

Public

Design Working Group

Meeting 18

22 May 2019
ELEXON



Health & Safety

In case of an emergency

An alarm will sound to alert you. The alarm is tested for fifteen seconds every Wednesday at 9.20am

Evacuating 350 Euston Road

- If you discover a fire, operate one of the fire alarms next to the four emergency exits.
- Please do not tackle a fire yourself.
- If you hear the alarm, please leave the building immediately.
- Evacuate by the nearest signposted fire exit and walk to the assembly point.
- Please remain with a member of ELEXON staff and await further instructions from a Fire Warden.
- For visitors unable to use stairs, a Fire Warden will guide you to a refuge point and let the fire brigade know where you are.

When evacuating please remember

- Do not use the lifts.
- Do not re-enter the building until the all clear has been given by the Fire Warden or ground floor security.

Our team on reception is here to help you, if you have any questions, please do ask them.



Agenda

Agenda item	Paper no.	Lead
1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives	Verbal / Gantt chart	Kathryn Coffin
2. Ofgem SCR update	Verbal	Jasmine Killen
3. Review transition consultation document by area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement Classes / metering mapping • Transition approach by segment • Transition critical path • Elective Half Hourly • Performance assurance impacts • Settlement timetable transition approach • Any other comments on report 	Draft consultation document / Slides	Kevin Spencer Matt McKeon Matt McKeon Matt McKeon Matt McKeon Kevin Spencer Kevin Spencer
4. Agree consultation questions	Draft consultation document / Slides	Kevin Spencer
5. Agree transition content for RAID log	Draft consultation document / Slides	Mark De Souza-Wilson
6. DWG17 Headline Report and Actions	Actions log	Kathryn Coffin
7. Summary and next steps	Verbal	Kathryn Coffin




Ofgem SCR Update

Jasmine Killen



Review of Consultation by area

Kevin Spencer / Matt McKeon



Measurement Class / Meter Type Mapping

Pages 14 - 16

Kevin Spencer

Measurement Class/ Meter Type Mapping: NHH (Pages 14 - 15)

Profile Class	Meter Type	Current MC	Destination MC	Destination Market Segment
01and 02	Whole Current (SMETS)	A	F	Smart and Non-smart
	Non-Smart (and not Advanced)	A	F	Smart and Non-smart
	Advanced (Whole Current)	A	F	Advanced (unless replaced by smart Meter)
	Advanced (with Current Transformer)	A	F	Advanced
01	Unmetered Supply	B	D	Unmetered Supplies
03 and 04	Whole Current (SMETS)	A	G	Smart and Non-smart
	Non-Smart (and not Advanced)	A	G	Smart and Non-smart
	Advanced (Whole Current)	A	G	Advanced (unless replaced by smart Meter)
	Advanced (CT)	A	E	Advanced
05 to 08	Advanced (Whole Current)	A	G	Advanced (unless replaced by smart Meter)
	Advanced (CT)	A	E	Advanced
08	Unmetered Supply	B	D	Unmetered Supplies
Default Domestic	Meters without comms. or HH capability at Target End State	A	F	Smart and Non-smart
Default Non-Domestic	Meters without comms. or HH capability at Target End State	A	G	Smart and Non-smart

Measurement Class/ Meter Type Mapping: HH (Page 16)

Meter Type	Current MC	Destination MC	Destination Market Segment
Advanced HH (>100 kW)	C	C	Advanced
Advanced CT (<100 kW MD)	E	E	Advanced
Advanced Non-Domestic Whole Current (<100 kW MD)	G	G	Advanced
Domestic Elective SMETS	F	F	Smart and Non-smart
Non-Domestic Elective SMETS	G	G	Smart and Non-smart
Unmetered Supply	D	D	Unmetered
Default HH Meters no comms.	No change to MC	No change to MC	Advanced



Transition Approach by Market Segment and Critical Path

Pages 20 - 28

Matt McKeon

Transition Approach by Segment and Critical Path

- **High level approach by Market Segment**

Pages 20 - 21

- **Smart-Non Smart Market Segment**

Page 22 and Appendix A (pages 34 – 49)

- **Advanced Market Segment**

Pages 22 - 23 and Appendix A (pages 34 – 49)

- **Unmetered Market Segment**

Page 23 and Appendix A (pages 34 – 49)

- **Cross-segment approach and critical path**

Pages 24 - 28 and Appendix B (page 50)



Elective HHS

Pages 16 - 17

Matt McKeon



Performance Assurance Impact

Pages 18 - 20

Matt McKeon



Settlement Timetable Transition approach and any other comments

Pages 29 - 31

Kevin Spencer

Settlement Timetable transition (Page 29 to 31)

DWG proposals on the timing for introducing the revised Settlement Timetable

The DWG have discussed the timing of the transition to the new Settlement Timetable. The DWG identified that one consideration for the timing would be the penetration of smart Meters, noting that the Stage 2 consultation responses favoured 'back loading' the cutover to the new timetable (i.e. making it one of the last activities for transition):

Arguments for:

- Allows maximum time for the MDS, LSS and TOM data services to be ready;
- Ensures the new Settlement Calendar will only impact BSC Central Systems;
- Allows the PAF to monitor performance while new serials are developed;
- Allows for a stepped reduction of key reconciliation runs (e.g. SF, RF and DF).

Arguments against:

- Extends NHH runoff later in absolute time (although this could be sped up);
- Requires HH Aggregators to be in place for longer before MDS takes over; and
- Delays realisation of benefits related to faster reconciliation.



Executive Summary

Key messages on Transition

Matt McKeon

ELEXON

Executive Summary – key messages on Transition

- This is not planned to be a 'big bang' implementation of the TOM but a phased migration approach from the existing to the new arrangements.
- In regard to the 'one way gate', an MPAN should transition to the new arrangements once but to do this everyone would need to be ready at the same time so as not to create barriers to switching, undermining the competitive retail market.
- The critical path for transition is going to be driven by the readiness of the central systems to support the TOM. Once those are in place the window for transition can start, it is then a question of how long that window should be.
- For a large proportion of the market, this is about evolution, not revolution. Parties could provide old style NHH/HH and new TOM services at the same time, enabling migration between the two operating models without an unnecessary transfer of data.
- Transition to the new settlement timetable will only occur when the TOM is in place and will be based on an assessment of the data available. The move to a shorter settlement timetable should not adversely impact the accuracy of the data used in the settlement process.
- ?



Consultation Questions

Page 33 (placeholder)

Kevin Spencer

Consultation Questions:1

Question 1	Do you agree with the DWG's proposed mapping for Metering System types to Market Segments?
Please list any elements that should amended.	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 2	Do you believe it is feasible to use the elective HHS process to migrate large amounts of customers to HHS as an interim step in the transition process?
Please identify any issues you have noted with the current elective process.	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 3	Do you agree all the potential on impacts on the PAF have been identified?
Please identify any omissions that you can identify.	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 4	Do you agree with the phased approaches proposed for each Market Segment?
Please identify any issues and dependencies with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	

Consultation Questions:2

Question 5	Do you agree with the critical path for transition identified by the DWG?
Please identify any issues and dependencies with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 6	Do you agree DWG's proposed approach for transitioning to the revised Settlement Timetable?
Please identify any issues with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 7	Do you agree DWG's proposed approach for the timing of the Dispute Run.
Please identify any issues with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	
Question 8	Do you agree DWG's proposed approach to setting the Dispute Materiality Thresholds?
Please identify any issues with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	

Consultation Questions:3

Question 9	Do you agree with the Transitional Risks, Issues, Assumptions and Dependencies identified by the DWG?
Please identify any issues with the proposed approach,	
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	

Question 10	Do you have any other comments?
Answer: Yes/No (delete as appropriate)	
<i>Please provide your reasons here</i>	



Transition Content for RAID log

Mark De Souza-Wilson

Appendix D: Definitions

Risks	Possibility of events happening or of situations developing that have an impact on MHHS under the TOM
Assumptions	Accepted as true/certain without proof
Issues	Problems, difficulties, hurdles, obstacles that need to be overcome
Dependencies	External factors required before MHHS TOM can function

Dependencies – “What would hold us up”

Dependency	Notes
DCC must have the capability to handle the volume of data to be pulled from smart meters	
There must be a sufficient proportion of DCC-serviced smart meters providing SP-level data for settlement	...to enable production of load shapes
Registration Services must be updated and upgraded	Need to hold data on new services and also additional data items eg. opt-out flag
Code changes must be directed by Ofgem	
DCC must have a role that enable the MDR to operate as designed	

Issues – “To do list”

Issue	Notes
Application of Group Correction Factor needs to be considered	e.g. how GCF is applied to NHHDC-serviced meters vs SDS-serviced meters during transition.
Need to curtail migrated MPANS from switching back to NHH	
Need to define large UMS customers for the purpose of phased transtion	

Assumptions (1)

Assumption	Notes
Ofgem's charging review requirements can be catered for in the proposed TOM design	There is close contact between Ofgem's MHHS and charging reform teams.
HH data will not be accessible from some meters	Could be due to customer choice, communication issues or meter characteristics.
Settlement will continue to be in clock time	Smart meters use UTC
Ofgem policy decision on Access to Data will be in line with the least regrets steer provided	
Ofgem policy decision on Supplier Agent Functions will be in line with the least regrets steer provided	

Assumptions (2)

Assumption	Notes
Sites transitioning between HH and NHH will not cause the loss of related-meter identification	
Advanced meters without functional communications will either be repaired or replaced by a smart meter	
Interfaces can be tested, for qualification, using stubs	This allows services to qualify independently of other services.
NHH Advanced meters will be upgraded to gain HH functionality	

Risks

Risk	Notes
Transition could destabilise settlement for HH Advanced Meters	This sector of the market currently consists of around 360k metering systems and accounts for 50% of the energy in settlements
European legislation could mandate a 15-minute settlement period	TOM design refers to 'Settlement Period' rather than 'half hour'
DCC could fail to meet the required performance levels	DCC is regulated by Ofgem
The first SDS going live could create distortion in the market	Some smart/non-smart meters would be HH-settled whilst others would be settled on EACs/AAs.

Other considerations

- What can we do to validate assumptions?
- What can we do to mitigate risks?
- Are there any items missing from the RAID log?

