ELEXON

Headline report

Meeting name	**Code Change & Development Group – MHHS SCR**	Purpose of paper	**Information**
Meeting number	**13**	Classification	**Public**
Date and time	**19 January 2021**	Venue	**By webinar**

Synopsis **Summary of the thirteenth CCDG meeting and actions arising**

1. Introduction, apologies and meeting objectives

1.1 The Chair introduced CCDG13 and confirmed those in attendance. The Chair also welcomed Richard Vernon from the Data and Communications Company (DCC) as a new member of the group.

1.2 It was noted that the detailed TOM design and Code Change Matrices are still out for consultation and that the CCDG will discuss the consultation responses at its meeting on 16 February 2021. Elexon has subsequently extended the consultation deadline to 8am on 29 January 2021.

1.3 The Chair confirmed that the meeting objectives were to:

- Remind members of the transition approach developed by the Design Working Group (DWG); and
- Discuss Elexon's initial straw men on the transition/migration activities for the Advanced and Unmetered Supplies (UMS) market segments.

1.4 The Chair reminded the CCDG of the approach and timetable of activities for the group's transition/migration deliverable, as previously agreed at CCDG12.

1.5 The Chair noted the latest COVID-19 lockdown developments and asked members to confirm whether these have affected members' capacity to support the CCDG's work. Some members commented that industry workload has generally increased and that this is a bigger concern for them than the immediate impact of lockdown. Another member noted that, while they are not directly affected, the lockdown is impacting their ability to get input from other operational teams within their organisation. A member commented that it may affect their capacity to support the CCDG's work outside of meetings, for example any offline working on the transition straw men. The Chair agreed to continue reviewing this regularly with CCDG members.

2. Updates on other SCR workstreams

2.1 Ofgem provided an update from the Significant Code Review (SCR), confirming that it still intends to publish its Full Business Case decision in Spring 2021.

3. Overview of DWG's transition approach

3.1 The CCDG Technical Lead presented a recap of how the current Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) market arrangements will transition to the new Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Target Operating Model (TOM) under the approach agreed by the DWG.[1]

[1] For more detail on the DWG's transition approach, see its final report here: https://www.elexon.co.uk/documents/groups/dwg/dwg-final-stage-2-report-to-ofgem/

© Elexon 2021

3.2 A member asked whether the CCDG is constrained by the DWG's approach. Elexon noted that it is part of the CCDG's Terms of Reference that its recommendations must be consistent with the DWG's Preferred TOM design and transition approach/principles, unless Ofgem requests changes to these. However, there may need to be changes to some of the lower-level detail to cater for any developments that have some to light since the DWG concluded (for example, on Ofgem's opt-out policy work). Ofgem noted the need for the CCDG to highlight clearly to industry any changes it makes to the approach previously consulted on by the DWG.

3.3 A CCDG member asked whether the group's transition/migration deliverable would cover activities relating to the Performance Assurance Framework (PAF). Elexon confirmed that these will be considered in the cross-segment straw man to be presented at CCDG15 in March 2021. Elexon advised that its initial thoughts are that there may be need to be different interim and enduring performance standards, for example to cover:

- Initial use of the Change of Measurement Class (CoMC) process
- Subsequent cutover to the new TOM services
- Introduction of the compressed Settlement timetable at the end of transition.

4. Transition straw man for Advanced segment

4.1 Elexon presented its initial straw man for the Advanced market segment, for discussion by the CCDG.

4.2 The group noted the importance of continuing to allow customers the option of using Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) metering over smart metering, particularly non-domestic customers.

4.3 A member suggested that the meter count table on slide 14 was missing the proportion of traditional meters in Profile Classes 3-4. The group also noted that there are 1.2m legacy credit meters across all Profile Classes that will add to the numbers of whole current (WC) meters. Elexon noted that the counts for the straw man were based only on eligible Advanced meter types, and so only captured Non Half Hourly (NHH) AMR meters.

4.4 The CCDG discussed Elexon's proposed enabling governance change of aligning the BSC's definition of Advanced Meter with the Supply Licence and offered comments on the appropriate definition. Members agreed that the type of meter on site should drive the transition approach and the aim should be to avoid unnecessary costs. Members suggested that the best outcome may be to treat Advanced meters without communications as being Non-smart meters, if this is more proportionate. Elexon commented that such treatment would be more of a problem for current transformer (CT), rather than WC, meters, given the CCDG's desire to assign all CT sites to the Advanced segment. It would be better to ensure a clear obligation to ensure that working communications are always provided for such meters.

4.5 Elexon noted that the obligation to have Advanced Meters installed at CT sites (SCL12.27) applies from 31 December 2020 on an 'all reasonable steps' basis.

4.6 Elexon advised that, if the intention is to use a different transition approach/timing for CT meters, there needs to be a way of identifying these meters. The CCDG noted that the only definitive way to identify CT meters in the Registration Service currently would be to introduce and use the Connection Type. Members suggested asking Distributors to decide the best way of doing this, noting this could mean accepting Connection Type as an imperfect mechanism or coming up with an alternative approach. A member suggested possibly using Meter Technical Details (MTDs), even though this would not be visible in Registration data.

4.7 The CCDG noted the need to understand how the timing for introducing Ofgem's opt-out framework interacts with the transition approach. It considered that the less changes in customers' opt-out choices happen during transition, the more efficient the transition process will be. Ofgem and Elexon agreed to discuss this offline in the first instance before updating the CCDG.

ACTION 13/01

4.8 Elexon noted that it still needs to document the load-processing requirements for the Advanced Data Service (ADS). It noted that the ADS will also need an interface with the Registration Service.

4.9 Elexon clarified that the tranches shown on the slides are not intended to be sequential but a way of reflecting that different types of meter in the Advanced segment will have different dependencies and so may need different transition milestones/timetabling. Some CCDG members considered that the proposed approach is too prescriptive and disagreed with the use of the pre-migration CoMC process. These members believed it would be better to provide a methodology and a deadline but otherwise leave it up to Suppliers as to how they migrate meters by that deadline, to give Suppliers flexibility to cater for their individual portfolios of meters and agents.

4.10 Elexon noted that this would be going against the transition approach agreed previously by the DWG, which was predicated on moving the Advanced segment early using the existing CoMC process wherever possible. Elexon commented that, without any prescribed phasing/timetabling of migration activities, there is a risk that Parties leave activities until the last minute, creating potential bottlenecks, missed deadlines, or missed opportunities to migrate easier meters earlier. A member suggested that the PAF could be used to give incentives to move. Other members suggested that there is an opportunity to review and improve the current CoMC process.

4.11 A CCDG member commented that they did not see why the new Registration Service data items proposed for 'Release 1' in the slides need to happen first, noting this would only be needed to distinguish CT from WC meters and its absence would not prevent the pre-migration CoMC from happening. The member also suggested that the 'Release 3' shown in the slides needs to be completed before Qualification can take place. Elexon responded that Qualification could be undertaken based on interim processes and interfaces.

4.12 Elexon asked for volunteers to help it refine the straw man. Three members volunteered (Seth Chapman, James Murphy and Terry Carr) and Elexon agreed to check with those not present at the meeting on whether they wish to be involved. Elexon agreed to work with the volunteer members offline, before sharing the refined straw man with the whole CCDG over MS Teams and then at CCDG15.

ACTION 13/02

5. Transition straw man for UMS segment

5.1 Elexon presented its initial UMS transition straw man, developed with the help of a CCDG member (Tom Chevalier). Elexon noted the considerable crossover with the Advanced segment discussions. The steps of the proposed transition are:

- Cleansing erroneous or non-existent Meter Point Administration Numbers (MPANs), and developing a plan with parties for how to migrate MPANs to HH Settlement.
- Carrying out the CoMC process to migrate NHH UMS MPANs to the current HH arrangements.
- Once BSC Central Services and the Registration Services are in place, a date can be set for the transfer of data direct to the BSC Central Settlement Services.

5.2 Elexon noted that it would not know the size of a UMS customer before amalgamating the MPANs; however there will be around 20,000 MPANs after amalgamation. It advised that the UMS Operator (UMSO) may not need to re-Qualify but that existing Meter Administrators (MAs, of which there are very few) may need to re-Qualify as UMS Data Services (UMSDS). Elexon asked the group for views on how much detail it was necessary to prescribe on the adoption process.

5.3 A CCDG member noted that there may be constraints in the Supplier Meter Registration Service (SMRS) on the volume of MPANs that can move at a time, noting the current bulk Change of Agent (CoA) process limits. Ofgem advised that it will be for the MHHS Programme Manager/System Integrator to consider how to manage this but that it is useful for the CCDG to draw out the volumes of MPANs involved in each market segment/ tranche.

5.4 Ofgem and the group agreed that it would be helpful for Elexon to contact Suppliers that are currently migrating UMS MPANs from NHH to HH Settlement for the April 2021 deadline, in order to understand how they are doing this and what their feedback is on the process. Elexon agreed to do this, as well as asking its Operational Support Managers (OSMs) for any other UMS Supplier contacts to help review the UMS transition straw man.

ACTION 13/03

5.5 Elexon also asked the CCDG's Supplier members to provide it with any UMS contacts within their organisations, noting the need to engage Suppliers in the straw man development. It noted that, while it will seek input from the BSC's UMS User Group (UMSUG), this does not tend to have Supplier representation.

ACTION 13/04

5.6 The CCDG discussed a previous suggestion by a member that a better solution could be to move all existing HH UMS customers to NHH through a CoMC and then re-badge the NHH customers as HH. Elexon commented that it believed this was not possible to do through the existing CoMC process and noted that it would leave no visibility of what was still left to move.

5.7 Ofgem noted that UMSOs had raised questions in previous consultations about whether moving smaller UMS customers to HH Settlement would significantly increase these customers' costs, noting current MA costs. Elexon responded that it cannot comment on commercial arrangements. However, the TOM does not require smaller UMS customers to have a dynamic calculation of their consumption. Elexon clarified that the passive calculation that would be used for these customers will be more sophisticated than their current NHH energy allocation but is not inherently more complex to undertake. It also clarified that existing MAs' systems can already perform this calculation. Elexon suggested that it includes details on how the passive calculation works in the group's transition consultation, to help alleviate concerns.

6. Updates on actions

6.1 Action 11/08 – At the CCDG's request, Elexon has highlighted to the Supplier Volume Allocation Group (SVG) that there is an opportunity to remove any existing unused Standard Settlement Configurations (SSCs) and Time Pattern Regimes (TPRs) ahead of MHHS. The SVG has asked Elexon to bring it a paper setting out more detail on its proposed scope and approach, having suggested potentially including additional Market Domain Data (MDD) items in the data cleanse.

6.2 The CCDG noted that the data cleanse is a suggestion rather than a CCDG requirement/recommendation. It therefore agreed that it is for the SVG to decide if and how to progress this, unless the SVG has any questions on how MHHS will affect the data items. It noted that end-dating combinations will not in itself reduce the size of MDD and that there are separate internal Elexon discussions happening, independently of MHHS, on the potential future format of MDD. Elexon noted that it is also already looking at whether there is a need to re-use old Role Codes for MHHS. The CCDG agreed to close the action.

7. Updates on discussions with DCC/SEC

7.1 Action 12/11 – Ofgem has confirmed with the DCC and Smart Energy Code (SEC) Administration Services (SECAS) that monthly validation of Meter Advances against daily consumption can be spread out over a month. Ofgem is following up with SECAS and the DCC on what this means in practice.

7.2 Action 12/09 – Elexon, Ofgem, DCC and SECAS have discussed different options for supporting the DCC's need to know whether the Meter Data Retriever (MDR) requesting data is appointed for that Meter/date. The CCDG discussed the four options previously shared by Elexon over MS Teams. It agreed that, as a one-to-one relationship between the MDR and Smart Data Service (SDS) cannot be assumed, Option 1 is likely to be best. Under this option, a new MPID would be created for the MDR and added to the Registration Service (SMRS) in addition to holding the SDS MPID. The MDR will not be a BSC-qualified role, as the SDS will be the Qualified entity under the BSC. However, the MDR will need to go through the SEC qualification process as part of its new SEC User Role. Elexon noted that the outstanding question is therefore who populates the new MPID and agreed to continue discussions with the DCC and SECAS about this.

Headline report

8. AOB

8.1 Ofgem highlighted the question from the joint subgroup of the CCDG and Architecture Working Group (AWG), as posted on MS Teams, over whether to keep the existing Change of Energisation Status process or change it. The options being considered by the subgroup are:

- As now - Supplier requests for a change would go to either the Distributor or the Metering Service, depending on who would need to carry out the work; or
- All requests go through the Metering Service and the Metering Service informs the Distributor of the request if needed:
  - Potential benefits: Simplifies this process because the Metering Service will always be the party the request goes to, and they will know whether or not they can carry out the work
  - Potential cons: Involves the Metering Service in what is ultimately a contractual relationship between the Supplier and the Distributor that they don't need to be involved in.

8.2 CCDG members agreed that they could see no strong reasons in favour of change and agreed to share any further thoughts over MS Teams. Ofgem agreed to take the views received back to the subgroup.

ACTION 13/05

9. Summary and next steps

9.1 The next CCDG meeting will be on 16 February 2021, when the group will discuss the responses to its consultation on the detailed TOM design and Code Change Matrices. In the meantime, Elexon will work offline with volunteer members on the Advanced and UMS transition straw men before sharing the refined versions with the whole CCDG. Elexon and Ofgem will also continue discussions with the outstanding SEC questions with SECAS and the DCC.