

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME Architecture Working Group

Meeting number 05

Date of meeting 28 April 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 ELEXON opened the fifth AWG meeting, which was held via teleconference.

2. Updates from other work-streams

Code Change and Development Group (CCDG)

2.1 The CCDG Technical lead provided an update from the most recent CCDG meeting. They are still working to finalise the documents that will eventually feed into the consultation.

2.2 One outstanding area is around the use of partial data – where there is only actual data available for some settlement periods of a day. The expectation in the requirements is that if there is partial data by the settlement run date, then the data should be estimated. This work also feeds into the exception reporting work.

2.3 The group discussed settlement data: how and where it is stored; how and when it is transferred; and whether there was value in allowing partial days in settlement. There was a suggestion in the group that settlement period level data didn't necessarily have to be sent in batches of 48 settlement periods, and that sending data in smaller groups as and when it became available may be better. It was agreed that decoupling data collection from processing is a good principle in theory. The group agreed to move the discussion to later in the meeting.

2.4 The other outstanding area is considering registration and appointment data items. The CCDG technical lead noted the importance of avoiding duplication of effort between the CCDG and the AWG/CCDG subgroup on this area.

Other Code bodies

2.5 The CCDG Technical Lead noted that they had received completed code change matrices from both DCUSA and the MRA/REC, and that they would be presenting slides at the next CCDG meeting to cover the key themes of the code changes. Some of the MRA changes will be pushed into the BSC when Faster Switching comes into force.

2.6 He raised that the SEC changes were still being discussed, as they are still working on a solution to allow the MDR to collect the data. Both the Ofgem and ELEXON rep are attending TABASC to flesh out the requirements for the DCC solution.

SCR

2.7 The Ofgem representative informed the group that they have been reprioritising due to the coronavirus pandemic, setting out which work is considered time critical and what is likely to be delayed. The MHHS draft impact assessment would be going out next week with no set consultation deadline. A 10 week consultation period would be used at a later date. She noted that Ofgem are keen to progress as much MHHS work as possible; so if group members were being re-prioritised due to COVID-19, they should let Ofgem know.

2.8 She noted that the workgroup consultations would be delayed and the timelines re-planned, but that it is important not to progress work that assumes the consultation would give a certain outcome.

HEADLINE REPORT

3. Data Exchange Subgroup

- 3.1 The AWG Technical Lead gave an update from the CCDG/AWG data exchange subgroup, who are looking at more detailed requirements of the data exchanges in the TOM. He noted that they had held a planning session to agree their deliverables, scope and timeline, and that all the outputs are on MS Teams.
- 3.2 Another member provided an update on the group's work. They had gone through and selected those data items from the current DTC that they thought would be necessary in the new TOM. The next step is to link those data items to the scenarios/processes in which they would be used. He noted that although some of the data items weren't certain, it would be easier to take them out at a later date than to add more in.
- 3.3 The output of this work would be detailed requirements which the AWG will convert to interface specifications. The AWG Technical Lead raised a related activity looking through overall sizes of data transfers, noting that there is already some indicative sizing of daily transfer volumes. It was noted that the volumes in question are not anticipated to be problematic, they are just being focussed on to give those parties that need to meet the requirements an indication of the resources required. ELEXON noted that previous estimates, based on a rollout of 30 million smart meters, had given figures of overall data transfer at around 40GB/day.
- 3.4 ELEXON raised the ongoing question around the scope of the data under consideration by the subgroup, and that they were working on the assumption that this would be data for settlement purposes only.
- 3.5 It was noted that there is an action on the ELEXON MHHS project sponsor to propose different options for the scope and present them to Ofgem.

4. Workplan Update

- 4.1 ELEXON noted that they expect the COVID-19 pandemic to delay the current workplan by approximately 3 months. ELEXON noted that subgroup activities would be included in the revised workplan.
- 4.2 Ofgem noted that a 3 month delay sounds reasonable, and that it was a good idea to continue to hold AWG meetings to keep track of the outputs of the subgroup.

5. Data Collection and Processing

- 5.1 ELEXON opened the discussion around decoupling data collection from data processing, noting two distinct options for data transfer, either the data gets sent as soon as the data collector has it, or the data is retained until it is requested. At the moment, data is sent via an FTP; it is accumulated until there is a certain amount, then it is pushed out. It was noted that both transfer options have implications on technology and behaviour.
- 5.2 The implications of the first scenario are that the data collector doesn't have to store much data, only enough to send out in a bundle. This means that the data collector cannot correct errors because they don't retain the data. It also means the target party must always be available to receive data, as it is sent as soon as it is ready. The target becomes the authoritative location of the data.
- 5.3 In the opposite case, the data collector does nothing but collect data and receive requests. This means it has to store the data, and make corrections and amendments as necessary. The target parties only ask for data when they need it, and they don't need to store data, except for their own purposes. One member suggested that a model where the target requests the data would be safest.
- 5.4 The group discussed what this means in the context of the TOM, where there may be many different organisations sending or receiving data. A group member suggested that there could be one central store, that all parties send data to, and all parties request data from. It was noted that this still doesn't answer the question of whether the service will request data, or data will be pushed to it.

HEADLINE REPORT

5.5 It was agreed that the different options would need to be assessed. **Action** on ELEXON to produce a statement on what we need to know to fully understand the different options, including how many organisations are impacted at each interface.

6. Actions

- 6.1 01/02 – No update; still waiting on ELEXON IT
- 6.2 02/02 – the SPaR assessment has not been finalised, however with the delay to the timescales, there will be more time to complete it.
- 6.3 03/01 – Action closed – The whole workplan is being reassessed and the scenarios will be added.
- 6.4 03/04 – Action closed – Profile metadata will be defined as the specifics of the interfaces are worked out.
- 6.5 03/05 – Action closed – Market segment identifiers will be used to define role-based access.
- 6.6 04/01 – Action closed – The ELEXON project sponsor will produce options for the scope and present them to Ofgem.
- 6.7 04/02 – Action closed – ELEXON project manager is creating a central risk log.
- 6.8 04/03 – Action closed – There were no technical difficulties identified with connecting to calls.

7. Next meeting

- 7.1 The next AWG meeting will be held on 26 May 2020.