

Public

Review of the RAID Log

17 July 2018
Mark De Souza-Wilson

ELEXON

Definitions

Risks	Possibility of events happening or of situations developing that have an impact on MHHS (not project)
Assumptions	Accepted as true/certain without proof
Issues	Problems, difficulties, hurdles, obstacles that need to be overcome
Dependencies	Required before MHHS TOM can function

Dependencies (1) – “What we’re waiting for”

No.	Dependency	Comment
D01	Smart Meter Roll Out	Uptake of Smart Meters is key to MHHS and critical to load shaping
D02	Faster Switching	How would this affect the TOM?
D03	Policy - data access	TOM might require pseudonymisation service or anonymisation processes for customers opting-out of SP-level data
D04	Policy - centralisation	Defines market structure

Dependencies (2) – “What we’re waiting for”

No.	Dependency	Comment
D05	European Policy	Politics - can change overall requirements eg. 15-minute settlement. Ongoing risk?
D06	Flexibility innovations	Should we cater for White Paper flexibility now? Assumption for future? Couldn't be an issue for MHHS.
D07	Targeted Charging Review	Can we assume providing SP-level data for each MPAN will suffice?
D08	Brexit	Politics

Issues – “To do list”

No.	Issue	Comment
I01	No requirement to meter/settle export	TOMs have the capability to settle export. Requirement is a policy issue.
I02	Issues when a meter transitions between NHH & HH Settlement	How would this affect the TOM? Is it a data item for the Registration Service?
I03	Identifying type of customer/meter at point of sale	Does this affect Settlement? What data is in ECOES and what relates to customer choice?
I04	FiTs Meters or other behind-the-meter Metering	Is this something to be accommodated within the MHHS TOM?
I05	Interaction with customer billing	Does TOM need to provide additional data to Suppliers? Is this within scope?

Assumptions (1)

No.	Dependency	Comment
A01	Suppliers remain registrant of Meters	Will contribute to Registration Service and Volume Allocation Service
A02	Communications networks can handle volume of data	DCC, DTN etc. will need to be up to required standard in target end state. Is there planned upgrade or is this an issue?
A03	DCC can meet SLA	Processing service is being designed to handle missing data
A04	HH data from smart Meters is suitable for Settlement	Critical to MHHS. Should check immediately.

Assumptions (2)

No.	Dependency	Comment
A05	There will be some Meters which can't provide HH data	Should expand Meter assumption to include all meter types, all data types and the data access methods?
A06	Settlement in clock time and Meter data in UTC	SMETS2 details and CVA requirements are already known.
A07	Wh to kWh in Processing. kWh to MWh in Aggregation.	Meter data units are known. End requirements are known. Why convert to kWh in Processing?
A08	All smart Meters will be DCC-serviced	Can have combined assumption about Meters in target end state. Perhaps DCC adoption is a dependency?

Risks

No.	Dependency	Comment
R01	Risk that changes de-stabilise the existing HH market	No real changes to the Advanced segment are being proposed. Would a risk be due to the transition/implementation plan?

Other considerations

- Likelihood of issues if assumptions do not hold (Risk)
- Can assume we'll transition to MHHS smoothly, or recognise that transition might carry risk
- Can assume DCC structure can support the use of a Retrieval Service, or add required modifications to Issues list?
- Any more?