

MINUTES

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| MEETING NAME | Unmetered Supplies User Group (UMSUG) |
| Meeting number | 122 |
| Date of meeting | 1 March 2018 |
| Venue | ELEXON Limited, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW |
| Classification | Public |

ATTENDEES AND APOLOGIES

| | | |
|------------------|------------------|--|
| Attendees | Kathryn Coffin | UMSUG Chairman |
| | Andrew Eades | UMSUG Member (by teleconference) |
| | David Moorhouse | UMSUG Member |
| | Mark Burton | UMSUG Member |
| | Mark Webber | UMSUG Member (by teleconference) |
| | Nigel Birchley | UMSUG Member (by teleconference, part-meeting) |
| | Paul Angus | UMSUG Member |
| | Tom Chevalier | UMSUG Member |
| | Tym Huckin | UMSUG Member (by teleconference, part-meeting) |
| | Walter Hood | UMSUG Member (by teleconference) |
| | Peter Burbage | Attendee, Ringway Jacobs (part-meeting) |
| | Adam Jessop | ELEXON (by teleconference) |
| | Kevin Spencer | ELEXON |
| | Sam Daoudi | ELEXON |
| | Nick Baker | Technical Secretary |
| Apologies | Dave Johnson | UMSUG Member |
| | Leanne Cavagan | UMSUG Member |
| | Lindsay McGregor | UMSUG Member |
| | Mike Hawkins | UMSUG Member |

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Due to adverse weather conditions, the UMSUG agreed to an abridged meeting to cater for UMSUG members travelling home and the increased number of members participating by teleconference. There were also several last-minute apologies.

MINUTES

OPEN SESSION – DECISION PAPERS

2. BSCP520 and OID redlining for Action 121/07 (EV 'trickle' charge points in lamp posts) – UMSUG122/01

- 2.1 The Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) and Regulatory Delivery at the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) have confirmed that electric vehicle (EV) 'trickle' charge points in lamp posts can be considered for an unmetered supply. The UMSUG and Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) agreed previously in principle to use the measured Central Management System (mCMS) arrangements for these charge points, subject to receiving this confirmation and agreeing the detail to ensure appropriate use of the arrangements. This paper presented ELEXON's proposed redlined changes to [BSC Procedure \(BSCP\) 520](#) and the [Operational Information Document \(OID\)](#), along with its proposed next steps.
- 2.2 ELEXON noted the previous view of the UMSUG and SVG that mCMS shouldn't be used for fast or rapid charging, and that this somehow needed to be defined in the OID. The UMSUG noted that ELEXON has been unable to find any existing legal definitions of 'trickle', slow, fast or rapid charging to help craft appropriate BSC wording. UMSUG members discussed the paper's suggestion that 'slow' charging should be defined as a power output of 'typically not greater than 7kW', for the reasons described in the paper. ELEXON commented that, in hindsight, it wondered if it should have proposed 7.2kW. It noted that 32 amps (equivalent to 7.2kW) is the highest charging rate for which a manufacturer has, to date, applied to use a mCMS for lamp post EV charging. ELEXON noted that it has received other applications for 16 amps. An UMSUG member commented that they believed one manufacturer's product was around 25 amps.
- 2.3 ELEXON advised that the OID is only guidance and even the BSCP is subject to the [Electricity \(Unmetered Supply\) Regulations 2001](#) (which, as secondary legislation, take precedence over the BSC). ELEXON noted that, under the UMS Regulations, it's ultimately the Licensed Distribution System Operator's (LDSO's) decision whether to grant an unmetered connection agreement. It advised that it didn't wish its definition of 'fast' charging to be an arbitrary cut-off point or formal BSC parameter – noting that this could constrain the ability of the UMSUG and SVG to consider applications on a case-by-case basis.
- 2.4 An UMSUG member commented that their distribution business was unlikely to give an unmetered connection agreement at 32 amps, as this would conflict with its engineering standards. Other UMSUG members noted that some street lights have a cut-out of 25 amps. An UMSUG member advised that the capability of street lights, and therefore LDSOs' engineering standards, varied considerably.
- 2.5 An UMSUG member commented that the output should be as big as the street lamp allows. The socket is designed for 32 amps which is nominally 7.2kW.
- 2.6 The UMSUG agreed that ELEXON should amend the OID to refer to 7.2kW rather than 7kW.
- 2.7 An UMSUG member asked if an additional caveat could be included in the proposed OID wording, saying that use of a mCMS at 7.2kW is subject to the relevant LDSO's engineering standards. Other UMSUG members agreed that, while this would be true under the UMS Regulations anyway, it would be useful additional guidance. ELEXON agreed to include this in the redlining.
- 2.8 The UMSUG discussed the SVG's condition that LDSOs should use separate Metering System IDs (MSIDs) for mCMS within their inventories. ELEXON clarified that the intention behind this was to facilitate any potential future requirements to allocate different Line Loss Factors (LLFs) or report EV charge point consumption. ELEXON suggested it might also help with forecasting. An UMSUG member commented that, while they were unconvinced that this was necessary (and noted that separate reporting of energy consumption could be achieved under one MSID by using sub-meters within the Equivalent Meter), they could see the logic in future-proofing for potential different LLFs.

MINUTES

- 2.9 The UMSUG discussed the SVG's view that use of mCMS for lamp post EV charging should be limited to existing unmetered connection points – i.e. where EV charge points are 'retrofitted' into existing infrastructure.
- 2.10 Some UMSUG members disagreed with applying a strict limitation. A member commented that, while the take-up of EVs remains low, they could still see situations in which this technology might have advantages for new land developments. For example, there could be space restrictions and a need to reduce street / pavement 'clutter'.
- 2.11 An UMSUG member considered that, if there was to be a formal restriction, this would require a definition of what's considered to be an 'existing' versus 'new' connection point – e.g. 'existing' as at what date? They considered this could be open to challenge, since developments are being designed now that will be built after the OID wording is implemented.
- 2.12 ELEXON advised that, for the reasons stated in the paper, it proposed using the words 'it is anticipated that' rather than making this a hard-and-fast rule. It also noted that the OID is only guidance.
- 2.13 An UMSUG member considered that the wording could still be made less strict. ELEXON proposed, as a compromise, amending the wording to read: 'It is anticipated that new land developments will consider the feasibility of metered charge point infrastructure at the time of design'. UMSUG members agreed that this would deliver the intention of the SVG's condition while leaving flexibility for the future.
- 2.14 ELEXON noted that it was also not proposing to progress any restriction on use to 'residential' areas, for the reasons explained in the paper.
- 2.15 An UMSUG member stated that the redlining needed clarifying that mCMS is explicitly not for street lighting. Other UMSUG members agreed. ELEXON noted that the mCMS Test Specification is designed to be technology-neutral and not just for EV charge points. However, it agreed that the mCMS arrangements were not intended for use with street lighting controls – which should continue to use the 'normal' CMS arrangements. ELEXON agreed to add this caveat to both the OID and BSCP redlining.
- 2.16 An UMSUG member suggested also moving the existing Section 5 of the OID (on Half Hourly / Non Half Hourly trading) to nearer the start of the OID. ELEXON noted that, while not technically part of the EV changes, another member had suggested the same thing. It agreed to make this change.
- 2.17 ELEXON highlighted that, as explained in the paper, EV charge point operators would have to meet other, wider obligations under the [Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Regulations 2017](#). ELEXON asked the member from Regulatory Delivery at BEIS if there was any further clarity on how it intended to enforce these obligations (e.g. proactively or reactively). The UMSUG member confirmed that BEIS would be conducting 'active enforcement', but could not say at this time whether that would take the form of pre-approval or a physical check.
- 2.18 An UMSUG member asked if there was a risk that LDSOs use different 'local' (miscellaneous) Charge Codes for this equipment. ELEXON confirmed there wasn't, since the products use the mCMS arrangements and there's only one Charge Code from which the circuit watts are derived (using feedback from the mCMS).
- 2.19 ELEXON advised that there is already a Charge Code for Ubitricity, and agreed to consider outside the meeting whether all the products could use the same one. An UMSUG member asked how we know that EV charge points don't draw down when nothing's plugged in. ELEXON noted that each device might need a nominal, product-specific Control Charge Code, to be determined during testing and covered by its test scenarios. ELEXON advised that a dusk/dawn default Switch Regime will be used, the same as for Ubitricity.
- 2.20 The UMSUG agreed to revisit, after this round of applications, whether any further changes are needed to the mCMS Test Specification.

MINUTES

- 2.21 The Chairman noted that it was Regulatory Delivery at BEIS's intention to update the National Measurement Office's 2014 [Guidance on the UMS Regulations](#) to state that EV 'trickle' charge points can be considered for an unmetered supply. The Chairman considered that, while this and the OID were both guidance, ideally the two sets of guidance wouldn't conflict with each other. She therefore asked the UMSUG member from Regulatory Delivery whether they agreed with the UMSUG's proposed wording. The UMSUG member confirmed that their intention was to mirror the UMSUG's proposed wording for the OID as far as possible (subject to BEIS legal review). An UMSUG member asked what the timescales would be for updating the BEIS guidance. The UMSUG member advised that they were unable to commit to any specific timescales at this time, noting workload. The UMSUG member noted that it was ultimately only guidance, and had been developed with fast-charging in mind.
- 2.22 ELEXON confirmed that the next steps were to take the OID redlining to the SVG for approval at its next meeting on 27 March 2018. UMSUG members agreed that a Change Proposal (CP) to implement the BSCP changes could be implemented later, for the reasons given in the paper. An UMSUG member suggested that it would still be helpful to present SVG with the draft BSCP changes in parallel with the OID, just for information. ELEXON agreed to do so if possible.
- 2.23 ELEXON agreed to update the OID and BSCP redlining with the UMSUG's agreed changes, and circulate this to UMSUG members by email for a final check.
- 2.24 ELEXON noted that, as detailed in the paper, it was progressing mCMS applications for testing in parallel. It noted that its first testing session has been arranged for 5 March 2018, making the 27 March 2018 SVG meeting the earliest that an application could be approved.

Action 122/01

Action 122/02

Action 122/03

- 2.25 The UMSUG:
- AGREED** amendments to the OID and BSCP520 redlining, which will be issued to the UMSUG by correspondence for a final check;
 - AGREED** that ELEXON will take the OID changes to the SVG for approval at its meeting on 27 March 2018;
 - NOTED** that ELEXON will process and test mCMS applications in parallel, but will only seek the SVG's approval of these once the OID changes are approved; and
 - AGREED** that ELEXON will raise a CP to progress the BSCP520 changes, but that this does not need to be approved or implemented before the SVG approves any mCMS for Settlement.

3. **BSCP520 redlining for Action 121/01 (other minor changes from UMSUG121) – UMSUG122/02**

- 3.1 This paper presented other draft redlined changes to BSCP520, to discharge UMSUG Action 121/01. ELEXON invited the UMSUG to agree the final redlining for progression through a CP.
- 3.2 The UMSUG discussed the proposed changes, noting the difficulties the paper described in amending Section 3.1. UMSUG members commented that the proposed wording was an appropriate compromise. Members noted that the UMSUG had discussed all the other changes previously, and had no further comments.
- 3.3 ELEXON advised that the next step would be to raise a CP to progress these changes. UMSUG members agreed with ELEXON's suggestion that, for efficiency, these changes should be combined into a single CP with the changes to support EV charging.

MINUTES

Action 122/03

- 3.4 An UMSUG member asked who the Customer is, in the context of BSCP520 Sections 3.1 and 3.2. Where a combined inventory includes Apparatus connected to the network of an Independent Distribution Network Operator (IDNO), is the 'customer' the IDNO – and is the 'host' LDSO expected to validate the IDNO's inventory?
- 3.5 ELEXON clarified that the BSC defines 'Customer' as the end user of the energy – e.g. a local authority. ELEXON confirmed that, in the situation described by the UMSUG member, the onus is on the IDNO to validate its data before the combined inventory is submitted. The host LDSO is not expected to revalidate the IDNO's data. ELEXON is happy to clarify this with the BSC Auditor if necessary.
- 3.6 The UMSUG:
- AGREED** the proposed redlined changes without amendment;
 - AGREED** that ELEXON will raise a CP to progress these; and
 - AGREED** that these changes should be combined into a single CP with those covered in UMSUG paper 122/01.

4. OID redlining for Action 121/06 (equipment with variable loads) – UMSUG122/03

- 4.1 This paper presented draft redlined changes to the OID to discharge Action 121/06. It invited the UMSUG to recommend these changes to the SVG for approval.
- 4.2 The UMSUG:
- DEFERRED** consideration of this agenda item to a future meeting, due to the adverse weather.
- 4.3 ELEXON agreed to arrange a conference call with interested UMSUG members to discuss the proposed redlining, before bringing it back to UMSUG123.

Action 122/04

5. Clarification of Generic LED Lighting Charge Code process – UMSUG122/04

- 5.1 This paper identified areas of the Generic LED Lighting Charge Code process that manufacturers believe are currently vague and could be better clarified. ELEXON invited the UMSUG to discuss these and agree any clarifications that it believes are necessary.
- 5.2 The UMSUG:
- DEFERRED** consideration of this agenda item to a future meeting, due to the adverse weather.
- 5.3 ELEXON agreed to bring this paper back to UMSUG123.

Action 122/05

OPEN SESSION – UPDATES

6. OID changes to Standard Inventory Format (Action 121/02) – Verbal update

- 6.1 ELEXON noted that it had received a further review comment from an UMSUG member since submitting these changes to the SVG ([SVG205/02](#)). The SVG therefore rejected the changes at its meeting on 27 February 2018, to enable further UMSUG discussion. ELEXON invited the UMSUG to agree any necessary amendments.

MINUTES

- 6.2 ELEXON advised that the UMSUG member had suggested reversing the order of the two components of the new Field 16, to make it easier to sort the inventory data. Under this proposal, the first two digits of the MPAN would be followed by the four-character Market Participant ID of the embedded LDSO.
- 6.3 On further reflection, ELEXON also suggested clarifying that the first two digits are those of the MPAN Core or 'short code'. It also suggested that adding an example to the OID might be useful. UMSUG members agreed. An UMSUG member suggested using the example of '19LENG', noting that '20SOUT' (the example from the original paper) could be confusing.
- 6.4 ELEXON confirmed that it would take the revised redlining back to the next SVG for approval, but would circulate it by email first for a final check by UMSUG members.

Action 122/06

- 6.5 The UMSUG:
- a) **AGREED** amendments to the OID redlining, which will be issued to the UMSUG by correspondence for a final check; and
 - b) **AGREED** that ELEXON will take the final changes to the SVG for approval at its meeting on 27 March 2018.

7. Ofgem's Market-Wide Half Hourly Settlement SCR and UMS

- 7.1 ELEXON advised that it hosted a stakeholder event on 28 February 2018 to discuss the five Target Operating Models. All of the five designs propose the removal of Non Half Hourly unmetered supplies (UMS) arrangements and to move them to Half Hourly; they differ in the detail of how this is implemented.
- 7.2 ELEXON stated that it will give a further update at UMSUG123. More information can be found on the dedicated webpage for the [Design Working Group](#).
- 7.3 The UMSUG:
- a) **NOTED** the update.

8. ELEXON's customer survey feedback

- 8.1 The UMSUG:
- a) **DEFERRED** consideration of this agenda item to a future meeting, due to the adverse weather.

OPEN SESSION – OTHER BUSINESS

9. Actions

- 9.1 **Action 118/04** – Ongoing. Left open till UMSUG123, pending discussion between Dave Johnson and LANTERNS.
- 9.2 **Action 121/11** – Ongoing. ELEXON has updated the tool and will publish it on the BSC Website shortly.
- 9.3 ELEXON noted that all other actions have been completed.

10. Next meeting

- 10.1 The next UMSUG meeting will be held on 8 May 2018, subject to the level of business and the SVG's agreement.