

## SVG Recommendation for CP1388

CP1388 was presented, along with the IA and our responses to the 5 March SVG Meeting ([SVG145/05](#)). We invited the SVG to recommend that the BSC Panel approves CP1388, noting that an enabling Modification is required and that it would be beneficial to approve the Modification and the CP together.

The SVG is divided on the merits of the proposed CP1388 solution, with a majority of SVG Members in favour of rejection but with several Members in favour of approval. Therefore the SVG recommends by majority that the Panel rejects CP1388.<sup>1</sup>

All SVG Members agree that there is a need for a solution, and that doing nothing is not an option due to the risk of having incorrect MTDs and thereby reduced Settlement accuracy.

While the SVG's primary concern is the accuracy of Settlement, it notes that incorrect MTDs can also result in inaccurate billing to end consumers at precisely the time that the government would be promising improved bills from smart Meters.

### Views of those against

The majority of SVG Members who are against CP1388 are not convinced that it is necessarily the right solution. While these Members note that they are required to assess CP1388 on its own merits against the current baseline, they believe that the CP would not on balance better facilitate the achievement of the Applicable BSC Objectives.

Some Members are concerned that costly system changes could be made in time for the start of the mass smart roll-out in 2014, only for better longer-term solutions to arise once registration is centralised at the DCC or as a consequence of Ofgem's Smarter Markets work. Some Members consider that there are less costly, and more minimal change, approaches that could be adopted in the interim pending wider developments. Some Members suggest that further clarity is needed on these longer-term developments before any solution is progressed. Some Members note the need to have a solution in place for the 2014 mass roll-out, but consider that their other preferred (more minimal change) solutions would have shorter implementation lead times. These Members therefore do not believe that time pressure is an adequate reason for supporting CP1388 in the absence of any other solutions having been raised.

Some Members also believe that, regardless of the consideration of its ultimate shelf-life, the CP1388 solution involves unnecessary complexity and risk through its introduction of new data flows. These Members believe that it would be less complex and risky to use existing industry data flows to communicate smart MTDs (e.g. the D0149 and D0150).

Some Members consider that, while CP1388 is the only solution option to have received majority industry support (and while the group has been unable to identify any option with unanimous support), this is not in itself an argument for approval. These Members are unconvinced that the group has adequately set out all of the available options in its October 2012 (pre-CP1388) consultation, in terms of focusing on their respective costs and their pros and cons for Settlement accuracy. These Members are therefore concerned that respondents may not have understood the

---

<sup>1</sup> As the SVG can only make decisions if it is unanimous, the Panel would therefore need to make a decision on the CP even if no enabling Modification was required.

Settlement implications of each option fully, and believe that a further options consultation should be undertaken.

A Member is concerned at the number of impact assessment comments received (over 100 pages of responses), and the number of subsequent amendments required to the Code Subsidiary Document redlining. This Member believes that these amendments should be reissued for another industry impact assessment.

A Member notes that CP1388, if approved, may require consequential changes to the Settlement Risk register and new Performance Assurance Reporting & Monitoring System (PARMS) Serials.

Most Members who are against CP1388 believe that it will have a negative impact on Applicable BSC Objective (d), by introducing unnecessary complexity/risk and thereby reduced efficiency. One Member clarifies that they also believe the CP will negatively affect Applicable BSC Objective (c). This Member believes that the proposed solution introduces risk to Settlement and is therefore not competitive due to any material error caused by the realisation of the risk being shared amongst participants.

#### Views of those supportive

A minority of SVG Members believe that CP1388 would better facilitate the achievement of Applicable BSC Objective (d).

These Members recognise that, while there is broad consensus on the high-level principles, no individual element of the solution has unanimous support from the group or industry and that the CP1388 solution is the only one to achieve majority support (and as such is the group's endorsed solution). The Members believe that reopening the discussion of alternative options would not result in a different consensus, and risks being unable to implement a solution in time for the 2014 mass roll-out. These Members believe that it is essential to have a solution in place by this point, and that it is not possible to both achieve this and have certainty on longer-term developments.

A Member comments that the starting point for the development of the solution was the preferred solution in the SMIP's 'Legacy System Changes (Enduring)' paper in October 2011, which explored the pros and cons of a number of alternative options. This was subsequently modified to use new rather than existing flows based on the majority view in the group's consultation. The Member notes that the group had also conducted a lengthy assessment of all the different options (including many meetings and an industry consultation), and the Member disagreed with the suggestion that this assessment had been inadequate or had not focused on Settlement Risk. The Member believes that the group members and industry respondents have held consistent views throughout this process and that these will not change through any further consultation. The Member comments that the minority disagreement on individual elements simply reflects participants' different internal processes and preferences, that both large and small Suppliers are split in their views, and that there is no option that 'works best' for everybody. The Member considers that, while a high volume of IA comments have been received, the subsequent redlining changes are immaterial and relatively few in number – noting that these changes have been agreed by the group, which recognised that these weren't material.

On the matter of risk, an SVG Member argues that the starting point for all of the solution options considered by the group has been the need to avoid the Settlement Risk of incorrect MTDs. The

Member disagrees that introducing new data flows is more complex/risky than using existing flows, and comments that the proposed CP1388 solution clearly separates flows by responsibility. The Member notes that alternative options for using existing flows have been considered but discounted by a majority of the group and the industry.

The Member believes that:

- Any solution which retains existing flows and requires the Supplier to pass on information to the MOA for distribution has more potential for failure, because the participant responsible for maintaining and distributing the configuration details (the MOA) is not the party making the actual configuration changes (the Supplier).
- Any solution which retains existing flows and requires the Supplier to complete some parts of the flows, and the MOA to complete other parts, would give no clear responsibility for the flow content and is prone to error.
- Using existing flows for both smart and non-smart processes would itself be more prone to complexity and risk. It also requires process (if not system) changes in order to use the same flows for different purposes.
- CP1388 (while focusing on the core processes needed for 'day one' of the mass smart roll-out) gives the potential for further future simplification through other 'additive' changes over time, for example, separating the responsibilities for processing the closing and opening readings on change of Supplier between the old and new Supplier hubs and merging the new configuration details flow with the 'Affirmation of Metering System Settlement Details' (D0052) flow.

A Member considers that 'doing the minimum' and 'removing risk and complexity' are not necessarily compatible, and that the group believes that the CP1388 solution makes the minimum changes needed to deliver a workable process that removes the risk of incorrect smart MTDs.

Another Member notes that the risk of incorrect MTDs already appears in many of the top Settlement Risks. This Member argues that using the MOA to pass on information which is in turn passed to it by the Supplier is only likely to add to existing problems of the right data not being sent to the right people. This Member believes that, while CP1388 might not be the best of all possible solutions, it is the only one with majority support. The Member agrees that doing nothing is not an option, and believes that CP1388 should therefore be implemented in order to mitigate the risk of incorrect MTDs at the start of the 2014 roll-out.

A Member comments that, while CP1388 may require PARMs changes, it is for the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) to decide how it wishes to monitor any smart processes and that the CP1388 implementation leaves time for the PAB to do this.

### **Associated change**

There is also a separate MRA DTC CP3380, which relates to CP1388 but not part of it.

### **View of the P292 Proposer**

The Proposer believes that as Suppliers will be responsible for updating MTDs in the future for smart Meters, they will be the ones who need to ensure that the correct information enters into Settlement.

They believe that CP1388 enables the Supplier to update the details; whereas the legacy arrangements used for smart would create a significant risk to Settlement if Suppliers aren't able to ensure the provision of the MTDs to participants.

The Proposer believes a workaround, using for instance spreadsheets, creates problems for consistency and the ability of the PAB and the BSC Auditor to assure the industry of accuracy; whereas a clearly consistent and systemised solution would enable a more effective delivery.

The Proposer recognises that whilst not all Suppliers are supportive of CP1388, the wider industry has expressed its views both in the group and in the consultation process, which has resulted in CP1388; and that the group is made up of NHH experts, which reviewed the outputs of the SMIP and concluded that these changes need to be progressed through CP1388.

The Proposer points out that the group reviewed various options and have consulted widely across the Supplier-Supplier Agent-LDSO community. While no clear solution was preferred by everyone, the group has done its work and settled on the solution that the majority supported. The Proposer supports that approach, and is of the opinion that retaining legacy arrangements, which weren't designed with smart Meters, would not be compatible with the BSC Objective D. In addition, the Proposer believes that the issue of competition can equally be argued successfully from either side.

The Proposer points out that industry is already installing smart Meters and therefore the industry should not wait three to four years until Settlement is redesigned or the centralised registration is understood.

■ agree  
■ agree with reservations  
■ disagree

	British Gas	EDF	E.ON	Npower	SSE	Scottish Power	Gazprom	Haven	Ovo	Smartest Energy	Total Gas and Power	Northern Powergrid	Western Power Distribution	Electricity North West	Enterprise Managed Services (E&CS)	Lowri Beck	Siemens Communications and Services	TMA Data Management	Salient Systems
2.1 Do you agree with the high level proposal for the maintenance and distribution of Meter Technical Details	red	green	green	green	green	orange	green	red	red	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red
2.2 Do you agree that the proposed changes are required for the start of the mass smart roll-out in 2014?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	orange	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange
2.3 Do you agree with the proposal to progress changes in support of Non Half Hourly settled Metering Systems in the shorter term and consider the processes for Half Hourly settled Metering Systems serviced by the DCC as a subsequent change?	green	orange	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	orange
2.4 Do you agree that the new processes and flows should apply to all remotely configurable Non Half Hourly Metering Systems?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
No, SMETS only	green	green	green	red	red	red	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	red	green	green	red	green	green
No, DCC serviced SMETS only	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
No, DCC serviced only	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
No, all NHH	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
2.5 Feedback on Solutions	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
1 Supplier takes readings remotely	green	green	green	red	red	green	green	red	red	green	green	green	red	red	orange	green	red	green	red
2 Device details flow used for removal of legacy meter	red	green	green	green	red	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
3 Configuration data Supplier to MOA optional	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
4 Timescales for provision of Device Details and Configuration Details	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
5 MOA's D0303 flow obligation unchanged	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
6 MOA's D0312 flow obligation remains unchanged	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
7 Energisation/de-energisation processes to remain unchanged	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
8 No industry flow for other SMETS configurable items	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
9 Use of a Configuration Sequence Number	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
10 PARMS changes likely to be required	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
2.6 Supplier (green) or MOA (red) to provide device details to DC/MOA	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	red	red	green	orange	red	green	orange	green	green	green	green
2.7 Should NHHDC have to wait for device details before processing the CoS reading	green	red	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green
2.8 Feedback on draft redlining - agree (green) disagree (red)	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	red	green	green	green	green
3.1 Do you agree that Meter Asset Details and Meter Configuration Details should be sent as new flows for remotely configurable meters (with existing D0150, D0149 used for conventional non-smart and non-remotely-configurable AMR meters, and D0313 used for AMR meters)?	green	green	green	green	red	green	red	red	orange	green	green	red	green	red	red	green	green	red	green
3.2 Do you agree with the proposed contents of the Meter Asset Details and Meter Configuration Details flows?	orange	green	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	orange
3.3 Do you agree that Test Date and Next Test Date should be used in place of Certification Date and Certification Expiry Date?	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
3.4 Do you agree with the proposal to standardise 'Manufacturers Make & Type'?	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green
3.5 Do we exclude TPR etc from Non Settlement Registers	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	green	green
3.6 Is there still a requirement to include Non Settlement Registers in Meter Technical Details?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
3.7 Should Meter Type be a configurable item?	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
4.1 Would you favour standard industry flows for installation (work management) requests/responses [green] or bi-lateral Supplier-MOA arrangements [red]?	green	green	red	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange	green	green	green	green	orange	green
4.2 If you favour standard industry flows for installation (work management) requests/responses, how do you anticipate requests being made for single visit dual fuel smart installations?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
4.3 If you favour standard industry flows for installation (work management) responses, do you think other equipment should be included in the Meter Asset Details flow or could this be provided in a separate flow and potentially implemented in longer timescales?	green	orange	green	green	red	green	green	red	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	green	green	red
4.4 If you favour standard industry flows for installation (work management) requests/responses, what information do you think should be included in these flows?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
4.5 Do you see any distinction between the arrangements for requesting smart installations during the mass roll-out and those for subsequent installations/replacements/removals?	orange	red	red	red	red	red	red	green	red	red	green	red	red	orange	green	red	red	green	red
4.6 Please provide views on how and when asset tracking for smart equipment should be delivered. Please provide any requirements in this area that you consider warrant a standard industry solution.	green	red	green	green	red	green	orange	green	green	green	green	orange	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green
5.1 Do you consider that there is merit in the proposal to separate responsibility for the closing and opening Change of Supplier readings?	green	green	green	green	green	green	red	red	red	red	orange	green	green	red	green	green	green	green	green
5.2 If such a proposal were to be adopted, how would you view the risk of gaps/overlaps in the volume of energy settled? How could this risk be mitigated?	orange	green	red	green	orange	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	orange	orange
5.3 What would the implications be of running a new process alongside non-smart processes for legacy metering?	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green	green
5.4 Are there benefits in a new Change of Supplier process being available in time for the mass rollout of smart metering in 2014 [green] or would it be better to consider process revisions as part of Ofgem's smarter energy markets work programme [red]?	red	green	orange	green	red	red	red	green	green	red	red	green	green	orange	green	orange	green	green	red

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Change Proposal – BSCP40/02</b></p>	<p>CP No: 1388</p> <p><i>Version No: 1.0</i> (mandatory by BSCCo)</p>
<p><b>Title</b> (mandatory by originator)</p> <p><b><i>Meter Technical Details for Smart Meters</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Description of Problem/Issue</b> (mandatory by originator)</p> <p>Meter Technical Details (MTDs) are sets of data relating to the Metering Equipment installed at each customer premise. These data sets are currently maintained by Meter Operator Agents (MOA) and distributed to the relevant Supplier, Data Collector (DC) and Licensed Distribution Business Operator (LDSO) for each Metering System to which the MOA is appointed.</p> <p>The role of the MOA will change with the roll-out of smart metering. The MOA will continue to install and maintain Meters via site visits, when requested by the relevant Supplier. However, Suppliers will be able to configure smart Meters remotely, for example, to set and change the Meter’s tariff registers to effect a change of Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC). They will achieve this by sending the relevant service request via the Data and Communications Company (DCC) User Gateway, which will result in the appropriate command being sent to the smart Metering System.</p> <p>It is anticipated that where remote configuration is not possible, e.g. due to a local failure of the Wide Area Network (WAN), the MOA may be instructed by the Supplier to update a configuration locally (e.g. using a handheld terminal) subject to the DCC/Smart Energy Code (SEC) security architecture.</p> <p>The existing processes for the distribution of Meter configuration details by the MOA will not be efficient for smart Meters, because of the fundamental change in the way that Meters and metering data will be managed and the more direct role that Suppliers will have in configuring registers.</p> <p>A mechanism is required to enable Suppliers to request the installation, replacement and removal of other items of equipment that form part of the smart metering installation and for MOAs to confirm the outcome of the request. Whilst information about items such as In Home Displays and Communication Hubs is not required for Settlement purposes, existing BSCP processes will need to reflect proposed changes to the Data Transfer Catalogue (DTC) to include such equipment.</p>	
<p><b>Proposed Solution</b> (mandatory by originator)</p> <p>For smart Meters, it is proposed that MTD are split into two flows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smart Device Details – consisting of information that is sourced by the MOA based on the Meter and other smart equipment installed on site;</li> <li>• Meter Configuration Details – consisting of register mappings and other configuration data that can be set or amended by the Supplier remotely via the DCC.</li> </ul> <p>For the purpose of this Change Proposal, smart Meters will be defined as any Meters that comply with the Smart Metering Equipment Technical Specification (SMETS) – i.e. will exclude Advanced Meters (AMR), those Advanced Domestic Meters (ADM) that are not compliant with the SMETS and Half Hourly (HH) settled Meters. It is envisaged that the scope will be widened, if required, via subsequent Change Proposals.</p> <p>Responsibility for sourcing and maintaining the Smart Device Details will remain with the MOA. The MOA will provide the Smart Device Details to the Supplier when a smart Meter is installed, replaced or removed or when any changes are made to the Smart Device Details.</p>	

Responsibility for sourcing and maintaining the Meter Configuration Details will rest with the Supplier. If the MOA configures the smart Meter locally, the MOA will send Meter Configuration Details to the Supplier. The smart Meter can then be re-configured remotely by the Supplier, if required, once communications have been re-established.

Whenever there is a change to the Smart Device Details, the Supplier will forward the Smart Device Details to the LDSO (and optionally to the Non Half Hourly (NHH) DC).

Whenever there is a change to the Meter Configuration Details, the Supplier will forward the Meter Configuration Details to the NHHDC and LDSO (and optionally to the MOA).

The Supplier will not be required to send the Smart Device Details and Meter Configuration Details as a pair, but may choose to do so.

The Supplier will also be responsible for distributing the Smart Device Details and Meter Configuration Details to the appropriate participants on change of MOA and change of NHHDC and to the new Supplier on change of Supplier.

Where a smart Meter is serviced by the DCC, it is assumed that security and communications details will remain the responsibility of the DCC and its service providers. Where there is a need to transfer security and communications details, it is assumed that this will be via the DCC User Gateway and that the interface definitions will form part of SEC governance. This would include the transfer of such data to and from the DCC and Smart Metering System Operators (SMSO) on 'opt-in'/'opt-out' of DCC Services (i.e. for Non Domestic, Profile Class 3 and 4 Metering Systems).

The scope of this Change Proposal excludes the change of Measurement Class processes. This is because further consideration is needed in the wider context of potential changes to the Metering Codes of Practice and the use of elective HH metering. These processes are likely to be subject to a subsequent Change Proposal.

Key features of the proposed solution are as follows:

1. Meter readings will be taken remotely by the Supplier on installation, change of configuration etc and provided to the NHHDC for validation. MOAs will not be required to provide any readings taken on site to the Supplier, unless required by the Supplier as a contingency or as evidence of a site visit. Suppliers will not be mandated to use readings from MOAs, where provided, except as a 'backstop'.
2. On replacement of a legacy Meter by a smart Meter, the new Smart Device Details flow (rather than the 'Non Half-hourly Meter Technical Details' (D0150) flow), will be used to notify the removal of the legacy Meter.
3. The Supplier will not be required to send the Meter Configuration Details to the MOA, but has the option to do so.
4. The Supplier will not be required to send the Smart Device Details to the NHHDC, but has the option to do so.
5. The Supplier will notify the energisation status of the Metering System on the Meter Configuration Details flow. The Meter Configuration Details will thus provide the NHHDC with the information needed to validate readings from the Supplier.
6. The timescales for the provision of Smart Device Details to the LDSO and Meter Configuration Details to the NHHDC and LDSO will initially be the same as those for providing the D0150 and 'Notification of Mapping Details' (D0149) flows (i.e. by 10 Working Days from the effective date). This obligation will be placed on the Supplier, with the transfer of the Smart Device Details between the MOA and the Supplier subject to contractual agreements.
7. On change of MOA and NHHDC, the Supplier will notify the new agent that the Metering

System has a smart Meter. The Supplier may use the Contract Reference in the ‘Notification of Meter Operator or Data Collector Appointment and Terms’ (D0155) or other means, as agreed.

8. The MOA’s responsibility for sending the ‘Notification of Meter Operator, Supplier and Metering Assets installed / removed by the MOP to the MAP’ (D0303) flow to the Meter Asset Provider (MAP) will remain unchanged. (A missing instance of the D0303 flow between the new MOA and MAP on concurrent change of Supplier and NHHMOA will be added to BSCP514 6.2.4).
9. The MOA’s responsibility for sending the ‘Notification of Meter Information to ECOES’ (D0312) flow will remain unchanged.
10. The energisation/de-energisation processes will remain unchanged. The MOA will continue to send the energisation status and associated readings to the Supplier, NHHDC and LDSO. Remotely disabled Meters are energised for Settlement purposes (and can still be read). It is not envisaged that Suppliers will need to notify other participants if a Meter is disabled as this information can be obtained from the Meter. It is expected that Suppliers will continue to take readings from remotely disabled Meters.
11. The SMETS includes multiple items that can be configured by the Supplier via the DCC User Gateway, for example pre-payment rates and thresholds, block pricing rules and thresholds for configurable alerts. Where these items are configured locally by the MOA, a mandated industry flow between the Supplier and the MOA is not proposed as part of this Change Proposal.
12. Where a Meter is configured more than once on a given day, the Supplier will endeavour to ensure that the latest version for that day is the one that is distributed to the NHHDC and LDSO (along with the relevant readings, in the case of the NHHDC).
13. A new flow – Smart Equipment Work Management Request – will be introduced as an alternative to the ‘Request for Installation or Change to a Metering System Functionality or the Removal of All Meters’ (D0142) flow for smart Meters. This will allow Suppliers to request the installation of additional smart Metering Equipment, other than the electricity Meter. The new Smart Device Details flow will include optional information about other smart Metering Equipment. Although this information will be copied to NHHDCs and LDSOs, they will be under no obligation to retain it.
14. The new processes have been “designed for success”. Use of the D0170 (Request for Metering System Related Details) flow has not been prescribed. Additional process steps to chase missing flows may need to be progressed via a separate Change Proposal, along with changes to the DTC to allow Supplier-Supplier and MOP-Supplier instances of the D0170.
15. An additional change to BSCP509 (Changes to Market Domain Data) will need to be raised in order to create a valid set for the proposed new data items – Smart Meter Manufacturer, Smart Meter Model and Smart Meter Version.
16. Changes are likely to be required to the relevant Performance Assurance Reporting and Monitoring System (PARMS) Serials to reflect the transfer of some of the MOA’s responsibilities to the Supplier. These will need to be progressed via a separate Change Proposal.
- 17.

**Justification for Change** (*mandatory by originator*)

The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC)’s Smart Metering Implementation Programme (SMIP) has defined requirements in relation to smart metering arrangements, which impact existing



electricity and gas codes. These requirements and potential consequential changes to industry codes were documented in the SMIP Business Process Design Group (BPDG) paper - Legacy System Changes (Enduring) v2.0 dated 14 November 2011. The proposed solution is that put forward by the SMIP, with some further refinements, as developed by a joint BSC-MRA working group and following a consultation on 1 October.

Under the proposed operating model for smart metering, Suppliers will have direct responsibility for how smart Meters operate. The proposed change will reflect the revised responsibilities and avoids making the MOA a “post-box” for configuration changes made by the Supplier. Given that configuration changes will usually be made by the Supplier, moving responsibility for distributing data from the MOA to the Supplier will ensure that NHHDCs and LDSOs receive the data they need from a single source and will know who to chase for missing details.

Whilst the proposed solution represents a broad consensus of the joint BSC-MRA working group, unanimous agreement was not obtained for all features of the solution. It is anticipated that incremental changes to the solution may be raised or required prior to implementation.

**To which section of the Code does the CP relate, and does the CP facilitate the current provisions of the Code?** *(mandatory by originator)*

MOA responsibilities in respect of maintaining and distributing MTDs are set out in Section S 2.2 (Meter Operator Agents). Whilst these responsibilities will endure, a Modification is likely to be needed to the Code to reflect the transfer of some responsibilities from the MOA to the Supplier.

**Estimated Implementation Costs** *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

The ELEXON costs to implement the proposed changes equates to £240 (1 man day effort).

**Configurable Items Affected by Proposed Solution(s)** *(mandatory by originator)*

BSCP504 - Non-Half Hourly Data Collection for SVA Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

BSCP514 - SVA Meter Operations for Metering Systems Registered in SMRS

BSCP515 – Licensed Distribution

SVA Data Catalogue Volume 1: Data Interfaces

SVA Data Catalogue Volume 2: Data Items.

**Impact on Core Industry Documents or System Operator-Transmission Owner Code** *(mandatory by originator)*

An MRA change to the Data Transfer Catalogue will be required to introduce three new data flows – Smart Device Details, Meter Configuration Details and Smart Equipment Work Management Request – and any associated new data items.

**Related Changes and/or Projects** *(mandatory by BSCCo)*

An MRA change to the Data Transfer Catalogue to introduce the three new data flows.

**Requested Implementation Date** (*mandatory by originator*)

By February 2014 or June 2014 (depending on impact assessment)

**Reason:**

To allow testing to take place as part of (or at the same time as) the SMIP's End-to-End Testing, ahead of the smart metering mass-rollout in late 2014.

**Version History** (*mandatory by BSCCo*)

Version 1.0 of CP1388 issued on 28 December 2012.

**Originator's Details:**

**BCA Name**.....*Simon Fox*.....

**Organisation**.....*ELEXON Limited*.....

**Email Address**.....*simon.fox@elexon.co.uk*.....

**Telephone Number**.....*020 7380 4299*.....

**Date**.....*28 December 2012*.....

Attachments: Y

CP1388\_BSCP504\_redlined\_v0.1 (151 pages)

CP1388\_BSCP514\_redlined\_v0.1(133 pages)

CP1388\_BSCP515\_redlined\_v0.1 (2 pages)

CP1388\_SVA\_DC\_Vol\_1\_redlined\_v0.1 (1 page)

CP1388\_SVA\_DC\_Vol\_2\_redlined\_v0.1 (1 page)

CP1388\_DTC CP Annex B\_redlined\_v0.1 (8 pages)

CP1388\_DTC CP Annex D\_redlined\_v0.1 (7 pages)

*(delete as appropriate)*