

UMSUG Paper – 15th March 2023

Default Sub-Meter ID

1. Purpose

This document is seeking to capture the impractical requirement in BSCP520 to ‘agree’ a Sub-Meter ID given the increase in MPANs (=MSIDs) due to P434.

The approach of defining a default value was agreed in P434 for the Lat/Long values, unless a specific value was agreed. The paper proposes the same approach for defaulting Sub-Meter ID.

2. Background

P434 requires all existing NHH unmetered portfolios to trade HH during 2024. This will increase the number of HH MPANs to c.20,000. Section 3.1.8+ of the BSCP requires the UMSO & MA to agree the Sub-Meter ID. This exchange of information is currently done by email/phone, but the increase in volume makes this impractical.

To resolve this issue it might be possible to introduce or modify an existing dataflow. However, a simpler approach is to agree a default value that will be used unless there is a need for a specific agreement, such as where a CMS Sub-Meter is created.

The Sub-Meter ID needs to be unique within an MPAN, not across the market. The vast majority of the NHH unmetered MPANs will only require a single Sub-Meter.

It is therefore proposed that the OID should recommend a default value of the Sub-Meter ID to be used in the absence of a bi-lateral agreement between the UMSO and MA.

The proposed approach is to use a Sub-Meter ID using the relevant GSP Group letter, as follows:

GSP Group	Default Sub-Meter
_A	AAAAAAA
_B	BBBBBBB
_C	CCCCCCC
_D	DDDDDDD
_E	EEEEEEE
_F	FFFFFFF
_G	GGGGGGG
_H	HHHHHHH
_J	JJJJJJJ
_K	KKKKKKK
_L	LLLLLLL
_M	MMMMMMM
_N	NNNNNNN
_P	PPPPPPP

No system changes are required to introduce this approach so it can be introduced in the next update to the OID.

3. Recommendation

We invite the UMSUG to:

- a) **NOTE** the existence of a weakness with BSCP520; and
- b) **AGREE** to include a Sub-Meter ID defaulting approach in the OID.

Tom Chevalier

1st March 2023

BSCP520 Extract

3.1.8 On <u>Customer</u> or <u>Supplier</u> request.	Request from the <u>UMSO</u> the type of EM (Passive or Dynamic) and agree the location, if any, of the PECU array(s) and other factors relevant to the PECU Array Siting Procedure in 4.6.1.1.	MA	<u>UMSO</u>	Electronic or other agreed method
3.1.9 Within 5 WD of 3.1.8.	Agree the Sub- <u>Meter</u> ID(s), type of EM (Passive or Dynamic) and the location, if any, of the PECU array(s) in accordance with the provision of the PECU Array Siting procedures in 4.6.1.1.	<u>UMSO</u>	Type of EM and agreed latitude and longitude or geographic co-ordinates.	Electronic or other agreed method
	Provide latitude and longitude information to MA. In the absence of more specific information, the latitude and longitude for the geographic centre of the <u>GSP Group</u> should be used (see OID).		MA.	