

HEADLINE REPORT

MEETING NAME	BMRS User Group Meeting 5
---------------------	---------------------------

Meeting number	2014/05
-----------------------	---------

Date of meeting	6 November 2014
------------------------	-----------------

Classification	Public
-----------------------	--------

ATTENDEES

Zaahir Ghanty	ELEXON
Stephen Thompson	ELEXON
Colin Berry	ELEXON
Andy Howden	CGI
William Hulse	Cognizant
Paul Coates	RWE
Alasdair Yuille	Ofgem
Graham Bunt	EDF
George Lear	EDF
Vinayak Sonawane	National Grid
Michael Oprych	Innovez (on behalf of Hetco)
Dimosthenis Karadimas	Innovez (on behalf of Hetco)
Tom Bowcutt	Centrica
Julian Thacker	Vue Point
Tony Osborne	DataGenic (on behalf of EDF)
Nick Brooks	CGI (Part meeting)
Mahesh Gogtay	ELEXON (part meeting)

APOLOGIES

Nick Haines	Good Energy
Steve Roberts	National Grid
Alan Mowatt	SSE

1. Introduction

1.1 The meeting was focussed on the following main areas:

- Recap on Meeting 4
- Update on BMRS Project
- Industry Use Cases on submission of ETR Data

HEADLINE REPORT

- TIBCO Compression overview
- Participant Testing

2. Recap from Meeting 4

2.1 A summary of the previous meeting was presented and update on the outstanding actions:

- Action: ELEXON will follow up with National Grid to ensure guidance given to participants are aligned.
 - Update: ELEXON and CGI are working closely with NG for testing of the Participants' test files and ensure all Acks/Nacks and any issues are communicated back to NG.
- Action: ELEXON to follow up with users during testing and post go live for possible improvement to the Web UI.
 - Update: ELEXON will gather feedback from users in Q1 2015 and propose improvements to ISG for implementation in phase 3
- Action: CGI/ELEXON will review providing more slots in line with the proposal and communicate with users if this is possible
 - Update: Participants are not limited to three days for submission of their ETR data, but fully-supported Participant Testing will be limited to 3 days in w/c 10 Nov and 2 days in w/c 24 Nov.
- Suggestion: To provide an extra day e.g. 19th November to allow parties to establish connectivity (discussed later)
 - Update: the connectivity with MODIS is not in the scope of ELEXON and there is expectation that participants would have established connectivity with NG prior to start of Participant Testing.
- Action: EDF will prepare some use cases to be discussed at the meeting 5
 - Update: Discussed during the meeting as part of agenda

3. Update on BMRS Project

3.1 There was an overview provided on all the phases of the project. Phase 1 is entering main run OAT and ELEXON flagged risk of parties not being able to establish connectivity with MODIS system in time. Additionally one party highlighted the concerns below on the National Grid solution:

3.1.1 Scope not locked down:

- Design changes (e.g. removal of web services as a ETR/REMIT data submission route) still being announced with delay in follow up documentation meaning market participants (MPs) are constantly having to adapt / reconfigure their solutions to fit NG updates
- Changed process for receiving acknowledgements from NG pushing them to participants to participants pulling them from NG.
No ability to manage single sign on to MODIS if participants are using differing Registered Parties.
- Participants highlighted the risk that further design changes would have significant impact on ability to meet the deadline.

3.1.2 Lack of assurance that the End-to-End solution works with 2 weeks to go before testing (as of 16/10/14)

- The initial testing schedule was very short, which did not allow participants time to reconfigure files if errors found and test again within window. Testing also very close to delivery date, increasing risk NG or participants missing go-live if significant defects found in their solution design during testing.

HEADLINE REPORT

- Limited number of files actually passed through system. No demonstration of stability of system, particularly considering initial uploads by participants likely to be high stress event as all participants need to set up their initial 3 year views.
- There is no visibility on the timescales for the flows to reach EMFIP yet due to the limited success.
- Long lead time to fix master configuration file which resulted in flows being rejected on EMFIP.

3.1.3 Contingency plan 'B' not communicated across industry:

- Participants also expressed concerns that there does not seem to be any plan 'B' in place and if this were to be announced for go-live, MPs will have difficulty implementing these due to limited resources over the Christmas period.

Post Meeting UPDATE:

At the subsequent NG Teleconference on the same day, NG confirmed the Plan "B" – bypass MODIS for the files submitted by Participants and just FTP the files to BMRS (although MODIS would still be required for other Articles).

- 3.2 Only one participant has managed to successfully load their file on EMFIP; however, it was also noted that this was not performed as part of the End-to-End solution – only via the manual upload on EMFIP.
- 3.3 A participant asked for OFGEM's opinion possibility of GB not meeting the Transparency deadline. AY confirmed he will flag this to his colleague who looks after ETR.

Post Meeting UPDATE:

ELEXON and NG meeting OFGEM on 18 November about the ability to meet the Transparency Deadline.

- 3.4 One member of the user group also stressed the importance of establishing a Knowledge base for the wider industry. **ACTION:** ELEXON to highlight this with National Grid to ensure this is coordinated and regularly updated
- 3.5 **ACTION:** ELEXON to flag all issues raised by Participants in regards to National Grid connectivity to ISG and highlight this to Grid
- 3.6 An update was also provided on Phase 2 with the Push Data Service being the main functionality for Phase 2. One member asked about the implementation date which was confirmed as 28 May 2015.

4. Industry Use Cases

- 4.1 EDF presented their views on how outages could be represented, such as the shape of outages. They also suggested the use of ETR publication can fulfil obligation under REMIT as the information would have been made public. However it was viewed that ENTSO-e would not be willing to accept becoming a platform for inside information.



- 4.2 There were concerns that similar information is being published in the GB market that could make this more difficult for users e.g. OC2 data, MEL, Transparency data, REMIT data on parties website and BMRS.
- 4.3 One member suggested that it will be useful to be able to publish 'timeseries' for REMIT publication and another suggested that they do not go to the level of granularity such as minute-minute changes to outages.

HEADLINE REPORT

- 4.4 One member asked for OFGEM's opinion on whether very low level details should be included. OFGEM explained parties must ensure the inside information disclosed is as accurate and the very low level granularity may not always be needed for the purposes of REMIT.
- 4.5 ELEXON proposed that this could be highlighted to ISG as an improvement post go live; however, this will need to be consulted by Industry and a change to the solution must not impact parties who are happy with the current REMIT solution. Therefore any changes to the REMIT XSD should allow the flexibility to articulate via timeseries if they choose to.
- 4.6 RWE also presented several scenarios including the use of P1D for outages and mixed resolutions.



EU Transparency
REMIT time series .pp

- 4.7 It was also mentioned that using A03 is helpful however EMFIP may process this as A01 when publishing this, hence parties need to build an additional checks to ensure the 10,000 positions limit within the XML is not breached.
- 4.8 **ACTION:** ELEXON to follow up with ENTSO-e
- 4.9 **Post meeting UPDATE:**
 - i) ENTSO-e said that the file submitted by RWE npower using A01 curve type with P1D resolution should not have passed validation and was probably only displayed correctly on EMFIP "because the platform only takes the first value in the time series, no matter the resolution" – if a file was submitted using A01 curve type with multiple resolutions, one of which was P1D, the expectation was that the file would not be represented correctly on EMFIP.
 - ii) ENTSO-e also said that "the transformation of a file with curve type A03 into market time unit "chunks" should not be a concern for the data provider, the platform has been designed to handle that situation".
 - iii) ELEXON had also noticed that the value of "Installed Capacity" shown on EMFIP did not match the value submitted for
"production_RegisteredResource.pSRType.powerSystemResources.nominalP unit" in a Planned Unavailability of Generation ("PUGU") file – ENTSO-e said this was because "installed capacity is retrieved from the master data submitted in the Configuration files".

5. TIBCO Compression

- 5.1 A presentation on TIBCO compression was given covering impact on parties, implementation approach and benefits. It was suggested as a 6 month roll out and perhaps coordinating this industry wide. This can ensure the disconnection time can be done once. The main impact on parties will be to configure on their end which is straight forward. Nick Brooks also mentioned he can help with guiding parties what is required.
- 5.2 **ACTION:** TIBCO users to confirm whether they will take the TIBCO compression option

6. Participant Testing

- 6.1 An overview of Participant testing was provided explaining that testing will be available most times during OAT, but fully supported testing only available during the dates published – Platform unavailable on 14th

HEADLINE REPORT

November. Parties requested a single point of contact for when a flow fails and it was suggested that NG should be contacted in the first instance and ELEXON if submission is via the portal.

6.2 **ACTION:** ELEXON To provide an E-2-E testing picture

7. AOB

7.1 Improvement to XML Download on BMRS:

- Currently we are in the design phase for the phase 2 RestFul APIs and looking into the associated XML message structure.
- As we know the RestFul API will drive the UI components delivered as part of phase 3, therefore as part of the phase 2 design we need to be thinking about the phase 3 UI design and xml download formats.
- One feature that is key to our design is the fact that the XML download from the UI will be driven and hence mirror the RestFul API structure. It is envisaged however that the XML structure returned by the RestFul APIs will contain the same data items however have an improved and more verbose xml structure.



7.2 **ACTION:** Please can participants tell us their level of use of the as-is XML download option. What level of usage and in turn impact would it have if a change to the existing download structure was introduced as part of the phase 3 UI rollout?

7.3 TIBCO setup:

- As part of the BMRS data push service design, we are looking into the estimated number of concurrent users/endpoints we might expect.
- One of the methods of achieving this is to look at the number of TIBCO users with a view that a number of TIBCO user may move over to the BMRS data push.

7.4 **ACTION:** Please can participants on respond to the following questions:

- How do you currently receive your TIBCO data feed, is it typically a single connection receiving all the data and then disseminating it throughout the organization as appropriate or individual users with their own single connection?
- If you were thinking of subscribing to the new BMRS data push service how do you think you would connect. Would it be a single connection receiving all the data with dissemination throughout the organization, multiple connections to users or something else.

7.5 **Next Meeting:** Suggested date 1st December