

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME	Code Change & Development Group – Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR
Meeting number	04 Part B
Date of meeting	3 April 2020
Purpose of paper	Information
Classification	Public
Synopsis	Summary of Part B of the fourth CCDG meeting and actions arising.

1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

- 1.1 The Chairman confirmed that, due to the COVID-19 lockdown and closure of ELEXON's office, all CCDG meetings will be held remotely by Skype until further notice. The CCDG agreed to continue splitting each meeting into two parts to keep the length of the Skype meetings manageable. Members expressed a preference for morning meetings where possible.
- 1.2 Following CCDG04 Part A, held on 17 March 2020, the Chairman advised that the objectives for this Part B were to:
- Discuss the refined straw men for Industry Standing Data (ISD) and Registration (data items, appointment and confirmations), which have been updated since CCDG03
 - Discuss updates on other actions relating to the detailed design of the Target Operating Model (TOM).

The Chairman noted that the other agenda items can be rolled over to future meetings if needed.

- 1.3 The Chairman highlighted Ofgem's [announcement](#) that it is reprioritising its work plans for 2020 in light of the COVID-19 national emergency. She noted that Ofgem and ELEXON recognise the need for Suppliers and Supplier Agents to prioritise critical operations during the pandemic. As a result, the CCDG's consultation on the detailed TOM design and Code Change Matrices (originally planned for June-July 2020) is likely to be pushed back. For the time being, the Chairman suggested that, where practical, the CCDG continues to progress the following activities during April and May 2020 through a combination of Skype meetings and offline working:
- Agreeing outstanding aspects of the straw men and progressing related actions on the detailed TOM design
 - Continuing the work of the joint CCDG and Architecture Working Group (AWG) subgroup on TOM service interfaces
 - Reviewing the Code Change Matrices completed by ELEXON and other code bodies, which tabulate the impacts on BSC documentation and other impacted Industry Codes
 - Identifying any further requirements that need to apply during the transition from current Settlement arrangements to the TOM
 - Assessing the CCDG's recommendations so far against Ofgem's TOM [Design Principles](#) and [Development Principles](#)
 - Discussing, if time allows, the potential focus and structure of the consultation document (before ELEXON begins drafting it).

HEADLINE REPORT

1.4 The Chairman invited members to comment on this potential approach in light of COVID-19 priorities and resourcing. The group agreed to proceed along these lines for the moment, but to continue to review its ongoing feasibility as events develop and Ofgem's prioritisation exercise concludes. Discussion confirmed that while some members are not currently experiencing a reduction in their available resource for this work, others are experiencing greater constraints on their time. ELEXON noted that there may therefore be an overall constraint on how many CCDG activities can be progressed in parallel, and that it will regularly review the overall workload with the group.

2. Updates from other work streams

2.1 ELEXON noted that both the AWG and the joint CCDG/AWG interface subgroup have met since CCDG04 Part A. ELEXON will provide an update from these meetings at CCDG05 Part A on 21 April 2020. A CCDG member commented that there will be a need to ensure that the content of the CCDG and AWG consultations aligns in any areas of overlap. ELEXON agreed and noted that the CCDG's consultation will precede the AWG's.

2.2 Ofgem advised that the Code Change Matrices for the BSC, Master Registration Agreement (MRA) and Distribution and Use of System Connection Agreement (DCUSA) will be ready to present at CCDG05. As the DCUSA representative is now unable to make the original meeting date of 21 April, the matrices will be presented and discussed at the further CCDG05 Part B meeting.

3. Register Read Meters with switched load

Update on Action 04/03

3.1 ELEXON [presented](#) a proposed solution to this issue, developed during its offline discussions with Dom Bradbury and Paul Saker after [CCDG04 Part A](#) and following on from earlier discussions at [CCDG03](#). ELEXON noted that the intention is to ensure that Suppliers can still offer cost-reflective tariffs to switched load (primarily Economy 7) customers who have not yet had the opportunity to have a smart Meter installed, but without significantly increasing the complexity of the Load Shaping Service requirements. ELEXON noted the need to make this a time-limited solution so as not to disincentivise these customers from moving to smart Meters.

3.2 ELEXON walked through the solution, clarifying that:

- The Meter Reading Service (MRS) or Supplier will provide the Processing Service Smart (PSS) with both peak (normal) and off-peak (low) Meter readings for all non-smart Meters in Profile Classes 2 (Domestic Economy 7 Customers) and 4 (Non-Domestic Economy 7 Customers)
- Profile Class IDs for these Meters will therefore need to be retained under the TOM for the duration of the solution
- The PSS will use these Meter readings to calculate two Daily Advance Estimates: one for peak (normal) and one for off-peak (low)
- The Load Shaping Service (LSS) will use these Daily Advance Estimates, in conjunction with the average Load Shapes for Active Import for Domestic or Non-Domestic Metering Systems in each GSP Group, to calculate two new seven-day rolling totals: one peak (normal), one off-peak (low)
- ELEXON proposes that the PSS uses either Estimation Method 6 from the existing [PSS TOM requirements](#) (with Estimation Method 7 as a fall-back where a 30-day advance is not available), or just Estimation Method 7
- The off-peak calculation of the seven-day rolling total will be either Midnight to 7 or 00:30 to 07:30, depending on the most prevalent regime for each GSP Group
- The solution will capture Meters with switched-load capability even if their load is not switched in practice – however, the calculation will take account of this.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 3.3 The CCDG agreed in principle that this is an efficient solution to the issue. CCDG members:
- Agreed on the need to be clear what types of switched load are/are not covered (noting that Profile Classes 2 and 4 include other types of switched load in addition to Economy 7, but not necessarily all types)
 - Noted the need to look at the proportion of switched load customers in particular GSP Groups (e.g. in Cornwall)
 - Expressed differing views on whether use of Estimation Methods 6 and 7, or Estimation Method 7 only, is preferable
 - Agreed that the solution should apply until the end of transition to the TOM, at which point its ongoing need and duration can be reviewed based on the penetration of the smart Meter rollout.
- 3.4 ELEXON agreed to:
- Produce a spreadsheet showing the differences between Estimation Methods 6 and 7 (**Action 04/08**)
 - Use the Supplier Purchase Matrix (SPM) snapshots at the Initial Settlement (SF) Run, and the counts by Profile Classes 2&4 and Standard Settlement Configurations (SSCs), in order to tabulate the split between customers on Midnight to 7 and 00:30 to 07:30 for each GSP Group (**Action 04/09**)
 - Write up the solution in one of the Working Documents, clarifying which types of switched load it covers (**Action 04/10**)
- 3.5 ELEXON advised that it is aware of discussions about extending the Radio Teleswitch (RTS) arrangements until 2023. ELEXON highlighted that the TOM does not currently cater for RTS Meters, as the assumption had been that these arrangements would no longer be in use by the start of the TOM transition. The CCDG agreed to revisit this at a future meeting as needed, and as more information is available on any extension to the RTS arrangements.

ACTION 04/11

4. Discuss refined straw men for detailed design areas

Update on Action 04/07

- 4.1 ELEXON noted its action from CCDG04 Part A to consider further how 'clock time' Supplier/agent appointments will work under the TOM, which uses Universal Coordinated Time (UTC).
- 4.2 ELEXON advised that it has since circulated a problem statement and different solution options, as provided by a CCDG member, to the other CCDG member volunteers. ELEXON reminded these members to respond with their comments.
- 4.3 A CCDG member advised that they believe the Data and Communications Company (DCC) assumes that changes to appointments (as they relate to access controls) happen at midnight UTC. The member agreed to check and confirm this.

ACTION 04/12

Update on Action 04/06

- 4.4 ELEXON noted the suggestion made at CCDG04 Part A that, if data services obtain partial data for a Settlement date (for example, because the scheduled request was post-midnight), then this data should be validated and provided to BSC Central Settlement Services before the rest of the data has been obtained for that Settlement date.
- 4.5 ELEXON advised that this raises a number of questions, including:
- Does the DCC support partial data extracts from the data log?

HEADLINE REPORT

- Do the rest of the Settlement Periods for the day need estimating?
 - How does this interact with exception reporting, which is looking at data completeness?
 - Do the BSC Central Settlement Services need to default the missing data at the time of the Settlement Run?
 - What happens if the data never gets completed?
 - In British Summer Time, two days of UTC data will be needed – why not wait a day and send all 48 periods?
 - What are the performance implications of partial data?
 - What are the benefits of sending incomplete data if it complicates BSC Central Settlement processing?
- 4.6 ELEXON agreed to circulate these questions to the CCDG after the meeting and asked members to respond with their views on the benefits and disbenefits of processing partial data.

Industry Standing Data

- 4.7 ELEXON [presented](#) the latest changes to the Industry Standing Data tables, noting that:
- Advanced Market Segment Default Load Shapes and Valid Set of Load Shape Categories have been added as 'must haves'
 - Certain Unmetered Supplies (UMS) data items, as shown on slide 16, have been set to 'won't have' but will be kept until the end of the transition to the TOM.
- 4.8 A CCDG member noted that some of the 'won't have' UMS data items may already be redundant by the time that the TOM transition starts, in which case they could potentially be removed earlier through the normal BSC change process.
- 4.9 In response to a question from a CCDG member, ELEXON confirmed that the Advanced Market Segment Default Load Shape will be calculated annually and will replace the Default Profile Class Coefficients. Another CCDG member suggested this data item should be made more generic as a 'Market Segment Default Load Shape', since other market segments (e.g. UMS) may need something similar. ELEXON agreed to make this change.
- 4.10 A CCDG member suggested that the Whole Current CT table should be a 'must have'. ELEXON agreed.
- 4.11 ELEXON noted that it still needs to add tables showing the new Consumption Component Classes (CCCs) / Scaling Weights as well as the existing ones.
- 4.12 ELEXON noted that it has generally been identifying ISD at the level of the existing Market Domain Data (MDD) tables. It proposed that the ISD write-up should clarify that all existing tables contain the same data items as those currently held in MDD. However, it will need to explain what the new data items are. ELEXON noted that the CCDG also still needs to decide which data items are mastered under the BSC (and whether this is still through MDD) or under other Industry Codes.
- 4.13 ELEXON agreed to continue updating the ISD tables and write-up in Working Document A to reflect the above discussions and outstanding areas.

ACTION 04/13

HEADLINE REPORT

- 4.14 ELEXON reminded the CCDG that it still needs to agree how best to separate the Line Loss Factor (LLF) data item from the LLF Class (LLFC). ELEXON noted that the proliferation in LLFCs over the years has been driven by non-Settlement requirements – for example, use of this data item to identify Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charging bands and load managed areas. As a result, there are now an order of magnitude more LLFC IDs in use than there are actual unique sets of LLFs for loss calculations. ELEXON advised that Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) creates an opportunity to avoid unnecessary duplication or the need for Settlement to cope with more LLFCs than are needed to apply loss adjustments.
- 4.15 A CCDG member noted that this has also been raised at other industry forums. ELEXON highlighted the need to join up the discussion with colleagues working on the Targeted Charging Review, which may also be developing requirements related to LLFCs.
- 4.16 ELEXON noted it has also discussed this question with the subset of CCDG members working on the registration straw man. This discussion has identified a potential way forward, which would involve using a look-up table (potentially held by the Registration Service) to reduce the need to proliferate LLFCs. Another CCDG member commented that they have been thinking along similar lines, and agreed to share ideas with ELEXON offline.
- 4.17 ELEXON agreed to work with internal colleagues and this CCDG member in order to:
- Overlay the MHHS and TCR requirements relating to LLFs/LLFCs, to establish any current conflicts and potential options for resolving these
 - Analyse how many unique groups of LLFs currently exist in Market Domain Data (MDD)
 - Work up how a look-up table might work and how this could resolve the issue.

ACTION 04/14

Registration: Data items, appointments and confirmations

- 4.18 ELEXON [presented](#) the latest straw man, which it has refined further with volunteer CCDG members since CCDG03.
- 4.19 ELEXON noted that it still needs to:
- Produce a final annotated process diagram
 - Add indicative timings
 - Incorporate the straw man into Working Document A
 - Write up an accompanying explanation within Working Document A, including the areas set out on slide 29
 - Merge the registration data into the ISD section of Working Document A, using the ISD reference for each data item rather than the legacy/Data Transfer Catalogue reference.
- 4.20 CCDG members agreed that the straw man is a logical solution. A member commented that the 'new' and 'old' terminology is perhaps a little confusing for the uninitiated and that it may be simpler to just refer to appointments generally.
- 4.21 A CCDG member commented that the joint CCDG/AWG interface subgroup may need a positive acceptance of appointments, not just the absence of a rejection.
- 4.22 ELEXON ran through the three potential options, set out on slide 28, for validating that a Service Provider is able to operate within the Market Segment for the Meter to which it is appointed. Members had differing views on which was best, with some expressing a preference for Option 2 and some for Option 3. The CCDG noted that this validation could be rules-based (for example, based on Meter type) but that consideration needs to be given to Meters changing Market Segments and situations where there may not currently be a

HEADLINE REPORT

Meter. A CCDG member suggested that a decision tree could help determine the best option and agreed to work with ELEXON to develop this outside of the meeting.

ACTION 04/15

- 4.23 ELEXON agreed to continue finessing the straw man for inclusion in Working Document A, incorporating the above discussions.

ACTION 04/16

- 4.24 ELEXON also gave an update on Action 02/07, noting that this can now be closed. ELEXON confirmed that:

- GSP Group is already held in the Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS)
- The Switching Programme will introduce Domestic Premises Indicator, Metered Indicator and Energy Flow
- While these new data items will initially be populated from existing Settlement data items (e.g. Measurement Class), they will then be mastered independently – either in the Central Switching Service (to which SMRS will sync) or in SMRS
- There is therefore no need for the BSC to master these data items in ISD.

- 4.25 ELEXON noted that the decision tree will help set rules for allocating Metering Systems to a TOM Segment based on the above data items.

- 4.26 A CCDG member asked whether the TOM could consider a way to link Import and Export Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs) to a single property, noting that the only current linkage is through address data. ELEXON agreed to look into whether this has been considered under the Switching Programme.

ACTION 04/17

5. BSC legal drafting questions

- 5.1 The CCDG agreed to postpone this item until CCDG05 Part B (see item 8 below).

6. Identify any further transitional requirements

- 6.1 The CCDG agreed to postpone this item to a future CCDG (potentially until after all the straw men have been finalised).

7. Assess recommendations so far against TOM Design / Development Principles

- 7.1 The CCDG agreed to postpone this item until all of the straw men have been finalised.

8. Summary and next steps

- 8.1 The CCDG agreed that Part A of CCDG05 will go ahead on the originally-scheduled date of 21 April 2020, and will be held from 09:30-12:30 by Skype. The agenda for this meeting will focus on progressing outstanding areas of the straw men (in particular, exception reporting) and related TOM-design actions. It will also include progress updates from the recent AWG and CCDG/AWG subgroup meetings.
- 8.2 The CCDG agreed that Part B of CCDG05 will be held in late April by Skype, with the date TBC by ELEXON based on members' availability. The agenda for this meeting will focus on reviewing the Code Change Matrices completed by the code bodies and addressing ELEXON's BSC legal drafting questions. ELEXON will circulate the matrices before the meeting and the relevant code bodies will present slides to draw out the key themes/impacts for their Codes.
- 8.3 ELEXON noted that it had only received very minor comments on the CCDG04 Part A Headline Report, which it has now [published](#).

HEADLINE REPORT

ACTIONS

01/02 – Ofgem to clarify whether the legal text for MHHS should be drafted against the current Industry Codes baseline or new consolidated REC baseline – Open – Update provided at CCDG02. Ofgem is still considering this, and a representative from Ofgem’s REC team will be attending future Code bodies meetings.

02/05 – ELEXON to clarify what data item outputs the AWG needs from the CCDG and when – Open – ELEXON gave updates at CCDG03 and CCDG04 Part A. This is also being considered by the new joint CCDG/AWG subgroup.

02/07 – ELEXON to check with St Clements whether any of the following data items are already held in SMRS: GSP Group, AI/AE indicator and domestic/non-domestic indicator – Closed – See item 4 above.

03/04 – ELEXON to update the Registration straw man based on the discussions at CCDG03, circulate to the relevant CCDG members for further discussion and bring the outputs to CCDG04 – Closed – See item 4 above.

04/02 – ELEXON to work with the relevant CCDG members to draw out the pros and cons of the three options for Settlement run-off (including quantifying any associated risks), before bringing the outputs to CCDG05. ELEXON to send the relevant STAG paperwork to the volunteer CCDG members – Closed – ELEXON sent the STAG paperwork to relevant members on 26 March 2020. Discussion held on 6 April 2020. ELEXON will give a verbal update at CCDG05 Part A and bring the outputs to CCDG06.

04/03 – ELEXON to hold further offline discussion with Dom Bradbury and Paul Saker about the potential tariff implications of using average domestic load shapes for Economy 7 (E7) customers, to see if any consensus can be reached – Closed – See item 3 above.

04/04 – ELEXON to work with the relevant CCDG members to reconsider the exception reporting straw man in light of discussions at CCDG04 Part A, before bringing the outputs to CCDG05. ELEXON to focus on what last-resort protections are needed for Settlement and consider if/how the AWG’s work can help remove the need for downstream validation checks – Open – Discussion held on 31 March 2020. ELEXON will bring the outputs to CCDG05 Part A.

04/06 – ELEXON to consider further any issues associated with processing partial data if Actual/Estimate IDs are allocated to CCCs at a Settlement Period level – Open – See item 4 above. ELEXON circulated a list of questions to the CCDG on 7 April 2020. Members to respond with their views on the benefits and disbenefits of processing partial data. Agenda item at CCDG05 Part A.

04/07 – ELEXON to work with the relevant CCDG members to consider further how ‘clock time’ Supplier/agent appointments will work under a UTC-based TOM – Open – See item 4 above. Relevant CCDG members to respond with their comments. Agenda item at CCDG05 Part A.

04/08 – ELEXON to produce a spreadsheet showing the difference between using Estimation Methods 6 or 7 to create adjusted Load Shapes for Register Read Meters with switched load – Closed – ELEXON circulated the spreadsheet to the CCDG on 7 April 2020. Agenda item at CCDG05 Part A.

04/09 - ELEXON to use the SPM snapshots at the SF Run, and the counts by Profile Classes 2&4 and SSCs, to tabulate the split between customers on Midnight to 7 and 00:30 to 07:30 for each GSP Group – Closed – ELEXON circulated the tabulated counts to the CCDG on 7 April 2020. Agenda item at CCDG05 Part A.

04/10 – ELEXON to write up, in one of the Working Documents, the solution for adjusting Load Shapes for Register Read Meters with switched load. Write-up to clarify which types of switched load the solution covers – Open.

04/11 – ELEXON and the CCDG to revisit the need for any TOM requirements for RTS Meters at a future meeting, once more information is available on any extension to the RTS arrangements – Open - ELEXON is maintaining a watching brief.

HEADLINE REPORT

04/12 – CCDG member to check/confirm that the DCC assumes that changes to appointments (as they relate to access controls) happen at midnight UTC – Closed – Email received from the CCDG member on 3 April 2020 confirming that the DCC uses UTC.

04/13 – ELEXON to continue updating the ISD tables and write-up in Working Document A to reflect the CCDG04 discussions and outstanding areas – Open.

04/14 – ELEXON to work with internal colleagues and a CCDG member to progress a potential solution to separate the LLF and LLFC data items, as discussed at CCDG04 Part B – Open – Email received from the CCDG member on 3 April 2020, containing suggested options for a LLF look-up table.

04/15 – ELEXON and a CCDG member to work up a decision tree, to help determine the best option for validating that a TOM Service Provider can operate in the Market Segment for the Meter to which they are appointed – Open – Email received from the CCDG member on 3 April 2020 with suggestions for a decision tree.

04/16 – ELEXON to continue finessing the Registration straw man for inclusion in Working Document A, incorporating the discussions from CCDG04 – Open.

04/17 – ELEXON to look into whether the Switching Programme has considered any ways of linking Import and Export MPANs to a single property – Open.