Tym Huckin Ltd

Date: 30 November 2020

Title: Invitation to discuss the processing of non-reporting CMS units

Author: Tym Huckin BSc (Hons) FIAP MBCS, Director

Introduction

This short paper does not present any recommendation per se. This is an invitation for the UMSUG to discuss, and make any subsequent recommendations on changes to the way missing CMS event data is handled by the relevant parties, or to maintain the status quo.

Current situation

As per the CMS specifications, the settlement for any CMS units which are identified in the control file, but for which events are not present in the event log file, must be calculated using default values. For CMS this is regime 205 (dusk-to-dawn) at 100% power, and for mCMS this is regime 375 (16:00 to midnight) at 100%.

The rationale behind this is to provide a financial incentive for the events to be made available.

The party which is financially disadvantaged by this is the lighting authority, despite the fact that they are not responsible for making the events available. This is the responsibility of the CMS system provider but they are not penalised for any failings in their system.

Obviously we are not aware of any SLA between the lighting authority and the provider, but it does seem somewhat unfair that the lighting authority should be bearing the cost of a failure for which they are not responsible.

Going forwards

This is only one suggestion, and we invite UMSUG to discuss this along with any alternatives, or to decide that the present way of working is the preferable one.

Missing CMS events are not uncommon, and their tardy arrival is often the result of incremental event log versions, which can continue to arrive up to 28 days after the event day itself; we are aware of event log versions exceeding 90 in isolated cases. However, at the end of that 28 day period, if no real events have been retrieved, the default calculations stands and the lighting authority is out of pocket.

With this in mind, would it be worth considering allowing the CMS manufacturers, in the absence of real event data on day 28, to report what the item *should* have done, rather than leaving it as a default calculation? This could be identified by using the flag field, as was originally mooted when we first introduced the CMS events in to settlements. This would not be a mandatory requirement, but an option to enable them to better reflect the true consumption and remove the burden from the lighting authorities.