

## Minutes

### Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG)

Meeting number **245**

Venue **Elexon/Teams**

Date of meeting **6 July 2021 09:30**

Classification **Public**

#### Attendees and apologies

##### Attendees

Oliver Meggitt	OLM	Chairman
Sarah Ross	SAR	Vice Chair
Paige Binet	PAB	Technical Secretary
Sedef Kiris	SEK	Elexon, presenter
Freya Gardner	FRG	Elexon, presenter
Kevin Spencer	KES	Elexon, presenter
Jenny Sarsfield	JES	Elexon, presenter
Santosh Vasudevan	SAV	Elexon, presenter
Wayne Jenkins	WAJ	Elexon, presenter
Andrew Grace	ANG	Elexon, presenter
Elliott Harper	ELH	Elexon, presenter
Jonathan Priestley	JOP	SVG Member
John Jones	JOJ	SVG Member
Lee Stone	LES	SVG Member
Annika Moody	ANM	SVG Member (alternate)
James Evans	JAE	SVG Member
Phil Russell	PHR	SVG Member
Simon Yeo	SIY	SVG Member
Vijay Chikoti	VIC	Distribution System Operators Representative (alternate)
Gareth Evans	GAE	SVG Member
Tom Edwards	TOE	Panel Sponsor

##### Apologies

Kevin Woollard	KEW	SVG Member (alternate)
Paul Hart	PAH	Distribution System Operators Representative
Iain Hall	IAH	SVG Member
John Liddell	JOL	SVG Member

### OPEN SESSION – DECISION PAPERS

#### 1. MDD Change Requests for Version 313 (SVG245/01)

- 1.1 This paper invited the SVG to approve eight General Change Requests, and note 17 Fast Track Change Requests, for implementation in Version 313 of Market Domain Data (MDD) with a go-live date of 21 July 2021.
- 1.2 No Comments.
- The SVG:
- a) **APPROVED** eight General Change Requests for implementation in MDD 313 with a go-live date of 21 July 2021;
- b) **NOTED** 17 Fast Track Change Requests for implementation in MDD 313 with a go-live date of 21 July 2021; and
- c) **NOTED** the Market Participant Impact Assessment comment for CR M3817.

## 2. **CP1543 'Use of DTC dataflow D0051 in the Half Hourly sector for Data Collectors to confirm the Data Retrieval method to Suppliers' (SVG245/02)**

- 2.1 A SVG Member stated that from their perspective and the line of work they are in they would like it to go back out for consultation after reading the changes made to the solution. A SVG Member felt that using a D0268 would still only provide a point in time view of the Retrieval Method and noted that there are currently other dataflows and processes that can identify the data, citing D0001s and D0002s as examples.
- 2.2 A SVG Member had some queries on the statements in the Change Proposal and wanted to understand the purpose or the implication where Elexon stated they would be putting the obligation on the HHDC to confirm the Retrieval Method.
- 2.3 Elexon stated, following discussions with the Proposer, that the Proposer's rationale for raising the CP was to enable a uniform approach from all DCs, noting that whilst contracting with different DC's they would use different methods to identify the Retrieval Method.
- 2.4 Elexon added that they felt from the consultation responses received a majority of respondents were in support of the Change Proposal, but the timing of where a D0051 is sent was queried by a number of respondents. Following discussions with the Proposer, they felt sending after the receipt of a D0268 was a more logical solution, and given some original respondents had agreed with the original solution CP1543 should go back out to Industry Consultation to ensure all views are received against the updated solution.

The SVG:

- a) **AGREED** the amendments to the proposed redlining for BSCP502 for CP1543 made following the CP Consultation; and
- b) **AGREED** that CP1543 be re-published for a second industry consultation phase due to material changes to the solution following the first industry consultation phase.

---

## **OPEN SESSION – INFORMATION PAPERS**

### **3. Introducing Data Transfer Catalogue flows to transfer UMS files (SVG245/03)**

- 3.1 A SVG Member questioned if all MA and UMSO have access to the Data Transfer Network. Elexon stated that MAs do and most UMSOs would also. A SVG Member noted that many years ago it was removed to send an appointment to MAs because they didn't have connectivity to the Data Transfer Network. Elexon confirmed that the member is correct as in the past MAs didn't have access, but now they do.
- 3.2 A SVG Member questioned if we mandate any dataflows that are sent between Parties and Party Agents over the DTN for any other processes. Elexon noted that the use of the DTN is optional in all processes; this CP would not mandate the use of the DTN but would mandate the format of the information to be shared.
- 3.3 Elexon stated that they will check the redlining to match the consultation document to confirm the obligation is the same as other dataflows.

The SVG:

- a) **NOTED** the proposed progression timetable for the CP; and
- b) **PROVIDED** any comments or additional questions for inclusion in the CP Consultation.

#### 4. Clarification on the Site Specific Line Loss Factor Calculation Process for Embedded Licensed Distribution System Operators (SVG245/04)

4.1 A SVG Member agreed that this is how the SVG had thought the process should proceed, so are hopeful that the CP follows through with the good work.

The SVG:

- a) **NOTED** the proposed progression timetable for the CP; and
- b) **PROVIDED** any comments or additional questions for inclusion in the CP Consultation.
- c) **NOTED** that the CP will be presented to:
  - the ISG on 6 July 2021; and
  - .

---

#### OPEN SESSION – TABLED ITEMS

##### 5. Change Report

5.1 The SVG:

- a) **NOTED** the report.

##### 6. Enhancements and testing of the BSC systems to enable TCR changes (SVG245/Verbal)

6.1 This was a verbal update on the TCR changes.

6.2 A SVG Member questioned how long the current Volume Allocation Run takes to run; when referring to the slide it is proposed to have had a 50% improvement. Elexon shared that, for the D0030s, it previously took 1 hour and 26 minutes, and now takes 40 Minutes. This is based on the cycle 1 against the test made in April. A SVG Member wanted to clarify that the new process even with more LLF is now working better and faster than in April. Elexon confirmed this

6.3 A SVG questioned if Elexon had checked the outputs of the test environment cycle running against the production outputs. Elexon shared that they deployed the code but they were not able to confirm if the outputs were compared in this way. The SVG member expressed disappointment at this answer and urged Elexon to find out the answer quickly.

6.4 The SVG Chair determined that Elexon would provide an answer on the regression testing via an ex-committee update, given the interest from the SVG in receiving this information quickly and ahead of the further approvals to be made in the August meeting.

The SVG:

- a) **NOTED** the update.

---

#### OPENSESSION – OTHER BUSINESS

##### 7. Actions

7.1 The SVG Technical Secretary confirmed that there was no new actions A SVG Member stated that they are disappointed that **ACTION SVG/06** has still not been closed. The SVG Chair will speak to the relevant team and provide an update.

##### 8. Minutes from previous meeting

8.1 The SVG agreed the minutes from the previous meeting.

##### 9. Any Other Business

9.1 The SVG Chair shared that they would encourage the SVG Members to read through the Market Wide Half Hourly Settlement consultation document that has now been issued and respond with their views.

- 9.2 The SVG Chair noted that Elexon will be sending out a questionnaire to the SVG Members regarding the continued use of remote sessions for the SVG meetings, as options for in-person meetings will be available soon.
- 9.3 A Member shared that they feel that the Teams approach has worked better than in-person meetings, especially for the travel side and the smooth running of the meetings. A SVG Member shared that they would not like to revert to spider phones and teleconferences, but suggested meeting perhaps twice a year in person – noting that there were a number of new members who had never met face-to-face.
- 9.4 An SVG Member asked to ensure that updates in regards to ADR should be included as a standing agenda item for the next few months of SVG.
- 9.5 A SVG Member noted they would like to know what the actual ADR calculation is. Additionally, the Member raised their concern about the number of failures by DA's to submit files; they would like more understanding on this area. The SVG Chair agreed to bring an update to the next SVG meeting

**ACTION 245/Verbal: Provide an  
update on failure of DAs to submit files to the next SVG meeting**

## **10. Next meeting**

- 10.1 The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 3 August 2021.