

ELEXON

**Code Change and Development Group:
Meeting 11**

ELEXON

17 November 2020

Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

Meeting objectives:

- Note update on new migration deliverable
- Agree approaches for design questions arising since CCDG10
- Agree key messages and questions for forthcoming consultation
- Agree final BSC, DCUSA and MRA matrices for inclusion in consultation

Next steps:

- Elexon will update the consultation document with today's comments and post it on Teams
- Members to review and comment from 23-27 November using Teams
- Elexon to send the near-final draft to members on 7 December (CCDG12 paper day)
- CCDG to sign off final document at CCDG12 on 15 December
- Consultation to be issued on 17 December, closing 26 January
- Elexon is planning an industry webinar for 13 January

Update on new transition / migration deliverable

We're continuing to discuss the scope/timing of this new deliverable with Ofgem

The table below shows the estimated impact on the CCDG milestone timings (still TBA)

We will share a more detailed plan of activities for this deliverable at December's meeting

Milestone	Nov 2020 re-plan**	Sep 2020 re-plan*	Original Dec 2019 plan
TOM design & matrices consultation (end state)	Mid Dec 2020 – late Jan 2021	Mid Dec 2020 – late Jan 2021	Jun – Jul 2020
Transition consultation (migration, Settlement run-off, assurance)	May – Jun 2021	N/A	N/A
Transition report to Ofgem	Aug 2021	N/A	N/A
Legal drafting consultation	Jan – Feb 2022	Jul – Aug 2021	Feb 2021
CCDG final report to Ofgem	May 2022	Nov 2021	May 2021

*Sep 2020 re-plan included COVID/cyber-attack impacts, new CCDG/AWG subgroup activities and new design questions arising from the CCDG

** Nov 2020 re-plan additionally includes the new transition deliverable requested by Ofgem



SCR UPDATE



DESIGN QUESTIONS

Exception Reporting

Exception Reporting sub-group convened on 12 November, supported by Andy Roberts (AWG), to agree the detail of what exception reporting will be required from Central Systems.

Assumptions:

Architecture/technology solutions can:

1. Provide registration data to all appropriate parties in a timely manner;
2. Ensure a degree of data validation;
3. Facilitate timely delivery/failure notifications with all communications.

This, along with Registration and Data Services processes, would mean that explicit validation processes within Central Systems is no longer required.

What exception reports are required from Central Systems?

- ☐ Data Services have an accurate view of data they have sent to Central systems, and what data is still expected from them.
- ☐ At MDS run time, reports should be produced detailing which MPANs have been defaulted for which settlement days/periods.
- ☐ Report needs settlement period granularity because Data Services can submit part-days of data.
- ☐ These reports should be made available to the Data Service and Supplier.

Requirement for Meter Advance reconciliation against daily consumption

Meeting held last Tuesday with Seth Chapman, Dom Bradbury and Paul Akrill on the validation requirement issue.

- ☐ I made the case that previously the SRAG questioned the value of the check. I noted the SEC/DCC indicated that difference can occur 'rarely' but we had no stats. However, they pointed out that the metering itself is not that different than CoP5 metering where there is an equivalent requirement.
- ☐ Dom suggested they picked up errors on 'total v register' and 'total v vend' when they performed the checks.
- ☐ I suggested that a sample could be tested but they felt every MPAN should undergo the test at some point. They also noted issues could occur with classes of meters/ manufacturers.
- ☐ We discussed frequency and didn't feel there was a need to undertake the check on a daily basis but that we shouldn't stop parties doing it at that frequency if they wish to.
- ☐ They pointed out there are few other validation checks available except the max consumption limit which is set quite high.
- ☐ They felt we should be setting out what is best for Settlement and if there is a restriction set under the SEC requirements that is up to them to specify.
- ☐ They also felt it would be useful to understand the capacity and cost implications.
- ☐ They noted in terms of data it was only 1 extra value to be transmitted, although noting it was for 30M meters.

Opt-out update and implications for domestic Advanced Meters

Data granularity indicator (recap of opt-out workshops held on 16 October and 6 November)

- ❑ It was agreed that the EFD and lowest granularity of data that can be collected from a customer should be added to the list of registration data items, and that they should be mastered by the Supplier. This should be part of the CoS process so that the gaining Supplier must update this information at that time once agreed with the customer.
- ❑ This was felt to be the best option because under the TOM there is no direct communication between Supplier and Data Service as part of the appointment process, so rather than create another interface between them it is simpler for the data to form part of the appointment.
- ❑ In the event of a SoLR where there is no CoS event visible in the Registration Service, a Supplier could take a month to contact the customer and so they and the SDS need an interim opt-out basis to work on. The subgroup considered it reasonable to use the previous opt-out preference which would be stored in Registration until it was updated.

Implications for the TOM design to support opt-out for domestic Advanced Meters

- ❑ The original TOM design anticipated that the application of domestic load shapes to register reads would be a requirement for the Smart and non-Smart segment only and that all Advanced Meters would be settled Half Hourly.
- ❑ To accommodate opted out Advanced Metered customers, the choice is therefore between:
 - 1) Treating all opted out Advanced customers as non-Smart for data collection and processing purposes (via the SDS); or
 - 2) Extending the application of domestic load shapes to register readings to the Advanced Data Service as well.

Opt-out update implications for domestic Advanced Meters (continued)

Option 1: treat opted-out Advanced Metered domestic customers as non-Smart

- ☐ Works from a data processing perspective by keeping all LSS interactions with the SDS
- ☐ SDS can contract with a qualified MRS to dial Advanced Meters, so doesn't impact SDS requirements
- ☐ Metering Service implications not as straightforward – such meters remain 'Advanced' under the SLCs
- ☐ Change in opt-out preference would trigger a Change of Segment even though meter itself is unchanged
- ☐ Daily opt-out granularity would not be available, which is consistent with other non-Smart Meters

Option 2: extend the application of domestic load shapes to register readings to the ADS

- ☐ Would require additional estimation requirements for the ADS to apply load shapes to opted-out customers
- ☐ ADS already has the capability to retrieve register readings from these meters and convert to HH data
- ☐ Metering Service can remain as MSA throughout, reflecting that the meter is still HH capable
- ☐ Change in opt-out preference would be smoother as only change would be a data granularity change
- ☐ Daily granularity could be provided if the meter is dialled every day, but this may not be cost effective
- ☐ Would enable opted-in Advanced metered customers to be included in the load shape calculation inputs

General consideration regardless of option chosen

- ☐ Where a large domestic customer has a CT connection, does this exclude them from the opt-out? If not, how to reconcile the conflict with the requirement that all CT Advanced meters are settled HH? How likely is such a connection and is this a valid exception case?

- ❑ There has been a long run issue about the requirements for SSCs and TPRs. Previously it was suggested that we pass them to another code to manage for non-Settlement Purposes
- ❑ However, the solution for non-smart meters with switch load requires the identification of the switched load register
- ❑ The agreed approach on MTDs requires the data to be passed in D0149. D0150 format which will require the SSC/ TPR data until the approach is discontinued
- ❑ The proposal set out in the consultation document is that the SSC/TPRs will be frozen and kept for 5 years after the end of transition
- ❑ Tables to be retained are SSC, TPR and VMR (which contains the switched load indicator)
- ❑ Do we also need to retain the Measurement Requirement table that maps SSC and TPRs?



CONSULTATION KEY MESSAGES

Key Messages (1)

- ❑ This is not a consultation on the preferred MHHS TOM design which Ofgem have provisionally agreed. It is a consultation on the CCDG developed the lower level detail on specific design areas within the MHHS TOM. The AWG will be providing the detail of data exchanges and end to end processes in their architecture requirements.
- ❑ Transition and Settlement Run-Off arrangements will be developed and consulted on during 2021 and will be followed by a consultation on legal changes to all impacted industry codes.
- ❑ The MHHS arrangements will segment the market by Meter Type rather than HH/NHH. In the Target End State the Change of Measurement Class process will no longer be required.
- ❑ The appointments process will change. The Registration system will be carry out the appointments of all Supplier procured Services. The D0155 and D0148 processes will be discontinued and new registration data items will be required.
- ❑ New data items and processes are likely to be required for the provision of data for network charging. This will depend on the outcomes of the Access and Forward-Looking Charges Significant Code Review.

Key Messages (2)

- ❑ There will be new processes for Change of Market Segment. The CoMC process will be used during the transition but will not occur in the Target End State.
- ❑ There will be a new calculation for GSPG Correction. New Consumption Component Classes have been defined with associated scaling weights.
- ❑ Special time limited arrangements will be put in place for non-smart customers with switched load. SSCs/ and TPRs will be frozen and retained for five years after the end of transition for this process.
- ❑ The drafting of Code changes will start next year, for all impacted industry codes. The Code sections and nature of changes required have been identified.
- ❑ Faster Switching will be implemented before the MHHS processes. There are other areas where dependant changes may be required.



CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Consultation Questions (1)

Question 1. Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design is consistent with the Design Working Group’s preferred Target Operating Model?

Yes/ No

Rationale:

Question 2. Do you agree that the detailed MHHS TOM design meets Ofgem’s Design and Development Principles?

Yes/ No

Rationale:

Consultation Questions (2)

Question 3. Do you have any specific comments on the proposed set of data items for the MHHS TOM?

Yes/ No

Rationale:

Question 4. Do you agree that the TOM should not include a process for correcting Settlement volumes associated with ETs?

Yes/ No

Rationale:

Question 5. What impact would the lack of a process to correct ET Settlement volumes have on your organisation?

Yes/ No

Rationale:

Consultation Questions (3)

Question 6. Do you have any specific comments on the proposed detailed processes for the MHHS TOM?

Yes/ No
Rationale:

Question 7. Do you believe that all the major changes to the Industry Code documents required to deliver the MHHS TOM have been identified?

Yes/ No
Rationale:

Question 8. Do you have any other comments?

Yes/ No
Rationale:

Question ?. For consistency we have adopted the existing BSCP Structure when producing the BSCP Matrix. Do you think there are any drivers for changing the scope and structure of these documents?

Yes/ No

Rationale:



REC UPDATE



BSC CHANGE MATRICES

- ☐ Matrices have been provided to CCDG
- ☐ Little has changed since last presented to the CCDG
- ☐ PSL non-functional timescales still need to be populated
- ☐ Review of BSC matrix undertaken with Elexon legal team
- ☐ No external review comments have been received to the BSC Matrices
- ☐ Do you have any comments before they are put into the consultation package?



Master Registration Agreement Service Company

Code Change and Development Group (CCDG) – MRA Code Change Matrix

17th November 2020

Managed by



Gemserve

Registration Services

Clauses 15, 16, 20 and 21

- Supplier's currently notify the Registration Service of the Agent Id and Type either as part of the Application for Registration, or following this.
- Data items submitted from the Supplier, following registration with the CSS, to the Registration Service will differ from those currently referenced in the MRA. **Clarification still required on if any data items will differ based on Market Sector (e.g. agent type).**
- Requirements for the Registration Service to notify the Data Aggregator will need to be amended to notify new market roles (Data Services and/or MDS). **Clarification required on who needs to be notified of Change of Supplier events, Initial Registration events and De-registration events.**
- Other references to existing agent roles to be amended to equivalent new agent roles.

Registration Services (cont'd)

Clause 22 and 23: Full and Selective Refresh and Clause 25: Resends

- Clarification still required on which Data Services will require Refreshes and Resends from the Registration Service. Will this only apply to the MDS or will the Data Services and Metering Services require this as well?

Clause 24: Changes and Confirmations of Data and Clause 28: Data and Message Processing

- Notification of changes to data items to be notified to Data Services and/or MDS, rather than Data Aggregator.
- References to existing agents, standing data items and MDMA to be updated to new terms.

Clause 33: Charging and Clause 34: Billing

- General clarification on if chargeable services (from the Registration Service) will apply to the MDS, Data Services and Metering Services.

Retrospective Amendments

Clause 19: Retrospective MPAD Amendments and MAP 04

- Clarification still required on which remaining/new MPAD items will be subject to Retrospective Amendments.
- Agent appointments are currently within scope of Retrospective Amendments. Will this remain the case under the new TOM?
- Which services will need to be notified of retrospective amendments? MDS? Data Service? Metering Service?
- MAP 04 currently restricts amendments prior to RF to cases where this is required as a result of a Trading Dispute in most cases. References throughout the document to 14 months that will need to be updated.

Disputed CoS Meter Readings and Erroneous Transfers

Clause 29: Change of Supplier Meter Reading and MAP 08

- Assumption that a process for replacing Change of Supplier meter readings will still be required. **Clarification required on if the D0086 data flow will continue in its current form for Smart/Non-Smart settled using Register Readings.**
- The process in MAP 08 currently includes steps for the NHHDC to send updated EACs/AAs which will no longer exist.

Clause 18: Error Rectification

- Assumption based on CCDG minded-to position (subject to consultation) that Settlement adjustments will not be required for Erroneous Transfers under the new TOM.

New MPAN Requests and Related MPANs

MAP 27: Requesting Additional MPANs

- Currently mandatory for Suppliers to provide the expected Measurement Class and Profile Class of a new/additional MPAN when sending the request to the DNO.
- Clarification required on if this requirement can simply be removed or the DNOs will require other information under the new TOM (e.g. the Market Sector).

MAP 29: Related MPANs

- Currently refers to criteria and actions for Half Hourly Metering Points and Non-Half Hourly Metering Points separately. The criteria aligns well with the new Market Sectors (Smart, Advanced, UMS) so the procedure could separate the requirements in this way.
- Requirement to amend MTCs to related/non-related ranges as part of the procedure. Clarification required on if this will still be necessary once the Related MPAN Indicator is in full use.

Summary

- Main impacts relate to low level exchange of messages and data items between market participants and the registration system.
- Clarification needed on which services need to be informed of different events in the registration system in place of the current Data Aggregator role.
- Determinations needed on new interfaces, messages, data items and interaction sequences prior to legal drafting. Legal drafting will need to reflect the agreed solutions.
- Other impacts mainly relate to changes in terminology or redundant references that will be removed as part of the RCC and Switching SCRs.

MRA

Master Registration Agreement Service Company

Any questions?

Jonathan Hawkins

Managed by



Gemserv



ElectraLink

CCDG

Impact on Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement



Summary

- MHHS Code Matrix Approach
- DCUSA Impact
- High level review
- Summary
- Q&A



ElectraLink

MHHS Code Matrix Approach

- Extracted BSC related clauses from DCUSA into separate document
- Added clauses into Code Matrix template
- Approach ensures that all clauses have been considered
- Presented to CCDG on 01 May 2020
- Updated to cater for approved changes to DCUSA
- Created five distinct categories/impacted areas
- Created separate DCUSA legal text (unaltered) for each for future changes



ElectraLink

DCUSA Impact

- Five key areas:
 - Unmetered Supplies
 - Load Managed Areas
 - Use of System CDCM Charging Methodologies
 - Housekeeping changes
 - Residual Charge Banding



ElectraLink

High Level Review

Unmetered Supplies

- A review identified several areas within the National Terms of Connection (NTC) that could be made in advance of the SCR to provide clarity to the current business as usual activities and deliver the change sooner than the SCR
- A new change proposal was raised to cater for these changes in October (DCP375)
- The obligations are to be amended to make them generic in nature rather than specific to the Non Half-Hourly or Half-Hourly market.
- The remaining clauses identified in the Code Matrix will be subsumed within the SCR housekeeping change



ElectraLink

High Level Review

Residual Charge Banding

- The Targeted Charging review introduced charging bands
- DCP358 and DCP360 introduced a new schedule to DCUSA (Imp date Sep 20)
- Various clauses cater for the non half-hourly market
- Added to the Code Matrix as a separate category of change required
- Consideration jointly with the Electricity System Operator (ESO) to cater for a similar outcome across codes



ElectraLink

Summary

- Code Matrix updated since May to cater for:
 - approach to Unmetered Supplies
 - approved DCUSA changes due to Targeted Charging Review SCR
- An understanding of BSC terms still deemed necessary could also reduce the necessary changes to DCUSA
- The approach to be adopted by the Electricity Network Access and Forward-Looking Charging (A&FLC) Review may impact the changes (Charging Methodology, Demand Control and Billing data)



Summary

Change	Comments
Unmetered Supplies	DCP375 to cater for changes to NTC. The remainder to form part of the housekeeping change
Demand Control	An understanding of whether this is catered for within the A&FLC SCR would be helpful
Charging Methodology and billing	An understanding of whether this is catered for within the A&FLC SCR would be helpful
Housekeeping	An understanding of some of the terminology that lives on would be helpful
Residual Charge Bands	New requirement. Changes required to remove NHH references. Common approach with the ESO



ElectraLink

Question and Answer session



APPROACH TO CUSC CHANGES

Elxon and Ofgem met with ESO CUSC representatives and we propose the following wording for the consultation:

Changes relating to the CUSC have not been included due to the dependency on understanding the requirements following the Access and Future Looking Charges Significant Code Review. New registration identifiers may be required. The requirements may also entail changes to the existing P210 TUoS data flow and timing changes may impact the SAAI014 data flow. The mechanism for provision of the data is also being considered and may be implemented prior to the MHHS TOM.



APPROACH TO DUOS INTERACTIONS

Elxon and Ofgem met with DCMDG to discuss the changes representatives and we propose the following wording for the consultation:

No requirements for changes relating to the provision of data for network charging have been included in this consultation due to the dependency on understanding the requirements following the Access and Future Looking Charges Significant Code Review. New identifiers in registration may be required under the AFLC SCR to allow the required aggregations to be undertaken by central systems prior to the implementation of the MHHS TOM. Likewise, meter level data will be required for tariff and banding setting.



NEXT STEPS