

CONSULTATION FOLLOW UP CALLS (DWG ACTION 08/01)

Energy Local

We asked Energy Local why they preferred separate Services in their response. They said that in their experience bigger player were:

- Less innovative;
- More difficult to work with;
- Less open to change; and
- Harder to access decision makers.

On the question of data access, they felt that a central portal for data access would be useful and that the system architecture could allow for flexibility 'behind the scenes'.

Salient Systems

We asked about their response to Question 1, which proposed an new ECVN/MVRN service. Salient clarified that they were proposing a kind of role similar to the Customer Notification Agent (CAN) role set out in ELEXON's white paper. They noted that there are a lot of ideas being touted and third parties are looking at trading systems and community energy offerings.

On the Consumption Data Estimation Service, they were suggesting a service that applies a common set of estimation rules for both processing and aggregation services.

Stark

Stark has provided clarification on the interaction of the TOMs with heat networks, identified in their response to the consultation:

'The response to Q6 was trying to convey that TOMs that rely on centralisation (e.g. TOM E) could be restrictive to new technologies e.g. Electric Vehicles or Heat Networks.'

'The complexity in these additional services is not fully understood at the moment and may be constrained by a centralised model, for instance differing metering arrangements/approaches in the case of EVs, as well as the impact of V2G on the requirement for settlement of export.'

'Similarly, a centralised model, due to their size and complexity, will make it difficult to run small scale trials for new technologies.'

'Another concern was that if centralisation become the preferred route in electricity then this could influence the emerging arrangements in Heat Networks.'

Siemens

Has provided information, which we are reviewing, on the two examples set out in their consultation response:

'The U.S.A. offers examples in the Texas (ERCOT) market and PJM, which covers several Mid-Atlantic states. The former has a monopoly hub, Smart Meter Texas, that has proved to be expensive and inflexible; for example, it has taken several years to decide on and implement third party data access (with consumer permissions). The latter relies on a standard developed collaboratively via the North American Energy Standards Board and has evolved into a highly dynamic energy services market with high levels of participation and frequent new entrants.'

TMA

We have contacted TMA but are still awaiting clarification on their view that a Load Shaping Service is not required.