

Minutes

Workgroup – New UMS DTN Flow

Meeting name	Workgroup – New UMS DTN Flow	Venue	Teleconference
Date of meeting	24 November 2020	Classification	Public

Attendees and apologies		
Attendees		
Adam Jessop	AJ	Elexon
Kevin Spencer	KS	Elexon
Freya Gardner	FG	Elexon
Roan Chavez	RC	Elexon
Tom Chevalier	TC	UMSUG Member
Richard French	RF	Power Data Associates
Elaine Carr	EC	UMSUG Member
Christina Cornes	CC	Scottish Power
Gillian Miller	GM	Scottish Power
Andrew Giblin	AG	UMSUG Member
Amanda Dainty	AD	UMSUG Member
Ryan Parker	RP	UMSUG Member
Apologies		
Paul Angus	PA	UMSUG Member
Steve Davis	SD	Amey

1. Background

- 1.1 Following the previous workgroup meeting on 8 October 2020, Tom Chevalier made updates to the proposed DTN flow to address comments received.

2. Data Items

- 2.1 The Logic Format of Data Item 'Charge Code' was changed to CHAR(13) which would require zeros to be included. Its Domain was also changed to 'Code' to align with MDD codes.
- 2.2 Number of Items – not INT(6)
- 2.3 Sub-Meter renamed as 'UMS Sub-Meter' for clarity.
- 2.4 Andrew Giblin asked whether UMSOs can still request further details of rejections via email Tom Chevalier responded this would be the case. The main point of the flow is to communicate key information.

3. UMS Inventory Flow

- 3.1 GP2 ' UMS Sub-Meter' group was changed to make the information clearer. CMS Indicator indicates whether or not it is a CMS or non-CMS inventory.

4. Response Flow

- 4.1 RP1 'MPAN Cores' group provides Response Reason Code as the first response.
- 4.2 RP2 'Invalid Charge Code' group would be used if Response Reason Code is G, which means information is valid but there are issues in UMS Error Code, Switch Regime, Charge Code or CMS Unit Reference.

5. Commentary document

- 5.1 Tom Chevalier referred to BSCP520's restriction from using H & T as initial characters on the CMS Unit Reference and asked whether this was still applicable. Tom Chevalier stated he had identified two approaches: to continue to exclude H & T in CMS Unit Reference or to change the validation process on event logs to allow H & T in CMS Unit Reference. Kevin Spencer responded that it would be easier for Market Participants if the onus of not creating CMS Unit References with H & T is put on CMS manufacturers. Kevin Spencer added it would be easier to change a document, than a software.
- 5.2 Ryan Parker stated they only check the last five digits of the CMS Unit Reference.
- Elaine Carr noted that there is currently no confirmation in place, and if the intention was that the DNO would validate it then a clear requirement would need to be in place. Tom Chevalier noted that the earlier the validation is done, the more effective it is.
- 5.3 Tom Chevalier stated that based on the comments, H & T will not be allowed.
- 5.4 The Effective From Date (EFD) suggested is now 13 months, rather than 14, as Market Participants could send a file which may not be processed by the Data Aggregator (DA).
- 5.5 Andrew Giblin recalled discussions around future EFDs and the MHHS, and asked whether 13 months be a limitation to UMSOs and their customers? Tom Chevalier responded that if a new connection for a UMS was being created, its MPAN can be registered in advance but the inventory would not need to be created until the MPAN is operational go-live. Andrew Giblin responded they were unsure as to whether they can register an MPAN and then create the inventory at a later date.
- 5.6 Ryan Parker asked whether Power Data Associates received files with future EFDs. Richard French responded a certain UMSO would only send inventories with future EFDs. Besides this UMSO and festive lighting, inventories with future EFDs were rare.
- 5.7 Ryan Parker noted that for a HH inventory with a future EFD, the inventory can be processed prior to the given date. However, this was not the case for NHH inventory. Richard French responded that where they receive inventories with future EFDs, they load the inventories into the system but would not calculate the energy until the given date.
- 5.8 Tom Chevalier asked for the workgroup's views on whether or not to allow a value of zero in the inventory file. Andrew Giblin responded their systems did not allow zeros. They would interpret a zero as a validation error and would sort it before reviewing and accepting the file. Tom Chevalier added zeros would still need to be processed but such files would be rare.
- 5.9 Tom Chevalier stated they would be happy to leave the upper and lower case requirements for the UMS Sub-Meter. Adam Jessop added that SSE would also be happy to continue using these requirements.
- 5.10 Andrew Giblin stated they did not want to process any inventory files lower than at MPAN-level Tom Chevalier responded that if the Sub-Meter is updated, the file would include information on all Sub-Meters. For Sub-Meters that were not changed, the information would remain as is.
- 5.11 Andrew Giblin stated they had only received one incomplete inventory file. Generally, they do not receive submissions that do not contain all Sub-Meters. Tom Chevalier understood that Ryan Parker and Paul Angus' organisations had customers who send incomplete files.
- 5.12 Ryan Parker stated that some of their customers had four to six Sub-Meters. For instance, CCTV cameras and traffic signals would be allocated into one inventory. Richard French added that some councils have one MPAN for each piece of equipment or one MPAN for a group of equipment. Tom Chevalier stated that new HH MPANs for MHHS would probably not have multiple Sub-Meters so they did not expect the issue of incomplete submissions to expand.

- 5.13 Kevin Spencer stated they wanted to know Tym Huckin's view on including multiple Sub-Meters into one inventory file. Tom Chevalier suggested to ask the UMSUG for their views.
- 5.14 Adam Jessop stated that according to Electralink, the limit of 2,000 lines that existed for data flows only applies when using the flow editor on web tools. This closes Action 1 from the October 2020 workgroup meeting.
- 5.15 Tom Chevalier stated that according to Northern Powergrid, where a customer confirms the inventory has not changed, they would submit a new inventory summary file with the current date. Tom Chevalier's commentary document stated this served little purpose and should therefore not be done. Ryan Parker asked whether Northern Powergrid still process the file if the customer submits the same file, and whether UMSOs would be expected to process such files. Tom Chevalier believed that a customer email confirming that nothing has changed to the UMSO would suffice.
- 5.16 Andrew Giblin asked whether UMSOs would be expected to send Sub-Meters or inventory information of related MPANs such as a customer who has separate MPANs for lighting and traffic signals. Tom Chevalier responded this was not the case, and that submissions would be at an MPAN level only.
- 5.17 Tom Chevalier asked for the workgroup's views on Northern Powergrid current process on inventory file submission. Richard French added that the process did not impact PDA, it would be the UMSOs' judgement on whether or not to send such files to PDA.
- 5.18 Tom Chevalier asked for Paul Angus' feedback. Adam Jessop stated that Paul Angus would not expect to see zero value records included in flows from UMSO to MA.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1 The document will be revised further to address feedback received. Adam Jessop and Tom Chevalier will work together to create a paper to the December 2020 UMSUG meeting. The paper will include an update on the progress made, next steps and expected timescales.
- 6.2 Kevin Spencer stated that Northern Powergrid expressed concerns with the implementation of the new flow prior to spring 2021.
- 6.3 Tom Chevalier stated they want to progress a Change Proposal (CP) with a consequential DTN Modification. The earliest implementation date would be November 2021. However, February 2022 would be more feasible.