

Public

# WG3: Evaluation of UMS options

---

DWG meeting 10

ELEXON  
22 August 2018

**ELEXON**

---

## Options evaluated

---

- At the first WG3 meeting, we evaluated four different options for handling smaller UMS customers in MHHS as follows:
  - 1) Option 1: where the UMSO aggregates inventories for smaller unmetered customers – retaining the EAC for billing but using aggregated MPANs by Supplier/GSP Group for Settlement
  - 2) Option 2: which treats all customer MPANs as HH
  - 3) Option 3: a half-way house between Options 1 and 2, where:
    - a) The UMSO sends the summary inventory for individual MPANs to the Settlement Period UMS Service (SPUMS, aka the MA)
    - b) The SPUMS processes them as aggregated MPANs by Supplier/GSP Group
  - 4) Option 4: where the UMSO sends the EAC to the SPUMS & the SPUMS profiles it
- WG3 agreed that Option 2 best delivers the TOM design principles.

# Evaluation matrix

MHHS: UMS options discussed by DWG WG3		Aligns with design principles	Most like HH metered arrangements	Removes EACs / Burn Hours - Y/N	Least no. of datasets required	Reflects ToU for customers	Avoids large/small customer threshold	Requires dual processes - Y/N	Adds CoS / CoMC complexity - Y/N	Extent of UMSO system changes	Extent of MA system changes	Extent of HHDA impact	Extent of Supplier system changes	Enables reconciliation of billing & Settlement data - Y/N	Accuracy of allocation	Gives cost-refl. billing opportunity - Y/N	Facilitates future innovations (e.g. offsetting of generation & supply)	Least no. of MPANs required	Requires related MPANs - Y/N	Facilitates new entrants - Y/N	Extent of Customer impact	Total Green	Total Red
Op. 1	Aggregated Inventories from UMSO	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5	10
Op. 2	Summary Inventories from UMSO	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	15	2
Op. 3	Summary Inventories from UMSO, MA aggregates	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	1	11
Op. 4	EACs from UMSO	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	14

# Evaluation by option: Option 1

- UMSO aggregates inventories for smaller unmetered customers – retaining the EAC for billing but using aggregated MPANs by Supplier/GSP Group for Settlement

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Uses existing arrangement for large customers</li><li>• Less data volumes due to aggregation</li><li>• Simple for SPUMS to implement</li><li>• More accurate than current NHH allocation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to define and maintain large/small customer threshold</li><li>• Difficult for Supplier to reconcile EACs for billing with Settlement data</li><li>• UMSO system changes to aggregate inventories</li><li>• Timing issues on change of inventory / CoS</li><li>• Dual processes difficult for new entrants</li><li>• Does not allow UMS energy to be off-set with generation at customer level</li><li>• Introduces complexity as requires related MPAN for aggregated inventories</li><li>• Supplier would not get UMS consumption at HH level per customer</li></ul>

# Evaluation by option: Option 2

- Treats all UMS customer MPANs as currently for HH

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Removes need for EACs</li><li>• Issues on CoS removed</li><li>• No issues on change of inventory</li><li>• More accurate than current NHH allocation</li><li>• No need to define and maintain large/small customer threshold</li><li>• Gives same granularity as smart Meter data</li><li>• More cost-reflective billing (than being billed on an EAC)</li><li>• No dual processes</li><li>• Removes need for Burn Hours standing data</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Greater data exchanges than Option 1 (but not significantly, ~20k MPANs only)</li><li>• MA system needs to be more granular (report to nearest Wh)</li><li>• Equivalent Meter changes required</li><li>• UMISO system changes may be required to send inventories for smaller customers</li><li>• Smaller customers not billed on EACs</li></ul>

## Evaluation by option: Option 3

- UMSO sends summary inventory for individual MPANs to SPUMS, but SPUMS processes them as aggregated MPANs by Supplier/GSP Group

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Uses existing arrangement for large customers</li><li>• Less data volumes due to aggregation by the SPUMS</li><li>• Simple for UMSO to implement</li><li>• More accurate than current NHH allocation</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to define and maintain large/small customer threshold</li><li>• Difficult for Supplier to reconcile EACs for billing with Settlement data</li><li>• SPUMS system changes to aggregate inventories</li><li>• Timing issues on change of inventory / CoS</li><li>• Dual processes difficult for new entrants</li><li>• Does not allow UMS energy to be off-set with generation at customer level</li><li>• Introduces complexity as related MPAN for aggregated inventories would be required</li><li>• Supplier would not get UMS consumption at HH level per customer</li></ul>

## Evaluation by option: Option 4

- UMISO sends the EAC to the SPUMS and the SPUMS profiles it

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple for UMISO to implement</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not reduce data volumes (assuming profile required for four existing categories)</li><li>• Need to define and maintain large/small customer threshold</li><li>• Difficult for Supplier to reconcile EACs for billing with Settlement data</li><li>• UMISO system changes to send EAC</li><li>• SPUMS system changes to profile EACs</li><li>• Dual processes difficult for new entrants</li><li>• Retains EACs and need for Burn Hours standing data</li><li>• Does not allow UMS energy to be off-set with generation at customer level</li><li>• Less accurate allocation of energy as switching/dimming behaviour cannot be modelled</li><li>• Supplier would not get UMS consumption at HH level per customer</li></ul>

