

## MRA Issue Form

MRA Issue Reference	Date Issued	Version Number
MIF302	5 <sup>th</sup> August 2019	1.0

Issue Title
Ceasing the “Related Meter” range of Meter Timeswitch Class/Code (MTC)

Summary of Issue
<p>Following the implementation of the “Related MPAN Indicator” J2245 and the related functionality into the June 2019 MPAS release it would be opportune to review the future of the use of the related range of MTC within MDD.</p> <p>This MIF is focused on considering removing the related ranges from the current MTC MDD. Its scope is not considering reuse or reinvention of the MTC data item. It is anticipated that the discussion will need to involve MRA, BSC and possibly DCUSA if there is a perceived impact on DUoS charging.</p>

### Contact Details

Originator Name	Tom Chevalier
Originator Company	Power Data Associates
Originator Email	Tom.Chevalier@PowerDataAssociates.com
Originator Phone	01525 601202

### Associated Documents

Association	Reference
Attachments/Appendices	
Related Issue(s)	
Related SPF(s)	
Related Change(s)	DTC CP 3550, MRA CP 0256, MAP CP 0309, MAP CP 0311

## Impacts

Urgent Issue?	No
Priority Provisions Impact?	Yes
Priority Provisions Clauses	N/A

Green Deal Matter:	No
--------------------	----

Roles Impacted	
Supplier	Yes
Distribution Business	Yes
Settlement	Yes
Other: (E.g. MOPs)	MPAS

Central Systems Impacted	
ECOES	Yes
GDCC	No

Codes and Products Impacted
Market Domain Data (MDD), MAP 29 – Managing Related Metering Points

## Issue Details

Description of issue
<p>Following the implementation of the “Related MPAN Indicator” J2245 and the related functionality into the June 2019 MPAS release it would be opportune to review the future of the use of the related range of MTC within MDD. This is identified in MDD in the table Meter Timeswitch Class where “MTC Related Metering System Indicator” is T=True.</p> <p>The use of the Related MPAN Indicator and the continued use of the related MTC will result in further anomalies of data where the two indications show conflicting information.</p> <p>The rules which surround the use of the related MTCs are not clear. The BSC manages the MDD where the MTC codes and relationships with other MDD items are defined, but neither the BSC or the MRA are clear on the rules of how they should be used. It is therefore difficult to know what governance change is required to review the historic convention which surround their use.</p>

Impact of issue
<p>The perceived benefits of removing the related MTC range of codes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplification of MDD by removing approximately 20,000 (22%) active combinations of MTC/LLFC/SSC/PC combinations</li> <li>• Remove the expected conflicts between Related MPAN indicator and related MTC</li> </ul> <p>Timing of any change needs to consider what, if any, dependency there is on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• remaining cleansing &amp; establishing relationship activity for existing Related Metering Points (both metered and UMS)</li> <li>• the implementation of the new Faster Switching arrangements when the Central Switching Service (CSS) is live, that will utilise the Related MPAN to ensure all related MPANs change supplier as a set</li> <li>• Use of the MTC or the Related MPAN Indicator to determine DUoS charging</li> </ul>

## Potential Solution(s) *(optional)*

Solution(s)
<p>Potential options are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do nothing – leave existing MDD values unchanged. Supplier’s would continue to be required to select a valid MTC/LLFC/SSC/PC combination when an MPAN is related or unrelated, as well as adding or removing the Related MPAN Indicator.</li> <li>2. Rationalise Related MTCs – Reduce the valid set of Related MTC’s to either a single MTC, or a small selection of valid MTCs.</li> <li>3. Remove Related MTCs – Remove all Related MTC’s from MDD. Supplier’s would not need to amend the MTC when an MPAN is related or unrelated, they would only need to add or remove the Related MPAN Indicator.</li> </ol>

Proposed Implementation Date	
No date proposed	No date proposed

Implementation Technique
None Proposed