

## Minutes

### Workgroup – New UMS Inventory DTN Flow

Meeting name **Workgroup – New UMS DTN Flow**

Venue **Teleconference**

Date of meeting **8 October 2020**

Classification **Public**

#### Attendees and apologies

##### Attendees

Adam Jessop	AJ	Elexon
Kevin Spencer	KS	Elexon
Roan Chavez	RC	Elexon
Tom Chevalier	TC	UMSUG Member
Richard French	RF	Power Data Associates
Andrew Giblin	AG	UMSUG Member
Amanda Dainty	AD	UMSUG Member
Ryan Parker	RP	UMSUG Member
Tym Huckin	TH	UMSUG Member

## 1. Background

- 1.1 Tym Huckin stated they had no issues with the proposal. However, they are concerned that the DTC has a limit of 2,000 lines for the D0379 flow.

**ACTION 1:** Elexon to find out if the limit of 2,000 lines exists only for D0379 flow or across all flows, and to find out if the limit can be changed.

- 1.2 Richard French stated in previous conversations with Electralink, they advised there was no limit to the number of lines. Therefore if there is an issue causing the limit, it would need to be investigated.

**ACTION 2:** Tym Huckin to share the DTC error message on 2,000 line limit and then Elexon to ask Electralink about the limit.

- 1.3 Elexon acknowledged there needed to be more representation from other UMSOs in the Workgroup.
- 1.4 Tom Chevalier stated there were now ca. 380 HH unmetered MPANs in Industry, an increase from ca. 200 in 2005. This number would only increase and as a result, the number of UMSO files will also increase.
- 1.5 Tom Chevalier stated plenty of customer data is sent through the DTS, so the proposal would be future-proofed against MHHS.
- 1.6 Tom Chevalier stated some CMS customers have a large control file to be sent via email. Given the small number of HH unmetered MPANs, the limit would not be exceeded on a single D0379 flow but could pose an

issue to the proposal. Richard French noted there were SLAs that may not be achieved if a file takes too long to load due to file size. They also noted however, that there were no limitations to the size of the flow.

## **2. Flow Structure**

- 2.1 Tom Chevalier stated that the proposed flow includes inventory sequence number that would continually increase each time the flow is sent. This would be a way to validate the latest flow.
- 2.2 Tom Chevalier stated that a customer with various sub meters would need to submit a flow with the full set of data for each sub meter. As an example, if only one of four submeters changed, the customer would still need to submit data for all four. Only that one submeter's data will change, while the data for the other three would remain the same.
- 2.3 Tom stated the flow with the highest sequence number, rather than the latest EFD date, should be processed.
- 2.4 Andrew Giblin asked if they would not need to backdate if they receive a backdated inventory. Tom Chevalier stated this understanding was correct, this was because the sequence number always increments with each submission.
- 2.5 Ryan Parker asked if Tom Chevalier's intention was for UMSOs to send files instantaneously or in a batch overnight. Tom Chevalier responded this would be for UMSOs to decide. Richard French added that flows with the same EFD could be sent, and the flow with the highest sequence number would be processed.
- 2.6 Ryan Parker noted that the flow could introduce issues for customers with multiple UMS handled by different departments. Tom Chevalier responded they have seen instances where customer submit incomplete information. The proposed solution would ensure UMSOs submit complete information, irrespective of whether the different customer departments submit at the same time.
- 2.7 Kevin Spencer asked whether future dates would be invalid EFD dates. Tom Chevalier responded some UMSOs send flows with future EFDs and added that an EFD outside of the Settlement calendar historically would have little value.
- 2.8 Tom Chevalier stated his preference is to create one flow for acceptance and rejection. For acceptance, the flow would have the A code and for rejection, the flow would have a series of rejection codes. Ryan Parker responded his preference is for separate rejection and acceptance flows. This would remove the need to open and filter each flow, improving efficiency especially as UMSOs receive more of these flows. Andrew Giblin saw no issues with either approach, but saw the benefits of separation. Tom responded that some members of the IREG and MRA will prefer only one flow.
- 2.9 Kevin Spencer had no preference between separation or combination of acceptance and rejection flows. They asked how long UMSOs wait before processing files. Ryan Parker responded they have a five day timescale to respond but if the timescale was instantaneous, the validation process would also need to be quick, especially when more files are being received.
- 2.10 Kevin Spencer asked how difficult it was to open the file and view the response code. Ryan Parker responded UMSOs would need view each file individually. Tom Chevalier suggested for Andrew Giblin and Ryan Parker to discuss the difficulty of this with their IT providers. Kevin Spencer added that UMSOs could create a code that separates and filters response codes. Andrew Giblin responded this was something they could create, as part of IT changes.

**ACTION 3:** Ryan Parker to gather Tym Huckin's view on the separation of acceptance and rejection, and any difficulties with having to split the two different file types individually.

## **3. Data Items**

- 3.1 A valid EFD needs to be defined (e.g. no future date, within settlement calendar). Andrew Giblin stated that for Marketwide HH Settlement (MHHS), they would need to consider how smaller customers can apply for new MPAN connections with an EFD in the future. Richard French added that festive lighting would also require future EFD. Tom Chevalier stated that using the settlement window to define valid EFD would be reasonable.

**ACTION 4:** Tom Chevalier to return to the UMSUG with a definition of a valid EFD.

- 3.2 Kevin Spencer asked if Tom Chevalier was confident that no more than 26 rejection codes are needed. Tom Chevalier responded this was the case. He added that the codes could include letters I and O, but excluding them would avoid confusion with numbers 1 and 0.

- 3.3 Kevin Spencer asked if the Sub-meter field needed to specify upper and/or lower case. Tom Chevalier responded this was not essential. Kevin Spencer added that the BSC prescribes using lower case for CMS and that Tym Huckin had issues with processing upper case. Richard French responded he did not believe the case would have any impact as moving forward, groups 4 (for non-CMS Meters) and 5 (for CMS Meters) would be on different lines of the file. Tom Chevalier clarified that for a CMS Sub-Meter, the file would not include group 4. Andrew Giblin added that in their CMS system, there was no input mask limiting the case of text that can be used.

**ACTION 5:** Tom Chevalier to gather Tym Huckin's view on the case of the text in Sub-meter fields.

- 3.4 Tom asked if the Switch Regime should be defined as CHAR 4, rather than CHAR 3. Kevin Spencer believed CHAR 3 would be reasonable as Switch Regimes already use alpha numeric codes.
- 3.5 Andrew Giblin asked if Power Data Associates' system would differentiate Highways England's switches by GSP Group, which are in MDD. Tom Chevalier responded that an UMSO could use a subset of these switches, if they have one.

#### **4. Next Steps**

- 4.1 Kevin Spencer noted the actions raised during the Workgroup.
- 4.2 Kevin Spencer noted that the UMSUG action on this workshop can be closed in the next UMSUG meeting. For next steps, Tom Chevalier will make amendments to the proposal and circulate the revised documents to the UMSUG for feedback, with a deadline to agree the proposal and consequently raise the Change Proposal.
- 4.3 Tom Chevalier observed that UKPN, Scottish Power, Northern Powergrid and ENWL were using the C&C system, and the changes would therefore impact them. Tom Chevalier was also willing to liaise with Scottish Power and Northern Power Grid to gather their feedback.

**ACTION 6:** Adam Jessop to discuss the proposed changes with ENWL and Amey Metering.

**ACTION 7:** Tom Chevalier to discuss the proposed changes with Scottish Power and Northern Power Grid.

- 4.4 Following discussion with the different parties, Tom Chevalier will provide the UMSUG an update on the workgroup, updated information and everyone's feedback in December 2020.

**ACTION 8:** Adam Jessop and Tom Chevalier to report back to UMSUG in December 2020.