



Meter Administrator Validation Process

The Need for a Standard Approach

1. Background

BSCP 520 requires both the UMSO and the MA to validate summary files. However, there is no specification for what that validation process should encompass. Whilst there are the obvious checks, such as unrecognised charge and regime codes, and invalid combinations as defined by the OID, there are differing opinions on what else constitutes a valid file. This needs to be resolved and a standard approach derived.

2. Detail

This paper specifically relates to the instances when control charge codes are missing from the summary file, though an invitation is made to discuss whether it is necessary to further provide a definitive validation process for both MA and UMSO.

It is our contention that a summary inventory file with missing control charge codes is invalid as it fails to capture all the energy usage of the inventory; for example, if there is equipment against regime 821, then there must be associated controls. This especially as we move towards MHHS and three decimal places in the data flows because of the increased accuracy these afford. It seems somewhat counterintuitive to strive for accuracy if it is acceptable to leave obvious energy usage out of the equation.

An inventory of 30,000 items, with ¼ Watt controls can account for over 31,000 kWh annually. Is it valid for this to be omitted from the inventory?

The CMS control file as specified within BSCP 520 states:

" The CMS controller devices operating each item of equipment should be summed and provided as a row(s) in the file body. Each different type of CMS controller shall have its own Charge Code and will be assigned a continuous Switch Regime of 998 and a CMS Unit Reference of 'Control ' (please note that this is 'Control' followed by five blank spaces ' ' and not five underscores)."

However, there is nothing within the Summary Inventory File Format section of BSCP520 to similarly require the inclusion of control charge codes.

The standard file format provided in the OID includes the Control Charge Code data and we believe it to be implicit that this should also be present in the summary inventory file.

3. Summary

We believe that whilst there is a specific requirement for control charge codes to be included in the CMS control file, it is implied that they should similarly be included in the summary inventory file, and we have validated against this for many years. This process is currently open to interpretation, and we ask the UMSUG to make a definitive decision on the mandatory inclusion of appropriate control charge codes within the summary inventory file/flow, and their absence thus making the file/flow invalid.

This was inconclusively discussed at a previous UMSUG, but with the introduction of CP1546 and the foreseeable increase in files, we believe now to be an opportune time to clarify the anomaly.

4. Recommendations

We invite the UMSUG to:

- a) **DISCUSS** the need for a definite validation specification,
- b) **AGREE** with the need to mandate control charge codes in the summary inventory file, and
- c) **RECOMMEND** changes to BSCP 520 and/or the OID to accommodate the requirements agreed.