ELEXON

Issue 112 Workgroup Meeting 1 Summary

Summary

1. Meeting Objectives

The Chair welcomed attendees and presented the meeting objectives:

- To discuss non compliances for HHDC's in not reporting fault flags due to MOAs request.
- To discuss the relevance of all fault flags and consider whether all fault flags do need to be reported.
- Determine timescales that should be implemented for fault flags to be reported in a timely manner.
- Gather Workgroup initial views

Elexon presented the background and Issue of the meeting, stating the key points such as Historical context, associated risks and the justification for Issue 112.

2. Workgroup's initial views

Elexon moved to workgroup discussions, the Issue group discussed that the majority of fault flags are not indicative of a fault so therefore it would not be helpful to use D0001 for every meter. The Issue Group mentioned that it would be too short of a timescale as you need several days and therefore would not be appropriate as you need time to identify a pattern of flagging. The Issue Group discussed if there were other formats to notify alarm flags other than the D0001 process. WG discussions were had on whether the D0001 process was the right technique if the PAB wanted all alarm flags to be reported. Alternative flows were discussed such as the D0005 flow as well as the DTN, however, it was noted by the WG that using the DTN would increase the usage charge for the DTS user therefore it may have an impact on Party Agents.

Elexon commented on whether the timescales for reporting flags work for the wider industry to gain an understanding of what fault flags need to be reported. The Issue group mentioned the importance of fault flags that have an impact being reported on all occasions, however other fault flags that are of less importance don't need to be reported for X amount of days. Elexon asked the Workgroup if all fault flags are not being reported due to MOA/MOPs advising HHDCs to not report certain faults. The Workgroup commented that the MOA/MOPs and DCs want to avoid a backlog therefore they focus on raising genuine fault flags that impact settlement.

Elexon engaged with the workgroup to decide on the timescales for changes to the BSC and CSDs, the WG discussed the MHHS transition being a blocker to these changes. Elexon provided an alternative to this to avoid the potential risk by possibly splitting the Issue into two parts for clarification within a Guidance note and then looking to update the BSC/CSD after the MHHS transition to provide a more permanent basis where the obligations can be stored. However, further clarification would be needed; this can be gained with future Issue group meetings and engagement with other codes. This was verbally agreed upon by the Issue group.

An Issue group member commented that there should be a full list of the codes/alarm flags and the obligations for the HHDC when sending this to a Supplier. This list/table would be available to the Issue Group so that there can be further agreement on the importance of each alarm flag. This was agreed by Elexon and the Issue group and an Action was given to the Issue Group member.

Elexon and the WG agreed to look to meet again once the codes list has been drafted, this will allow time for Elexon and the WG to set up a new meeting with a proposed date happening in May. This will allow for the following actions to be completed.

© Elexon 2022

Actions

No.	Action	Owner
1.	Create a list of the codes/alarm flags and the obligations for the HHDC to do when sending this to a Supplier.	Issue Group
2.	Elexon to provide MHHS Assurance Contact to the Issue Group	Elexon