MINUTES

MEETING NAME	Unmetered Supplies User Group (UMSUG)
Meeting number	118
Date of meeting	29 September 2016
Venue	ELEXON Ltd, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW
Classification	Public

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

Attendees	Kathryn Coffin	UMSUG Chairman
	Si Tze Wong	UMSUG Technical Secretary
	Dave Johnson	UMSUG Member
	David Moorhouse	UMSUG Member
	James Everley	UMSUG Member
	Mark Webber	UMSUG Member
	Paul Angus	UMSUG Member
	Simon Moseley	UMSUG Member
	Tom Chevalier	UMSUG Member
	Tym Huckin	UMSUG Member (by teleconference)
	Ewan Clare	Attendee, Everis/Scottish Power (by teleconference)
	Mark Burton	Attendee, UK Power Networks
	Mark Pleydell	Attendee, ARTSM
	Nicola Dew	Attendee, Northern Powergrid (by teleconference)
	Ryan Parker	Attendee, Western Power Distribution
	Adam Jessop	Operational Expert, ELEXON
	Kevin Spencer	Technical Expert, ELEXON
Apologies	Andy Eades	UMSUG Member
	Barry Dockney	UMSUG Member
	Bryan Heap	UMSUG Member
	Donna Townsend	UMSUG Member
	Keith Henry	UMSUG Member
	Mike Hawkins	UMSUG Member
	Paul Hart	UMSUG Member
	Walter Hood	UMSUG Member

MINUTES

OPEN SESSION – PAPERS

1. Proposed approach to mobile charging points for electric vehicles – UMSUG118/01

1.1 ELEXON has been asked to cater for new technology that allows electric vehicles (EVs) to be charged from connections to street lighting. ELEXON invited the UMSUG to recommend that the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) accommodates such equipment under the Central Management System (CMS) arrangements.

1.2 Power Data Associates (PDA), who are supporting the Ubitricity trial, presented some slides and gave a demonstration of the product's features and functions. The solution consists of a socket fitted into the gear tray of a street light, to which the EV charging cable connects. The cable includes a Measuring Instruments Directive-approved meter capable of recording quarter-hour readings and that recognises, through its connection to the socket, in which distribution network the energy is consumed. However, BSC Settlement cannot accommodate a meter which can be in any GSP Group at any point in time.

1.3 The Chairman asked if there is only a maximum of one socket fitted per lamp. PDA confirmed that this is the case.

1.4 An UMSUG Member asked whether it was the socket or the cable that would appear on the Distributor's inventory. PDA confirmed that it was the socket. PDA also advised that the socket in the lamp is not live. EV drivers would have to send a signal via their car to draw or stop drawing power from the socket.

1.5 ELEXON noted that this is only one example of mobile EV charging technology, but that it was likely that others would emerge and would need catering for under unmetered arrangements. ELEXON suggested that a CMS approach appeared the obvious solution because the functionality is the same. However, appropriate testing would be needed to check that the data allocation is accurate. An UMSUG Member commented that they were aware of other potential similar products.

1.6 ELEXON asked the UMSUG Member from Regulatory Delivery at BEIS[1] (formerly the NMRO[2]) for a view on how this equipment fitted with the Electricity Unmetered Supply Regulations (Statutory Instrument). The UMSUG Member commented that they had no objections in principle, and that no BEIS decision is needed providing the Unmetered Supplies (UMS) Operator (UMSO), Supplier and customer all agree on the unmetered connection.

1.7 An UMSUG Member asked whether this technology was compatible with the 500W limit in the Regulations. ELEXON noted that the guidance on the Regulations states that predictability is more important than the amount of energy consumed.[3] PDA noted that the loads are not concentrated in one area and suggested that these distributed, small loads were easier for network management than the current fixed-location charging points.

1.8 The Chairman asked if any Members objected in principle to using the CMS approach and Members confirmed they did not.

1.9 ELEXON suggested that it should draft a Test Specification with assistance from PDA, for the UMSUG to review by correspondence.

ACTION 118/01

---

[1] The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy.
[2] The National Regulation and Measurement Office.
[3] 'a predictable load significantly higher than 500 W could be provided with an unmetered supply if the anticipated metering costs, technical difficulties or the operation of law, would mean that it was not appropriate for the supply of electricity to be given through an appropriate meter' (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/299381/Guidance_on_Unmetered_Supply_Regulations_V2.0_-_March_2014.pdf).

1.10 ELEXON noted that, once the UMSUG is happy with the Test Specification, it will take a paper to SVG to seek approval in principle to cater for electric vehicle charging equipment under the CMS arrangements.

ACTION 118/02

1.11 The UMSUG:

a) **RECOMMENDED** that the SVG accommodates this technology under the CMS arrangements; and

b) **NOTED** that ELEXON will develop a Test Specification for the UMSUG's review.

2. Proposed review of Switch Regime Burn Hours – UMSUG118/02

2.1 The UMSUG completed the last Switch Regime (SR) Burn Hours review in 2010. Since then it has implemented both new SRs and new types of SR. This paper therefore proposed to undertake a fresh SR Burn Hours review.

2.2 ELEXON suggested that the review should include SRs that were not considered in the last review, and should use more sophisticated calculation methods than were available in 2010 (e.g. spreadsheets that calculate to the nearest minute). It highlighted that Tym Huckin Ltd (THL) had already reviewed the Burn Hours independently and had identified a number of issues. ELEXON suggested that a first step could be for it and PDA to validate THL's findings, as tripartite scrutiny would be helpful. It could then bring the output to the UMSUG for review in early 2017.

2.3 ELEXON noted that many of the SRs with errors were only likely to be used in a small number of cases and that the errors were likely to fall in both directions. Hence the materiality to Settlement would be very low; however it was important to get the calculation right. An UMSUG Member commented that they were particularly concerned about the 200 Regime and the Non Half Hourly (NHH) impact.

ACTION 118/03

2.4 The UMSUG:

a) **NOTED** THL's findings on the current Burn Hours; and

b) **AGREED** to initiate a review of the published Burn Hours.

3. Request to support research into the impact of street lighting on traffic accidents and street crime (LANTERNS project) – UMSUG118/03

3.1 ELEXON highlighted a data request from the Local Authority Collaborators' National Evaluation of Reduced Night-time Streetlight (LANTERNS) project to Unmetered Supplies Operators (UMSOs). This project examines the impact of lighting schemes on crime and public safety.

3.2 ELEXON noted the aims of the project as identified in the paper and showed the UMSUG where to find further information on the LANTERNS website. ELEXON noted that the findings of the project so far have been counter-intuitive, in that reduced lighting actually appeared to reduce levels of crime and road traffic accidents. ELEXON clarified that it has no direct relationship with the project, but had agreed to pass on the request.

3.3 An UMSUG Member commented that they were unclear what granularity/frequency of data was being asked for – e.g. whether it is one data dump per year or per month. Another UMSUG Member clarified that they believed the project was looking for a snapshot of what changes had been made to lighting schemes and when.

3.4 ELEXON noted that UMSOs may need to consider if they need local authorities' agreement to share the data.

3.5 An UMSUG Member provided some further background in their capacity as Chair of the ADEPT[4] Street Lighting Group. They noted that the project has benefitted from new single sources of police and road traffic data, and is looking for a way of automating lighting data to make it cheaper/easier to continue its work. The UMSUG Member agreed to seek further clarity from LANTERNS on the format and frequency of data required.

ACTION 118/04

3.6 The UMSUG:

a) **NOTED** the LANTERNS project's request for street lighting inventory data.

4. Potential CP: Provision of CMS missing unit report to UMSO – UMSUG118/04

4.1 This paper proposed removing the existing requirement for Meter Administrators (MAs) to send this report to UMSOs each month. MAs would continue to provide the report to customers monthly and to UMSOs on request.

4.2 The UMSUG Member who had submitted the paper explained that they believed UMSOs do not require/use this report because it already goes to the customer. They therefore suggested amending Balancing and Settlement Code Procedure (BSCP) 520 through a Change Proposal (CP). However, they noted that the BSCP change is not high priority and could be packaged as part of a wider CP with any other changes.

4.3 UMSUG Members agreed that UMSOs do not require/use the monthly report. ELEXON suggested that, given its current change workload, it should take an action to raise a CP at an opportune time in the next six months.

ACTION 118/05

4.4 The UMSUG agreed that there was no benefit in MAs sending the monthly report to UMSOs in the meantime. However, some Members expressed concern that this could leave them non-compliant with the BSCP and therefore subject to potential BSC Audit issues. ELEXON suggested that it seek the SVG's agreement to this approach at its 4 October 2016 meeting, so that it could be documented in the SVG minutes. If needed, ELEXON would then highlight the agreed approach to the BSC Auditor.

ACTION 118/06

4.5 The UMSUG:

a) **AGREED** that ELEXON should raise a CP to amend BSCP520 at an opportune time;

b) **AGREED** that, in the meantime, MAs do not need to send the monthly report to UMSOs; and

c) **AGREED** that ELEXON should agree this approach with the SVG to avoid any potential BSC Audit issues.

5. Update on Actions 117/02 and 117/03 – UMSUG118/05

5.1 This paper presented updated redlining to the Operational Information Document (OID), covering testing requirements for equipment with transformers and equipment with multiple components. ELEXON invited the UMSUG to recommend that the SVG approves these changes, to take effect in parallel with Version 248 of Market Domain Data (MDD) on 16 November 2016.

5.2 ELEXON gave an update on Action 117/02. It presented its proposed revised OID redlining, which covered the testing requirements for products that could not be tested within the standard 210-250V convention. ELEXON noted that it had consulted some test houses for their views on the testing requirements and had incorporated a test house's recommendations into the revised OID relining.

[4] Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport.

5.3 An UMSUG Member questioned whether it is still necessary to maintain the requirements for applicants to submit five samples of test data. Typically, unmetered products are not connected at 210V or 220V. They asked if the number of samples could be reduced to three for instance.

5.4 Another UMSUG Member commented that it is unclear what the voltage spread should be for products with an exact input voltage of 100V or 200V.

5.5 An UMSUG Member asked for clarity over how the wattage level of products that operate at a lower voltage (e.g. 48V) could be factored into UMS Charge Codes. ELEXON replied that it has received Charge Code applications for equipment that needs to be tested at a lower voltage in the past, such as the optics in a traffic signal. It accepted their data tested at their input voltage, which was 48V, and factored it into their Charge Codes. The products need not necessarily be tested only between 210-250V.

5.6 ELEXON added that it lacked clarity on how to process a Charge Code for a product that operates at a lower voltage level. It was not sure what the test ranges and spread should be, as there was no established convention. This had therefore prompted it to propose setting the testing requirements outside of the standard 210-250V convention.

5.7 An attendee from the Association for Road Traffic Safety and Management (ARTSM) agreed that the testing requirements and operational information for traffic signals are not very clear. The UMSUG agreed that further input from ARTSM, and especially its traffic signals workgroup, would be very helpful and agree that ELEXON should put the work related to Action 117/02 on hold pending further discussion with this group.

ACTION 118/07

5.8 ELEXON suggested that it attend a meeting of the ARTSM traffic signals workgroup to discuss both this specific question, and the construction of Charge Codes for traffic signals more generally.

ACTION 118/08

5.9 ELEXON then provided an update on Action 117/03. It presented the proposed number of test samples for products with multiple components, using a CCTV camera as an example as requested by the UMSUG at meeting 117. The example recommended that the camera (core component) should be tested with five samples but the additional components would only require one sample.

5.10 An UMSUG Member commented that the core component in the example (the camera) consumes less power than one of the additional components (the heater). They asked whether this would be appropriate. ELEXON replied that although this may be the case, the additional components are not always in use. It also clarified that the example only serves as a guideline and some degree of judgement is needed to determine whether a component should be considered as a core component.

5.11 The Chairman noted that the intention of the changes was to make the testing requirements less onerous than currently. The UMSUG agreed that they would be an improvement on the status quo, and that ELEXON should therefore take these OID changes for the SVG's approval.

ACTION 118/09

5.12 The UMSUG:

a) **AGREED** that, for Action 117/03, ELEXON should progress this redlining for the SVG's approval as proposed; and

b) **AGREED** that, for Action 117/02, ELEXON should place this work on hold pending further discussion with the ARTSM traffic signals workgroup.

OPEN SESSION UPDATES

6. Review of Generic LED Lighting Charge Codes implementation

6.1 ELEXON noted that there have been no major issues with implementation. However, there is some possible confusion around products with Constant Light Output (CLO) functionality as manufacturers have been asking for both CLO and non-CLO ranges and are not always including dimming levels. ELEXON will consider if the testing requirements need clarifying.

ACTION 118/10

6.2 An UMSUG Member was concerned that some manufacturers may not be applying for Charge Codes. ELEXON noted that the UMSUG had considered this risk before introducing the new generic codes, and had decided to create the manufacturers spreadsheet to help UMSOs audit the products connected to their networks. ELEXON reminded the UMSUG that this risk was also present under the previous arrangements.

6.3 An UMSUG Member suggested that providing a list of all applications from the last six months might help Members spot any 'missing' manufacturers. The Chairman noted that the UMSUG already sees the Charge Code applications each month. The UMSUG Member agreed, but suggested it would be easier to spot any issues by looking at the collated data.

6.4 ELEXON commented that, given the generic codes were introduced to make the application process quicker and easier, it would be disappointing if manufacturers still saw it as a barrier. It requested UMSUG Members' help in educating manufacturers on the process. An UMSUG Member commented that they believed the situation had improved, and noted that at a recent event all manufacturers present had applied for codes (not necessarily the case in the past).

6.5 The UMSUG:

a) **NOTED** the update.

7. Indicative UMSUG meeting dates 2016/17

7.1 The Chairman provided UMSUG Members with indicative meeting dates for 2016/17. She noted that meetings were subject to the SVG's agreement and sufficient levels of business. However, UMSUG Members have previously requested indicative dates to make it easier to keep the days free and to arrange travel.

7.2 The Chairman noted that the UMSUG has not used all four of its scheduled meetings in the last couple of years. She also noted that August and September appear to be particularly difficult months in which to hold meetings because of holidays. For 2017, ELEXON has therefore tentatively scheduled three meetings: in February, May and October. The Chairman suggested trying this revised timetable for a year and then reviewing if needed. UMSUG Members agreed.

7.3 An UMSUG Member asked if the 8 November 2016 UMSUG meeting would be going ahead. ELEXON confirmed that this was unlikely, unless there was any last-minute business, but that it would confirm nearer the time.

7.4 The UMSUG:

a) **NOTED** the update.

MINUTES

8. Request from ARTSM to standardise approach for traffic signals

8.1 Mark Pleydell, on behalf of Traffic Open Products and Specifications (TOPAS) and ARTSM, presented some slides highlighting that the traffic industry struggles with the Charge Code application process. He sought the UMSUG's input on how all participants in the process could co-operate to agree more standardised testing requirements for traffic signals equipment.

8.2 ELEXON and the UMSUG welcomed the presentation and any further interaction with the traffic industry, noting that the UMSUG lacks practical expertise of how these products are used in the field. ELEXON suggested that ARTSM's future participation in the UMSUG would be particularly valuable and agreed to progress this outside of the meeting.

ACTION 118/11

8.3 The UMSUG:

a) **NOTED** the update.

OPEN SESSION – OTHER BUSINESS

9. Actions

9.1 **Action 115/08** – On hold until the start of 2017.

9.2 **Action 116/02** – Complete. ELEXON contacted all respondents.

9.3 **Action 116/03** – Complete. ELEXON provided education to a number of customers and manufacturers.

9.4 **Action 116/06** – Complete. The UMSUG reviewed ELEXON's updated guidance notes which are now live.

9.5 **Action 117/01** – Complete. The SVG approved the changes on 1 December 2015.

9.6 **Action 117/02** – Complete. See Item 5 above.

9.7 **Action 117/03** – Complete. See Item 5 above.

9.8 **Action 117/04** – Complete. ELEXON updated the Multi-Level Static Dimming calculation spreadsheet.

9.9 **Action 117/05** – Complete. ELEXON updated the Switch Regime spreadsheet.

9.10 **Action 117/06** – Complete. ELEXON updated the Valid Dimming Combination Spreadsheet.

9.11 **Action 117/07** – Complete. Implemented by CP1457.

9.12 **Action 117/08** – Complete. Approved by the SVG under Action 117/01.

9.13 **Action 117/09** – Complete. ELEXON contacted Radix but has received no further response.

10. Matters arising

10.1 An UMSUG Member highlighted that Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution has been rebranded as Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks.