you have any further comments on CP1524?	6	9	0	0

Solution

10 respondents agreed with the CP1524 solution. These respondents agreed that the solution would enhance the visibility of fault rectification activities, thus enabling the Supplier to better manage its Agents than is provided for under the existing processes.

Five respondents did not agree with the CP1524 solution. One respondent commented that while they did not agree with the development of a bespoke suite of data flows for use in Half Hourly fault rectification, they were supportive of the clarifications that have been made to how faults should be passed on a Change of Agent event. Three respondents, who disagreed with the solution, noted the rationale for the change, but believed CP1524 would add unnecessary complexity to the fault rectification process and that the benefits would not outweigh the costs. This was discussed by the Issue 73 Group, which determined that the additional transparency and clarity of the proposed solution would add significant value.

Two of these respondents believed that effort would be better spent assessing the root causes of the erroneous actions identified by the 2013 audit and the FIRG; enhancing the effectiveness of the existing process instead. The Issue 73 Group considered reasons for

© ELEXON Limited 2020

faults not being resolved when it developed the solutions proposed by CP1524, CP1525 and CP1526. However, this was largely anecdotal, as ELEXON does not currently receive granular data needed for robust analysis.

One respondent believed that tailoring the CP1524 solution to Half Hourly Advanced Meters would essentially create two faults processes, which could lead to confusion. The respondent also believed that by limiting the solution to the Half Hourly market, the benefits would also be limited and so did not think the cost to make the change was justified. The respondent did not disagree that the proposed solution could bring benefits to the fault rectification process, but believed that the costs would outweigh this benefit. The respondent disagreed with the belief held by the Issue 73 group that data flows were largely used for job booking in the Non Half Hourly Market and so believed that there would be sufficient benefit to be gained in extending the scope to also cover this.

One respondent believed the solution overlapped with other industry obligations in the Distribution Connection Use of System Agreement. ELEXON believes that the noted 'D0135' process has similarities with CP1525, but not this CP1524, and that this potential synergy was considered by the Issue 73 Workgroup as part of its discussions, who favoured a dedicated BSC process.

Change of Agent or Supplier

12 respondents agreed with the proposals for how details of open faults should be passed between market participants on a Change of Agent or Change of Supplier. The respondents agreed that this would increase the visibility for involved parties and reduce the risk of new faults being needlessly re-raised when an Agent changes. One of those who agreed, believed that the solution could be simplified in the case of a concurrent change of MOA and Supplier. ELEXON notes that the proposed process is consistent with how Meter Technical Details are passed between participants and so should reduce any confusion sometimes associated with a new process.

One respondent questioned whether the notification of open faults was for information or whether an incoming Data Collector should raise a new fault. They expressed concern that in an audit situation, they may be reliant on data provided by another party. ELEXON believes that if a non compliance was found as a result of poor information provided, this would not be raised against the receiving party.

Of the three respondents that disagreed, one did not provide any comments, and one believed that there was duplication with existing industry processes. The other respondent that disagreed with the proposal believed that there was benefit in passing information on a Change of Agent or Change of Supplier, but disagreed that the new flows were the most appropriate vehicle for this.

Unintended risks

11 consultation respondents believed that the CP1524 solution could lead to unintended operational risks. Some respondents believed that the transition period during which older faults continue to follow the existing process could add unnecessary complexity and lead to confusion, one respondent commented that this could be mitigated through guidance and education ahead of implementation; the other believed that all open faults should be closed and reopened under the new process.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

Another respondent believed that there was the potential for both the Supplier and DC to raise the same fault, leading to duplication. ELEXON believes that this situation could occur in the existing arrangements and so is not a defect in the CP1524 solution.

One respondent commented that there may be instances where the Supplier did not have a commercial relation with the MOA (such as where a customer preferred agent is appointed), which could extend the proposed cyclical process. ELEXON believes that the proposed process is designed to support the Supplier Hub principle by giving the Supplier greater visibility to manage its Agents.

One respondent did not believe that the DC would have sufficient knowledge to correctly categorise faults. ELEXON notes that the DC categorisation is intended to be indicative to help the MOA target its investigations and confirm the category in its communications.

Implementation

10 respondents agreed with the proposed implementation approach for CP1524, agreeing that the lead time was sufficient for industry participants to prepare their processes and systems for the change. Other respondents who disagreed with the implementation approach gave varying reasons for their opinion. These included alignment with the Faster Switching Programme, which currently aims to be implemented in November 2021. Other respondents did not believe that the process of managing already open faults under the existing process, with new faults being raised following the process implemented by CP1524 would be effective. They commented that there should be a defined process for how the transition period should be managed. ELEXON will engage with industry ahead of implementation to ensure that a consistent approach is taken.

Development of bespoke data flows and processes

10 Consultation respondents agreed that the proposed process change would be more effective at ensuring the timely rectification of all faults than just adding new data items to the existing flows and processes. Respondents gave reasons including the increased transparency and clarity of the proposed processes.

Five respondents, who disagreed that the proposed process changes would be better than solely adding data items to the existing flows, believed that the new processes could add unnecessary complications to the process that would have the potential to introduce operational challenges and risks that would threaten the effectiveness of the CP1524 solution. Other rationale for disagreeing included the wider additional pressures faced by industry participants such as smart Meter obligations, which may cause faults to not be fully prioritised. ELEXON notes that these external pressures are not specific to the CP1524 solution.

Other comments

Six consultation respondents provided further comments on CP1524. Respondents commented that the solution would improve the faults process and could be adapted to support the future Target Operating Model under Ofgem's Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement Significant Code Review. Respondents also commented that smart Meters would not fit in with the process as developed by CP1524 and so thought would need to be given to how faults on smart Meters should be handled. ELEXON expects that this will

© ELEXON Limited 2020

be considered ahead of the implementation of Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement, and that the project should propose changes at that time to support its implementation.

Some respondents called on ELEXON to provide education days prior to the implementation of CP1524 to ensure a seamless transition. ELEXON will provide support and guidance to participants, if CP1524 is approved.

One respondent did not believe that CP1524, CP1525 and CP1526 could be implemented independently of each other. ELEXON notes that CP1526 is dependent on the preceding CPs being approved, but believes that the CP1524 redlining has been drafted in such a way that it can be delivered independently.

Comments on the proposed redlining

11 respondents agreed that the proposed relining would deliver the CP1524 solution; four respondents disagreed.

Comments on the CP1524 Proposed Redlining		
Document & Location	Comment	ELEXON's Response
BSCP502 3.4.3.3.A	This new section requires that if the Expected Action Date provided by the HHMOA is challenged within 2WD Supplier is to send MOA a D[AXYZ]. The section also includes an action if the Expected Action Date is accepted. It is unclear if the D[AXYZ] is also to be sent by the Supplier on acceptance of the HHMOA Expected Action Date.	ELEXON believes that the drafting makes it clear that the Supplier is not required to send a response to the MOA if it accepts the date provided.
BSCP502 3.4.3.2	Action is "Go to 3.4.3.10". This should read "Go to 3.4.3.7"	We have corrected this reference
BSCP514 5.2.1	Appears a reference is missing to tell current MOA to issue a flow (the most recent as per footnote 11) to the Supplier after ref 5.2.1.4 (if not rejected) and before 5.2.1.7.A otherwise there is no guarantee that the latest DAXYZ flow to supplier was the most recent actual update on the fault that MOA had available. Also which flow would be relevant from current MOA to Supplier, or would both be relevant; DAXYX / DAXYZ?	The Supplier will have the most recent DAXYZ flow already as part of the Fault rectification process. Both would be relevant; the DAXYX is information on the fault itself whilst the DAXYZ is information on progression of the fault.
BSCP514 5.2.3 &5.2.4	Ref 5.2.3.2 states for MOA to send to new DC, and ref 5.2.4.8.A states for current MOA to send new MOA the equivalent D1 and D5 flows (DAXYX and DAXYZ), but why is the DAXYX (eq. D1) required? The DAXYZ flow is used to update the fault from current	The DAXYX is the equivalent D0001 and so is the actual request to investigate a fault. The DAXYZ is details on the progression of the resolution of the DAXYX. Both are needed to

© ELEXON Limited 2020

Comments on the CP1524 Proposed Redlining		
Document & Location	Comment	ELEXON's Response
	MOA and this should contain all the data required to inform new DC/new MOA of the fault and current status. Sending a DAXYX from current MOA is unnecessary extra work. Also ref 5.2.4.10.A; if the above flow changes this would also need amendment in the same way.	provide full view of the fault and the progression of its resolution.
BSCP514 5.4.1.5.A	Ref 5.4.1.5A should be ref 5.4.1.5.A.	We have corrected this reference
BSCP514 5.4.1.5.A	This new section requires that if the Expected Action Date provided by the HHMOA is challenged within 2WD Supplier is to send MOA a D[AXYZ]. The section also includes an action if the Expected Action Date is accepted. It is unclear if the D[AXYZ] is also to be sent by the Supplier on acceptance of the HHMOA Expected Action Date.	ELEXON believes that the drafting makes it clear that the Supplier is not required to send a response to the MOA if it accepts the date provided.
BSCP514 5.4.1.8	Typo – "timesclaes" should be "timescales"	We have correct this.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

7 Recommendations

We invite the **SVG** to:

- **AGREE** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSCP502, BSCP514, BSCP537 Appendix 1 and BSCP537 Appendix 2 for CP1524 made following the CP Consultation**;**
- **APPROVE** the proposed changes to BSCP502, BSCP514, BSCP537 Appendix 1 and BSCP537 Appendix 2 for CP1524;
- **APPROVE** CP1524 for implementation on 24 June 2021 as part of the June 2021 BSC Release; and
- **NOTE** that CP1524 will be presented for decision to the
    - SVG on 3 March 2020; and
    - PAB on 26 March 2020.

We invite the **ISG** and the **PAB** to:

- **AGREE** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSCP537 Appendix 1 and BSCP537 Appendix 2 for CP1524 made following the CP Consultation**;**
- **APPROVE** the proposed changes to BSCP537 Appendix 1 and BSCP537 Appendix 2 for CP1524;
- **APPROVE** CP1524 for implementation on 24 June 2021 as part of the June 2021 BSC Release; and
- **NOTE** that CP1524 will be presented for decision to the
    - ISG on 3 March 2020;
    - SVG on 3 March 2020; and
    - PAB on 26 March 2020.

© ELEXON Limited 2020

Appendix 1: Glossary & References

Acronyms

Acronyms	
Acronym	Definition
BSCP	Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure
CP	Change Proposal
FIRG	Fault Investigation Review Group
LDSO	Licensed Distribution System Operator
MOA	Meter Operator Agent
ISG	Imbalance Settlement Group *(Panel Committee)*
PAB	Performance Assurance Board *(Panel Committee)*
SVG	Supplier Volume Allocation Group *(Panel Committee)*

Data Transfer Catalogue data flows and data items

Data Transfer Catalogue data flows and data items referenced in are listed below.

Data Flows and Data Items	
Number	Name
D0001	Request Metering System Investigation
D0002	Fault Resolution Report or Request for Decision on Further Action
D0005	Instruction on Action
D[AXYX]	Request Metering System Investigation
D[AXYY]	Fault Resolution Report
D[AXYZ]	Fault Rectification Communication

External links

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

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
2, 18	2013 Audit Report	https://www.elexon.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Fault-Investigation-Process-Findings-TAPAP-Report-May-2013-v1-02.pdf
2, 18	P283	https://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p283
2, 18	Issue 73	https://www.elexon.co.uk/smg-issue/issue-73/
5, 18	BSCPs	https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc-and-codes/bsc-related-documents/bscps
4, 18	CP1526	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1526
7, 18	CP1525	https://www.elexon.co.uk/change-proposal/cp1525

© ELEXON Limited 2020

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
10	SVG227	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/SVG227/
10	ISG225	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/isg225/
10	PAB227	https://www.elexon.co.uk/meeting/pab-227/

© ELEXON Limited 2020