

---

## P434 Workgroup Meeting 5 Summary

---

### Summary

#### 1. Meeting Objectives

The Chair welcomed attendees and presented the meeting objectives:

- Consider the responses received from the MHHS Programme
- Finalise the solution
- Workgroup to provide its final views against the Applicable BSC Objectives and recommendations to the BSC Panel

#### 2. MHHS Programme Response

- 2.1 There were a number of questions that were sent to the MHHS Programme (MHHS) after the fourth Workgroup meeting. The MHHS representative explained that the Code Change and Development Group (CCDG) recommended the early movement of Unmetered Supplies (UMS) MSIDs to Half Hourly (HH) Settlement to allow time for the data cleanse to occur. The idea was if these UMS MSIDs are moved across early it reduces the risk of migration to the TOM. If we don't implement this Modification there will be no obligation on Parties to undertake the data cleanse.
- 2.2 The MHHS representative stated that they could see that there will be additional costs for Suppliers to take on as they will need to appoint HH Data Collectors (DCs) and HH Data Aggregators (DAs). There may also be costs to Suppliers to make system changes to receive the D0379 or D0380 if they cannot process these flows already. However, the main intention of this Modification is to close down the NHH processes as soon as possible, if the risk materializes and everything cannot be migrated to HH Settlement then that extends the length of the Programme and there's significant costs in supporting that.
- 2.3 It was pointed out by a Workgroup Member that MHHS migration is built on the fact that P434 will be approved, if P434 isn't implemented then the Programme will have to design a new arrangement to CoMC NHH UMS MSIDs, this could potentially delay the migration.
- 2.4 It was also pointed out that Ofgem's Significant Code Review (SCR) objective is to move everything to HH to ensure there is accurate Settlement for consumers, P434 achieves the SCR objectives of HH Settlement earlier.
- 2.5 The MHHS Representative explained that the Programme has identified the need for an Annual Consumption value to be provided. Currently the proposal is that every month the Programme will add up all the data from an MSID, annualize it and that data will be visible in the Electricity Enquiry Service (EES). However, there's no way of exposing that data to the customer so potentially there still needs to be a mechanism put in place for customers to check their data. However, although the Proposer could see that it is an issue if customers cannot independently check their bills they didn't think this issue could be resolved under the BSC, it was agreed this wouldn't be part of the P434 solution.

#### 3. Alternative Solution

- 3.1 Elxon asked the Workgroup Members whether there was value in raising an Alternative Modification that only contained the mandate for the coordinated data cleanse activities. The Programme's response indicates that the key issue/risk to the transition is around the data cleanse & customer engagement aspects, in that case could the obligation around the CoMC activities be taken out from this Modification so that the only obligation is around the data cleansing?
- 3.2 The Proposer and the Workgroup stated that they believed doing the CoMC early is beneficial and would prefer to include it in the solution. It was stated that doing the CoMC and rationalising four NHH MSIDs into one HH MSID has the same importance as the data cleanse. Furthermore, The HH Settlement mandate under P434 means that if reverse TOM migration is allowed, customers migrating out of the TOM would go to HH UMS.

Without the P434 mandate, a customer migrating out of the TOM might choose to go back to NHH UMS, which would require the creation of new NHH UMS MSIDs

- 3.3 It was pointed out that by moving customers to HH Settlement early their consumption will be reflected more accurately. P434 will also result in earlier customer engagement too, so it spreads the workload for customer queries.

#### **4. Workgroup's final views**

- 4.1 The Workgroup agreed unanimously that there are no Alternative Modifications.
- 4.2 The Workgroup agreed unanimously that P434 is not a Self-Governance Modification.
- 4.3 The Workgroup agreed unanimously that P434 does not impact the EBGL provisions held within the BSC.
- 4.4 The Workgroup agreed unanimously with the Implementation approach.
- 4.5 The Workgroup by majority agreed that P434 should be approved as it better facilitates Objective (c) 'Promoting effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity, and (so far as consistent therewith) promoting such competition in the sale and purchase of electricity' and objective (d) 'Promoting efficiency in the implementation and administration of the balancing and settlement arrangements.

---

#### **Actions**

No.	Action	Owner
1.	Review the Assessment Report	Workgroup