

Summary

Communication flows

The Workgroup questioned the need to include both the 'Requested Actin Date' and 'Expected Action Date' data items in the DAXZY data flow, believing that just one date field could be used for both purposes. It noted that the proposed process allows 2WD for Suppliers to query the date provided by the MOA, and that if no query was received in this time it would constitute agreement. The Workgroup commented that where a Supplier was challenging the date provided by a MOA it should provide additional reasoning, which could include a visit being booked – this would help prevent Suppliers requesting unrealistic timescales. It also commented that in some instances the new flow would need to be sent from the Supplier to the LDSO for responding to requests (and between other roles?)

The Workgroup noted its earlier decision that the process should be tailored for the HH market rather than accommodating both the HH and NHH markets, but commented that it didn't want to mandate the new process, it also didn't want to preclude NHH from using the processes developed. ELEXON commented that a 'NHH fault' or 'non advanced' category could be added to the fault categories to support this. The Workgroup also commented that it would like to avoid running two processes during the implementation period, referencing the challenges that had been experienced when changes to commissioning were introduced.

The Workgroup discussed the unique fault reference, with some Members questioning the need to include the MPAN in the reference as it was also included in the flow. Other Members noted that removing the MPAN would mean that the reference would only be unique on cross-referencing with another field and that this was undesirable. It was suggested that the reference could be shortened by including a longer string of digits instead of the core, but some members commented that this would make a fault harder to track from end to end. As such the Workgroup concluded that the proposed reference format was agreeable.

On the new data items, the Workgroup believed that 'no response required' should be removed from the JCCCC item. It also proposed changes to the fault categories including a new category for requesting LDSO Support, making 'MC1' more generic, and splitting MC2 up to cover the 4 point failures in the ability of connecting to the Modem, connecting to the comms, connecting to the Meter and retrieving data. The Workgroup commented that where no access was indicated a free text field should be mandated to provide additional information.

Process for involving LDSOs

The Workgroup considered two processes for LDSOs taking responsibility for resolving faults. One where the MOA closed the open fault and a new fault was raised against the LDSO and one where the fault stays open with the MOA but responsibility is transferred to the LDSO.

The Workgroup noted similarities with the 135 process used under MOCOPA, and that this was designed to focus on safety rather than Settlement accuracy. It commented that it didn't want to replicate this process, but agreed that a BSC process would likely improve the resolution of faults. The Workgroup questioned whether faults could be removed from the 135 process to avoid duplication, but ELEXON noted that this was outside of BSC remit.

There was discussion over which process was preferred, with some Members commenting that MOA would prefer to close the fault, so that it is removed from their system when they have no responsibility for it, and that if the LDSO required assistance this was provided for in the proposed process. Other members preferred the latter option, to ensure end to end visibility of the fault – though this could be provided by including the MPAN in the fault reference. One Member questioned whether the same fault reference could be used when raising a fault with the LDSO to ensure continuity. This was agreed by the Workgroup. It was questioned why the MOA was included in communications from the LDSO with the Workgroup believing that the MOA (and DC) would only need to know when the fault was raised and resolved with the LDSO.

ISSUE 73 MEETING 3 – 13 JUNE 2019

The Workgroup commented that it would like prescribed timescales for LDSO communications to ensure consistency with the MOA process. ELEXON amended the processes to include these. The Workgroup also requested that a step be added for the LDSO to request MOA support.

Service Level Agreements proposals

The Workgroup noted that SLAs proposed by ELEXON and that they were based on a limited amount of data. ELEXON commented that if the Workgroup wanted more robust analysis, it could use the RFI process to expand the data pool. It also noted that as the changes to the communication process would remove the existing SLAs, it would want to simultaneously implement the new proposals.

The Workgroup noted that it would be much easier to define realistic SLAs once the new communication process was in use and suggested some temporary SLAs be put in place and reviewed when data was available. A Member commented that there was not much variation between the different categories, and that an average of 25WD for MOA faults could be used for simplicity. For LDSO timescales, 40WD was proposed as this criteria exists under DCUSA for LDSOs.

The Workgroup also considered that it was unrealistic to resolve all faults within these timescales as exceptional cases will exist. As such it proposed that participants should aim to resolve 90% of faults in the prescribed timescales.

Change of Agent challenges

It was suggested that the Supplier should take ownership of faults and coordinate on agent changes to ensure continuity. This would also allow the Supplier to make informed decisions. For example, where the fault was with DC systems not being able to dial the Meter, upon a change of agent, the fault may no longer exist and so could be closed without any action. The Workgroup commented that if the most recent DAXYZ was included for information on a Change of Agent, then it would help with the continuity of a fault. Some Members did not believe that the a Change of Agent with an open fault was a significant problem, and commented that any solution should be proportionate to this. The Workgroup agreed that on a change of Agent the fault should be closed and a new one opened for the new agent, with the DAXYZ being passed for information to the incoming agent.

There was discussion on who the LDSO should communicate with in the event of a Change of Agent (or Supplier). The Workgroup noted that both Suppliers would have an interest in the fault resolution as it would affect Settlement data, but concerns were raised around GDPR compliance of passing information to a Supplier that is no longer responsible for the Meter. ELEXON agreed to investigate this legal point.