

## Stage 03: Assessment Procedure Consultation

# P300 'Introduction of new Measurement Classes to support Half Hourly DCUSA Tariff Changes (DCP179)'

P300 seeks to introduce new Measurement Classes for aggregated Half Hourly-settled customers (for current transformer and whole current metered domestic, and whole current non-domestic markets). P300 builds on [Rejected Modification P280](#) and aligns with [DCUSA DCP 179](#), which seeks to implement Half Hourly DCUSA tariff changes. P300 would enable LDSOs to charge Suppliers on an aggregated basis as well as on a site specific basis.

This Assessment Procedure Consultation for P300 closes:

**5pm on Friday 11 July 2014**

The Workgroup may not be able to consider late responses.



The P300 Workgroup initially recommends **approval** of P300

This Modification is expected to impact:

- Suppliers
- Licenced Distribution System Operators (LDSOs)
- Supplier Meter Registration Agents (SMRAs)
- Half Hourly Data Aggregators (HHDAAs)
- Half Hourly Data Collectors (HHDCs)
- Half Hourly Meter Operator Agents (HHMOAs)
- The Supplier Volume Allocation Agent (SVAA)
- ELEXON

What stage is this document in the process?

01 Initial Written Assessment

02 Definition Procedure

03 Assessment Procedure

04 Report Phase

P300  
Assessment Procedure  
Consultation

23 June 2014

Version 1.0

Page 1 of 24

© ELEXON Limited 2014



---

### Any questions?

---

Contact:

**Simon Fox**

---



[Simon.fox@elexon.co.uk](mailto:Simon.fox@elexon.co.uk)

---



**020 7380 4299**

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	Summary	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	Why Change?	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	Solution	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	Impacts & Costs	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	Implementation	<b>13</b>
<b>6</b>	Workgroup's Discussions	<b>15</b>
<b>7</b>	Workgroup's Initial Conclusions	<b>18</b>
	Appendix 1: Glossary & References	<b>20</b>
	Appendix 2: Workgroup Details	<b>23</b>

## About This Document

The purpose of this P300 Assessment Procedure Consultation is to invite BSC Parties and other interested parties to provide their views on the merits of P300. The P300 Workgroup will then discuss the consultation responses, before making a recommendation to the BSC Panel at its meeting on 14 August 2014 on whether or not to approve P300.

There are three parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides details of the solution, impacts, costs, benefits/drawbacks and proposed implementation approach. It also summarises the Workgroup's key views on the areas set by the Panel in its Terms of Reference, and contains details of the Workgroup's membership and full Terms of Reference.
- Attachment A contains the draft redlined changes to the BSC for P300.
- Attachment B contains the specific questions on which the Workgroup seeks your views. Please use this form to provide your response to these questions, and to record any further views or comments you wish the Workgroup to consider.

---

P300  
Assessment Procedure  
Consultation

---

23 June 2014

---

Version 1.0

---

Page 2 of 24

---

© ELEXON Limited 2014

## Why Change?

P300 has been raised to support the changes to Half Hourly (HH) Distribution Use of System (DUoS) charges being proposed by Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement (DCUSA) Change Proposal ([DCP 179 'Amending the CDCM tariff structure'](#)).

## Solution

The proposal seeks to split Measurement Class E into three as follows:

- relabeling of Measurement Class E, which will be designated for HH current transformer (CT) Metering Systems and which will give a site specific DUoS bill; and
- the creation of two new Measurement Classes for HH aggregated DUoS billing, one for domestic HH CT or whole current (WC) Metering Systems; and one for non-domestic HH WC Metering Systems.

In addition, the proposal sets out that the Supplier Volume Allocation Agent (SVAA) will carry out some of the aggregation of data for Metering Systems registered to the new Measurement Classes and send this onto the Supplier and Licensed Distribution System Operator (LDSO).

## Impacts & Costs

P300 will impact all LDSOs, HH Suppliers, HH Data Aggregators (HHDAs), HH Data Collectors (HHDCs), HH Meter Operator Agents (HHMOAs) and Supplier Meter Registration Agents (SMRAs), as well as BSCCo and the SVAA.

Central costs will be approximately £120k, and participant costs between £30k and £600k.

## Implementation

The P300 Workgroup is recommending implementation on 1 April 2016, subject to the Authority's decision being received on or before 31 December 2014. This is to allow participants' at least 15 months lead time to implement the changes to their systems and processes.

## Recommendation

The P300 Workgroup unanimously believes that P300 would better facilitate Applicable BSC Objective (d). A minority also felt that it better facilitated Applicable BSC Objective (c). The Workgroup initially recommends approval of P300.



### DUoS charges and related industry changes

For HH settled customers, distribution network charges (also known as 'Distribution Use of System charges' or 'DUoS charges') are calculated on a site specific basis. With the introduction of HH capable smart and advanced Meters into the Non-Half Hourly (NHH) settled market, more NHH sites will have the ability to be settled on a HH basis. This could significantly increase the amount of sites where LDSOs will have to calculate site specific DUoS charges.

To ensure that LDSOs have DUoS charges that are more reflective of the use of system (UoS) to better encourage the move to HH Settlement, the industry has raised three DCPs (DCP103, DCP151 and DCP179) and one BSC Modification Proposal (P280).

#### DCP103

[DCP103 'DUoS Charges for sub 100kw HH settled sites'](#) was raised in July 2011 but subsequently withdrawn. This sought to help facilitate the move from the NHH settled market into the HH settled market by attempting to ensure that DUoS charges would remain the same for NHH customers electing to be settled HH under Measurement Class E. In conducting this work, the DCUSA consultation concluded that the industry would be better served settling HH customers on an aggregated basis rather than on a site specific basis. However, this was deemed outside of the scope of the DCP.

#### P280

Electricity North West raised [P280 'Introduction of new Measurement Classes'](#) on 29 November 2011. This sought to introduce new non-mandatory Measurement Classes for HH-settled customers in the 'domestic' and 'small and medium enterprise' (SME) markets, and to require the SVAA to provide LDSOs with aggregated HH consumption data for Metering Systems registered to those new Measurement Classes.

At its meeting on 10 August 2012, the BSC Panel recommended to the Authority that it approve P280. However, the Authority subsequently rejected P280, stating in its decision document (dated 6 November 2012):

*"The P280 proposal alone does not facilitate any change to the way sites will be settled and charged for UoS. A change to the UoS charging methodology is required in order for any benefits to be realised. Until we are able to make an assessment of the most appropriate UoS charging structure for sites with demand below 100kW that wish to be settled HH, we do not consider we can approve this modification. This is because it is not certain whether the P280 proposed change will be required if a different approach is taken in developing the UoS charging methodology. Approving the P280 proposal may therefore result in wasted costs to the industry."*

#### DCP151

Electricity North West raised [DCP151 'HH Aggregated tariffs'](#) in June 2012 to amend the Common Distribution Charging Methodology (CDCM) to cater for the introduction (subject to approval) of three HH aggregated Measurement Classes raised under P280. The resulting tariffs would have been the same in structure and rates as those currently on

#### DUoS Charges

The DUoS charge covers the cost of receiving electricity from the national transmission system and feeding it directly into homes and businesses through the regional distribution networks. These networks are operated by LDSOs



#### Measurement Classes

The Measurement Class of a Metering System reflects how it is settled i.e. HH or NHH. There are currently five Measurement Classes:

- A: NHH metered
- B: NHH Unmetered Supply (UMS)
- C: 100kW or above HH metered
- D: HH equivalent UMS
- E: Non-mandatory HH metered

---

P300

Assessment Procedure  
Consultation

23 June 2014

---

Version 1.0

Page 4 of 24

© ELEXON Limited 2014

NHH tariffs excluding NHH preserved and NHH export tariffs. This was withdrawn when the Authority rejected P280.

## DCP179

Electricity North West raised [DCP179 'Amending the CDCM tariff structure'](#) in June 2013, to amend the existing tariff structure by introducing HH metered tariffs for connections below 100kW. To enable this, it seeks to introduce new tariffs based on the receipt of HH aggregated data. It builds on the work undertaken by the Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum (DCMF) Methodologies Issue Group 22 (MIG 22), which is a sub-group that was formed by the LDSOs and Suppliers to address the anomalies between the two different cost allocation mechanisms for HH and NHH tariffs in the CDCM.

### Aggregated Data

Currently, HH Data Aggregators (HHDA) for HH sites send the D0040 'Aggregated Half Hour Data File' data flow to the SVAA. The D0040 data flow includes Consumption Component Classes (CCCs), which detail the aggregated data instead of the site specific data. However, the LDSOs only receive the site specific data through the D0036 'Validated Half Hourly Advances for Inclusion in Aggregated Supplier Matrix' and D0275 'Validated Half Hourly Advances' data flows, which they receive from the HH Data Collector (HHDC).

With the rollout of smart and advanced metering, there is the potential for the percentage of the market settled HH to increase substantially. Without any mechanism for LDSOs to utilise and bill Suppliers on an aggregated basis, they will need to use site specific billing for these customers. This will be disproportionately expensive and not reflective of the actual DUoS

There are also benefits to Settlement for moving to HH metered, as this is considered more accurate.

### Impacts on P272

It is now mandatory (since 6 April 2014) that all sites in Profile Classes (PCs) 5-8 must have an advanced (i.e. HH capable) Meter regardless of when installation took place. This is not to say that these HH capable Meters must be settled HH. However, Suppliers can elect to settle these Metering Systems HH if they wish (or if the customer wishes them to do so).

Smartest Energy raised [P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'](#) on 20 May 2011. P272 proposed mandatory HH Settlement for PCs 5-8 from 1 April 2014. P272 contends that to settle such sites on average profiled data, rather than on HH data, leads to inaccuracies in Settlement and masks individual customer behaviour. The P272 Workgroup put forward an alternative solution with an Implementation Date of April 2015.

The Panel made its final recommendation that P272 should be rejected at its meeting on 13 December 2012. P272 is currently with the Authority for decision, but on 6 February 2014 it [directed the Panel to consult again on the Implementation Date](#). The Authority has advised that it is minded to approve P272.

DCP179 (and P300) enables more reflective DUoS charges to be put in place. This would mean that current NHH PC 5-8 Metering Systems that move to HH Settlement won't be

penalised through DUoS charges. It is hoped that having the reflective DUoS charges in place will reduce a known barrier to elective HH Settlement but would also support the transition period for implementing P272. The Authority directed the BSC Panel to consult on a revised Implementation Date for P272 to allow its decision to take account of ongoing changes to distribution network charging.

## What is the issue?

The BSC contains a number of provisions for providing LDSOs with the metered data they need for charging purposes. However, these don't provide a mechanism for distinguishing between HH-settled customers whose network charges should be calculated on a site specific basis, and those whose network charges should be calculated on an aggregated basis. P300 supports DCP179 by proposing to create new Measurement Classes associated with HH aggregation under the BSC.

**Does P300 mandate HH metering?**

P300 does not mandate the migration to HH metering; it only facilitates the DCP179 changes by creating new Measurement Classes for aggregated DUoS billing.

**Proposer's proposed solution**

P300 builds on the solution put forward under P280 and aligns to the requirements of DCP179. It proposes the following:

- Measurement Class E will be split into three Measurement Classes (for HH Metering Systems that are not 100kW Metering Systems). It does this by renaming Measurement Class E and introducing two new Measurement Classes for HH sites, which will be used for aggregated DUoS billing, as follows:
  - rename Measurement Class E to reflect that it is intended for non-domestic HH current transformer (CT) metered Metering Systems that have site specific DUoS billing and are not 100kW Metering Systems;
  - introduce new Measurement Class F for domestic HH CT and whole current (WC) Metering Systems that have aggregated DUoS billing and are not 100kW Metering Systems; and
  - introduce new Measurement Class G for non-domestic HH WC metered Metering Systems that have aggregated DUoS billing and are not 100kW Metering Systems.

This will not mandate Suppliers to use the new Measurement Classes, who may continue to use Measurement Class C and the redefined Measurement Class E if the Metering System is HH settled. In addition, it does not mandate the migration to HH metering. P300 only facilitates the DCP179 changes by creating new Measurement Classes for aggregated DUoS billing.<sup>1</sup>

- Measurement Classes F and G will use the same CCCs as Measurement Class E, whether it is for import or export customers.
- HHDAs will need to implement the changes so that they can process the amended D0040 and D0298 'BM Unit Aggregated Half Hour Data File' data flows.
- LDSOs will need to specify which Standard Settlement Configuration (SSC)<sup>2</sup> should be used to report aggregated HH data for each relevant Line Loss Factor (LLF) Class (LLFC), since the D0030 'Non Half Hourly DUoS Report' data flow requires consumption data to be reported against an SSC.
- The SVAA system will process the amended data flows and the mapping information in order to include the relevant data in the D0030 data flow that the LDSOs use for aggregated DUoS billing.
- HHDCs must not send D0036 and D0275 data flows to LDSOs for the new Measurement Classes, but will instead send the D0010 'Meter Readings' data flow. Suppliers will not receive the D0010 data flow and will continue to receive the D0036 and D0275 data flows, which will include the precision of the metering data.
- The Performance Level for Measurement Classes E, F and G will be 99% of energy settling on actual data at the First Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run (R1) with

<sup>1</sup> However, DCP179 is seeking to mandate the use of the appropriate Measurement Class for DUoS billing purposes if a site is registered as HH.

<sup>2</sup> This will be an LDSO SSC, and not a Supplier SSC.

subsequent Settlement Runs also at 99%. Supplier Charges will be £0 for R1 and subsequent runs up to the Final Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run (RF), which will remain unchanged at £1.43 per chargeable MWh.

## Workgroup's potential alternative solution

During its discussions on who should carry out the aggregation, the P300 Workgroup came up with an alternative solution. However, the Workgroup agreed not to recommend this above the proposed solution and therefore did not put forward an alternative solution for this assessment consultation. However, it wanted to seek views on this alternative solution in the Assessment Consultation.

Under the alternative solution, the HHDA would receive information from Supplier Meter Registration Agents (SMRAs) on which LLFCs were applicable for aggregation. The HHDA would then aggregate the HH data before submitting the aggregated data to the Supplier and LDSO using two new data flows.

This would mean that the LDSO would have to process the data in their billing system to the appropriate time bands associated with each DUoS tariff instead of this activity being undertaken by the SVAA. The LDSO would send two new data flows, one to any embedded LDSOs within the host LDSO's network and one to the Supplier. Likewise, Suppliers will have to process the new data flows together with any validation they wish to undertake. Otherwise, the solution is the same as the proposed solution. Further details of the alternative solution, which the Workgroup discussed and consulted upon, are set out in the P300 Impact Assessment document. This is available on the [P300](#) page of the ELEXON website.

### Assessment Consultation Question

Do you agree with the Workgroup that there are no other potential Alternative Modifications within the scope of P300, which would better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?

*Please provide your rationale and, if 'No', please provide full details of your Alternative Modification(s) and your rationale as to why it/they better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

## BSC legal text

The proposed redlined changes to the BSC to deliver the P300 proposed solution can be found in Attachment A.

### Assessment Consultation Question

Do you agree with the Workgroup that the draft legal text in Attachment A delivers the intention of P300?

*Please provide your rationale.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

### Estimated central implementation costs of P300

The total indicative central implementation cost for P300 is approximately £120k. This comprises:

- approximately £112k in SVAA and PARMS costs; and
- approximately £8k (34 man days) in ELEXON effort.

These are one-off implementation costs, and there would be no on-going central operational costs.

The SVAA changes involve amending the SVAA system, which will need to process the amended data flows and the newly updated mapping information received. The SVAA has to include the relevant data in the D0030 data flow. The costs also include testing and deployment.

The proposed solution also impacts the PARMS Application, specifically the PARMS Serial SP08 'Energy and MSIDs on Actuals'. Whilst the data file structure sent from SVAA to the PARMS will not change, the changes to the Performance Level will require system changes.

The ELEXON costs include managing the implementation project and updating the relevant BSC Sections, Code Subsidiary Documents and other documentation, and will include implementation of changes to reporting and processes.

### Indicative industry costs of P300

Supplier, HH Supplier Agent, LDSO and SMRA respondents to the Industry Impact Assessment stated that they would be impacted by P300. LDSOs and SMRAs have indicated costs between £45k and £360k. Supplier costs are between £30k and £3m. HH Supplier Agent costs are approximately £560k. It was clear from the responses that these costs considered the wider impacts, including DCP179 and P272, rather than P300 in isolation.

Whilst the Workgroup noted the varied and large implementation costs, it accepted that this would remove one of the perceived barriers to migrating to HH Settlement, which is seen as more accurate. The Workgroup considered whether there were potential impacts on small micro-generators. However, it concluded that this was not relevant and noted that no respondents to the Impact Assessment highlighted any impacts on this area.

Because of the varied and large implementation costs indicated in the Industry Impact Assessment, Ofgem is keen to understand to what extent the responses include costs for implementing DCP179, P272 or other costs beyond P300. This consultation is also an opportunity for respondents to provide updated implementation costs, particularly now that the DCP179 consultation has been issued and the solution has been further defined since the Workgroup issued its Industry Impact Assessment.

## Assessment Consultation Question

What are the implementation costs for your organisation to implement P300 as a standalone change (not including DCP179, P272 or any other change)?

*Please provide details of these costs; how they arise; and whether they are one-off or on-going costs. Please also state whether it makes any difference to these costs whether P300 is implemented as part of or outside of a normal BSC Systems Release.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

## P300 impacts

### Impact on BSC Parties and Party Agents

Party/Party Agent	Impact
Suppliers	Suppliers will have the option of receiving bills based upon aggregated and site specific data. In the case of gaining a site that is utilising one of the new Measurement Classes, the Supplier will need to either re-register it (fulfilling any other requirements associated with that Measurement Class, such as ensuring applicable Metering Equipment installed appropriate to the Measurement Class) or amend its systems to accept the appointment.  Suppliers may wish to validate its DUoS bills to ensure that it doesn't receive site-specific invoices for Measurement Class F and G Metering Systems.
LDSOs	LDSOs will need to change the way they operate and may need to amend billing systems. This may require new LLFCs and associated LLFs. In addition, depending upon when the change is implemented, all LDSOs may need to make mid-year re-submissions for their LLFs.
SMRAs	SMRAs will need to ensure that the SSC for Metering Systems using the new Measurement Classes are not populated in SMRS.
HHDAs	HHDAs will need to change the way they generate aggregated data for submission to the SVAA.
HHDCs	HHDCs will need to change what data flows they send to LDSOs.
HHMOAs	HHMOAs will need to be able to process the new Measurement Classes within their systems.

### Impact on Transmission Company

No impact.

### Impact on BSCCo

Area of ELEXON	Impact
Market Domain Data (MDD)	To add new valid values to MDD and process MDD Change Requests to enter the new Measurement Classes into MDD.

Impact on BSCCo	
Area of ELEXON	Impact
LLFs	Depending upon the timing of the change, there will potentially be a need to process mid-year re-submissions for LLFs.

Impact on BSC Systems and process	
BSC System/Process	Impact
SVAA	To introduce system changes to aggregate data.

Impact on Code	
Code Section	Impact
Section S Annex S-1	To reference Performance Levels for the new Measurement Classes and any changes to Supplier Charges.
Section S Annex S-2	To add new sub aggregation by LLFC.
Section V	Description of data provided for DUoS reporting purposes.
Section W	Reference the new Measurement Classes and show which classes are relevant for NHH Trading Disputes.
Section X Annex X-2	Include the summations and acronym updated in Annex S-2; expand the definitions of Measurement Class to include the redefined Measurement Class E and new Measurement Classes F and G; and extend definition of Consumption Level Indicator A to Measurement Classes F and G.

Impact on Code Subsidiary Documents	
CSD	Impact
BSCP501	Capture changes in respect to SMRS.
BSCP502	Capture changes in respect to HHDCs.
BSCP503	Capture changes in respect to HHDAAs.
BSCP508	Reflect the reporting of consumption to LDSOs on an aggregated basis.
BSCP533	Reflect the Performance Level for Measurement Class E and include Measurement Classes F and G in PARMS Serial SP08c for PARMS reporting.
BSCP533 Appendix A	
BSCP533 Appendix B	
BSCP536	Reflect changes to Supplier Charges.
CoP10	Reflect that CoP10 will be used for new Measurement Classes F and G.
SVA Data Catalogue	If P300 is approved, ELEXON will develop and consult on the necessary redlined changes as part of the implementation project to reflect any changes under the DTC.

Impact on other Configurable Items	
Configurable Item	Impact
PARMS User Requirement Specification	Amend the Performance Level for Measurement Class E and include Measurement Classes F and G in PARMS serial SP08c for PARMS reporting and Supplier Charges.

Impact on Core Industry Documents and other documents	
Document	Impact
Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement	As per DCP179.
Master Registration Agreement	Amendments to certain data flows under the DTC.

### Recommended Implementation Date

The Workgroup recommends an Implementation Date for P300 of **1 April 2016** if the Authority's decision is received on or before 31 December 2014.

The lead-time is driven by the time required by respondents to the Industry Impact Assessment to make the necessary system changes to facilitate the implementation of P300. Indicative BSC Agent lead times are all shorter than this.

### Workgroup's consideration of the Implementation Date

The Workgroup noted that respondents to the Industry Impact Assessment indicated a variety of lead times to implement P300. It noted ELEXON's view that the responses were likely to include the implementation of DCP179 as well as P300, and that in some cases may have included migration to HH metering. Therefore, the responses may not necessarily reflect the estimated lead times for implementing P300. The Workgroup noted that many respondents indicated either a 12 month or an 18 month lead time. The Workgroup felt that it was achievable for industry to implement P300 by 1 April 2016 so long as a decision from the Authority was received by 31 December 2014, as this would provide a minimum of 15 months lead time to implement P300.

DCP179 has since been out for consultation and impact assessment, with a proposed Implementation Date of 1 April 2015. The Proposer and P300 Workgroup would ideally wish for P300 to be implemented with DCP179 under a joint implementation approach; however, neither believes this can be achieved unless DCP179 implementation is aligned with P300's Implementation Date. Whilst DCP179 may be implemented without P300, the full realisation of the benefits of DCP179 will require P300. To this end, the DCP179 Working Group has considered how the legal text can be drafted to cater for a later P300 implementation.

#### Assessment Consultation Question

Do you agree with the Workgroup's recommended Implementation Date?

*Please provide your rationale.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

Because of the long lead times indicated by some respondents under the Industry Impact Assessment, Ofgem is keen to understand to what extent the responses include the implementation lead times for DCP179, P272 or other changes beyond P300. This consultation is also an opportunity for respondents to provide updated implementation lead times, particularly now that the DCP179 consultation has been issued and the solution has been further defined since the Workgroup issued its Industry Impact Assessment.

## Assessment Consultation Question

What are the implementation lead times for your organisation to implement P300 as a standalone change (not including DCP179, P272 or any other change)?

*Please provide an explanation of your required lead time, and the key drivers behind the timescale. Please also state whether it makes any difference to this lead time whether P300 is implemented as part of or outside of a normal BSC Systems Release.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

### Workgroup views on Measurement Classes and CCCs

#### Views on New Measurement Classes

The Workgroup discussed the proposal to split Measurement Class E into three Measurement Classes, with the introduction of two new Measurement Classes and relabeling of Measurement Class E. The Workgroup did not believe that the use of these Measurement Classes should be mandated, but noted that DCP179 may do so under its solution.

The Workgroup supported this approach, but one member suggested that there might be benefit in the creation of an additional Measurement Class H for non-domestic CT metering for micro-businesses that would also have aggregated HH DUoS billing. This was based on the belief that an obligation will be introduced into the Supply licence, which is expected to be consulted on during summer 2014. The Workgroup agreed to communicate this to the DCP179 Working Group and raise awareness through this report. ELEXON advised that this would require an amendment to the DCP179 proposal. The Workgroup did not support this as an alternative solution. However, it agreed to ask a question around this in the Assessment Consultation.

#### Assessment Consultation Question

Do you believe that P300 should include a Measurement Class 'H', which would be used for non-domestic CT Metering Systems that would have aggregated DUoS billing?

*Please provide your rationale.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

#### Views on Consumption Component Classes

The proposal was to have 10 new CCCs each for the new Measurement Classes, six for Import and four for Export. The Workgroup supported this, but there was a minority view that there were already too many CCCs and the addition of others would increase the size of certain data flows. ELEXON advised that if the Performance Level was aligned with the P272 solution (99% at R1 for non-mandatory HH metering), then the least impact on PARMS and Supplier Charges would be to keep the same CCCs. The Proposer agreed with this approach and therefore amended the proposal. The Workgroup also agreed with this, so did not propose an alternative that created new CCCs.

#### Views on Performance Levels and Supplier Charges

The Workgroup noted that under P272 the Performance Level for HH Meters that are less than 100kW would move to 99% of energy settling on actual data at R1 Run rather than the current 99% at RF. The group didn't want to undermine P272 and thought that P300 should also reflect the Performance Level proposed for Measurement Class G, as well as E.

Initially, the Workgroup believed that the Performance Level for Measurement Class F should be aligned with that for Measurement Class A (NHH metered). However, once the Proposer amended the solution to use the same CCCs, the Proposer and Workgroup agreed that the Performance Level for all three Measurement Classes should be aligned to 99% at R1 and at all subsequent runs.

One Workgroup member felt that 90% at R1 would be better and more achievable due to the issues with interoperability and communications failures. However, when considering that P272, if approved, would set this at 99% at R1 and that it was unlikely that there would be any significant uptake of HH Settlement for PCs 1-4 in the first few years following implementation, the Workgroup didn't propose an alternative solution.

## **Supplier Charges**

### **Impact on SP04**

The Workgroup noted that SP04 only reports on NHH sites that meet the requirements of 100kW and therefore require mandatory HH metering; SP04 does not report on Measurement Class E sites, even though the CoP requirements are more stringent for Measurement Class C. As SP04 doesn't currently report on Measurement Class E, the Workgroup didn't believe that this Modification should propose it

### **Impact on SP08c**

The Workgroup believed that the Supplier Charges should be kept at the current level, which is a charge at RF, but that the Supplier Charges should reflect the changes to the Performance Level. Therefore, the Proposer and the Workgroup agreed that for R1, Second Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run (R2) and Third Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run (R3) the Supplier Charge should be set at £0.00 and the RF charge kept at the current rate.

### **Further review of Supplier Charges**

The Workgroup recommended that ELEXON and the Panel consider raising an Issue to review Supplier Charges should the Authority approve P300 and/or P272.

## **Views on sending of the D0010 instead of the D0036 and D0275**

The Workgroup agreed with the proposal that the HHDC would send the D0010 data flow rather than the D0036 and D0275 data flows for the new Measurement Classes to the LDSO.

During the initial discussions, a Workgroup member proposed to adopt the alternative solution proposed under P280, which gave Suppliers the option of also receiving the D0010 instead of the D0036 and D0275 but did not set out how the Supplier would inform the HHDC of its preference. When considering the Impact Assessment responses and the views from the Performance Assurance Board (PAB) on the risk of not specifying the method of instructing the HHDC of preference of data flow, the Proposer amended the proposed solution to remove the optionality for the Supplier. Therefore, the Supplier will receive the D0036 and D0275 data flows as per the current process. The Workgroup also agreed and decided not to raise an alternative with respects to this element of the solution. ELEXON advised that any Supplier that wished to receive the D0010 could potentially still do so under a bilateral arrangement with the HHDC outside of the BSC.

## Views on changes to MRA DTC

The proposal sets out amendments to the D0040 and D0298 data flows to provide the necessary information to the SVAA, to include with the mapping information in the D0030 and D0298 data flow. The Workgroup want to ensure that the detailed solution is consistent with the aggregation of de-energised MSIDs in the NHH sector and that there was a mandatory requirement that the D0298 data flow is sent.

The Workgroup also believed that the D0036 and D0275 data flows need amending to ensure that the precision of the metering data is included in these data flows to allow the loading of data for MSIDs allocated to the new Measurement Classes.

Further information on the proposed changes to the D0040 and D0298 can be found in the P300 Impact Assessment report; however, these are likely to be amended further and will be subject to the MRA DTC change process.

## Views on LLFC size and format

The Workgroup noted the Impact Assessment responses with respects to potential issues with the size and format of the LLFC number, which currently is 'nnn'. The Workgroup considered that potentially this could be amended to four or more numeric characters and/or use alphabetic characters, as there potentially could be an issue with the increase in the number of LLFCs following implementation of this change. The Workgroup concluded that it wasn't necessary to make these changes now, but it wanted to consult on this area in this assessment.

### Assessment Consultation Question

Do you believe that there will be potential issues with the number of LLFCs should P300 be approved?

*Please provide your rationale and views on any solution.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.



### Workgroups views on the Applicable BSC Objectives

The Workgroup has given its views on P300 against Applicable BSC Objectives. These views have been captured below and a table summarising the views against each Applicable BSC Objective has been included at the end of this section.

#### Recommendation

The P300 Workgroup initially recommends that P300 is approved.

#### Applicable BSC Objective (c)

The Proposer believes that P300 would better facilitate objective (c) as it accommodates a change raised within another Code that has a direct impact on its ability to deliver i.e. without a change to the BSC Systems and processes, it prevents the improvement in competition being facilitated via another Code. However, whilst the Workgroup understood the intent of this view, it believed that with no approved change in place this was not relevant. Therefore, it was neutral on this objective.



#### What are the Applicable BSC Objectives?

(a) The efficient discharge by the Transmission Company of the obligations imposed upon it by the Transmission Licence

#### Applicable BSC Objective (d)

The Workgroup unanimously agreed with the Proposer that P300 would better facilitate objective (d) because it provides an efficient and cost effective mechanism to deal with a large increase in the volume of HH data without flooding Parties with Site Specific data resulting from the expansion of the HH market. Furthermore, the increased use of actual data from HH metering will provide industry-wide benefits through improvements in the accuracy of Settlement.

(b) The efficient, economic and co-ordinated operation of the National Electricity Transmission System

(c) Promoting effective competition in the generation and supply of electricity and (so far as consistent therewith) promoting such competition in the sale and purchase of electricity

### Summary of views against the Applicable BSC Objectives

**The initial unanimous Workgroup view is that P300 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives and the Workgroup therefore initially recommends that P300 is approved.**

(d) Promoting efficiency in the implementation of the balancing and settlement arrangements

The following table contains a summary of the Proposer's and the Workgroup's views against each of the Applicable BSC Objectives:

Does P300 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposer's Views	Other Workgroup Members' Views <sup>3</sup>
(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>
(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes</b> - by accommodating a change raised within another Code that has a direct impact on its ability to deliver i.e. without a change to the BSC systems and processes it prevents the improvement in competition being facilitated via another Code.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Neutral (majority)</b> - no impact</li> <li>• <b>Yes (minority)</b> - Agree with the Proposer.</li> </ul>

(e) Compliance with the Electricity Regulation and any relevant legally binding decision of the European Commission and/or the Agency [for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators]

P300  
Assessment Procedure  
Consultation

23 June 2014

Version 1.0

Page 18 of 24

© ELEXON Limited 2014

<sup>3</sup> Shows the different views expressed by the other Workgroup members – not all members necessarily agree with all of these views.

Does P300 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives?		
Obj	Proposer's Views	Other Workgroup Members' Views <sup>3</sup>
(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Yes</b> - because it provides an efficient and cost effective mechanism to deal with a large increase the volume of HH data without flooding Parties with site specific data resulting from the expansion of the HH market. Increased use of actual data from HH metering will provide industry-wide benefits, through improvements in the accuracy of Settlement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Yes</b> (unanimous) - Agree with the Proposer.</li> </ul>
(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Neutral</b> - no impact</li> </ul>

**Assessment Consultation Question**

Do you agree with the Workgroup's initial unanimous view that P300 does better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?  
*Please provide your rationale with reference to the Applicable BSC Objectives.*

The Workgroup invites you to give your views using the response form in Attachment B.

### Glossary of defined terms

Acronyms and other defined terms used in this document are listed in the table below.

Glossary of Defined Terms	
Acronym	Definition
AMD	BSC Application Management and Development
BSC	Balancing and Settlement Code
BSCCo	BSC Company
BPO	Business Process Outsourcing
CCC	Consumption Component Class
CP	Change Proposal
CT	Current Transformer
CDCM	Common Distribution Charging Methodology
DCMF	Distribution Charging Methodologies Forum
DCP	DCUSA CP
DCUSA	Distribution Connection and Use of System Agreement
DTC	Data Transfer Catalogue
DUoS	Distribution UoS
HH	Half Hourly
HHDA	HH Data Aggregator
HHDC	HH Data Collector
HHMOA	HH Meter Operator Agent
LDSO	Licensed Distribution System Operator
LLF	Line Loss Factor
LLFC	LLF Class
MDB	MRA Development Board
MDD	Market Domain Data
MRA	Master Registration Data
MSID	Metering System ID
NHH	Non Half Hourly
PARMS	Performance Assurance Reporting and Monitoring System
PC	Profile Class
R1	First Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run
R2	Second Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run
R3	Third Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run
RF	Final Reconciliation Volume Allocation Run

Glossary of Defined Terms	
Acronym	Definition
SSC	Standard Settlement Configuration
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SMRA	Supplier Meter Registration Agent
SMRS	Supplier Meter Registration Service
SP04	PARMS Serial SP04 Installation of HH Metering
SP08c	PARMS Serial SP08c Percentage of non-mandatory HH Energy Settled on Actual Readings
SVAA	Supplier Volume Allocation Agent
TPR	Time Pattern Regime
UoS	Use of System
WC	Whole Current

## DTC data flows and data items

DTC data flows and data items referenced in this document are listed in the table below.

DTC Data Flows and Data Items	
Number	Name
D0010	Meter Readings
D0030	Non Half Hourly DUoS Report
D0036	Validated Half Hourly Advances for Inclusion in Aggregated Supplier Matrix
D0040	Aggregated Half Hour Data File
D0209	Instruction(s) to Non Half Hourly or Half Hourly Data Aggregator
D0242	Supercustomer DUoS Daily Statement
D0275	Validated Half Hourly Advances
D0298	BM Unit Aggregated Half Hour Data File
D0314	Non Half Hourly Embedded Network DUoS Report
D0315	Embedded Network Supercustomer DUoS Daily Statement
J0066	GSP Group Id
J0084	Supplier Id
J0147	Line Loss Factor Class Id
J0160	Consumption Component Class Id
J0189	Distributor Id

## External links

A summary of all hyperlinks used in this document are listed in the table below.

All external documents and URL links listed are correct as of the date of this document.

External Links		
Page(s)	Description	URL
1, 3, 5	DCP179	<a href="http://www.dcusa.co.uk/Public/CP.aspx?id=201">http://www.dcusa.co.uk/Public/CP.aspx?id=201</a>
1, 4	Rejected Modification P280	<a href="http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p280-introduction-of-new-measurement-classes/">http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p280-introduction-of-new-measurement-classes/</a>
4	DCP103 'DUoS Charges for sub 100kw HH settled sites'	<a href="http://www.dcusa.co.uk/public/cp.aspx?id=123">http://www.dcusa.co.uk/public/cp.aspx?id=123</a>
5	Authority direction to the Panel to consult again on the Implementation Date of P272	<a href="https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/balancing-and-settlement-code-bsc-p272-direction-bsc-panel-consult-revised-implementation-date-p272">https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/balancing-and-settlement-code-bsc-p272-direction-bsc-panel-consult-revised-implementation-date-p272</a>
4	DCP151 'HH Aggregated tariffs'	<a href="http://www.dcusa.co.uk/Public/CP.aspx?id=161">http://www.dcusa.co.uk/Public/CP.aspx?id=161</a>
5	P272 'Mandatory Half Hourly Settlement for Profile Classes 5-8'	<a href="http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p272-mandatory-half-hourly-settlement-for-profile-classes-5-8/">http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p272-mandatory-half-hourly-settlement-for-profile-classes-5-8/</a>
8	P300 webpage	<a href="http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p300/">http://www.elexon.co.uk/mod-proposal/p300/</a>

### Workgroup's Terms of Reference

Specific areas set by the BSC Panel in the P300 Terms of Reference
What has changed since the Authority's decision on P280?
What are the expected impacts and benefits associated with P300 (where not already covered by DCP179)?
What is the interaction with DCP179 and the DCUSA?
Are the Measurement Classes and CCCs identified by P300 appropriate?
What should the Performance Standards be for the new Measurement Classes?
What is the impact on Supplier Charges?
What changes are needed to BSC documents, systems and processes to support P300 and what are the related costs and lead times?
What changes are required to MRA DTC and any other industry Codes?
Are there any Alternative Modifications?
Does P300 better facilitate the Applicable BSC Objectives than the current baseline?
What should the implementation approach be for P300?

### Assessment Procedure timetable

P300 Assessment Timetable	
Event	Date
Present Initial Written Assessment to Panel	20 Mar 14
Workgroup Meeting	11 Apr 14
Workgroup Meeting	01 May 14
Impact Assessment (15 Working Days)	09 - 30 May 14
Workgroup Meeting	09 Jun 14
Assessment Procedure Consultation (15 Working Days)	23 Jun – 11 Jul 14
Workgroup Meeting	W/B 21 Jul 14
Present Assessment Report to Panel	14 Aug 14
Report Phase Consultation (10 Working Days)	14 – 29 Aug 14
Present Draft Modification Report to Panel	11 Sep 14
Issue Final Modification Report to Authority	12 Sep 14

## Workgroup membership and attendance

P300 Workgroup Attendance				
Name	Organisation	11/03/14	01/05/14	09/06/14
<b>Members</b>				
David Kemp	ELEXON ( <i>Chair</i> )	✓	✓	✓
Simon Fox	ELEXON ( <i>Lead Analyst</i> )	✓	✓	✓
John Lawton	ENWL ( <i>Proposer</i> )	✓	☎	✓
Julie McMillan	IMServ	✓	✗	✗
Peter Waymont	UK Power Networks	✗	✗	✓
Tracey Pitcher	Western Power Distribution	✓	☎	✗
Walter Hood	IBM (on behalf of Scottish Power)	✓	✗	✓
Ben Fuller	Centrica	✓	☎	✓
Steven Bradford	Flow Energy	✓	✗	✓
Haydn Wyllis	SSE	✓	☎	✓
Helen Boothman	TMA	✗	☎	✓
Philip Russell	Independent Consultant	✓	☎	✓
Anika Brandt	SSEPD	✓	☎	✓
Andrew Enzor	Northern Powergrid	✓	✗	✓
Chris Ong	UK Power Networks	✓	✗	✓
Dave Smith	Npower	☎	✗	✓
Julia Haughey	EDF Energy	✓	☎	✓
Rachael Burn	E.ON	✗	✗	✓
<b>Attendees</b>				
Jonathan Priestley	ELEXON ( <i>Design Authority</i> )	✓	✓	✓
Tina Wirth	ELEXON ( <i>Lead Lawyer</i> )	✓	✓	✓
Bethany Hanna	Ofgem	✓	✗	✓
Johnny Amos	Ofgem	✓	✗	✗
Tim Parry	St. Clements Services Ltd	✓	☎	✓
Swetta Coopamah	Centrica	✓	✗	✗
Rachael Mottram	Gemserv	✓	✗	✗
Dan Hickman	Npower	✗	☎	✗
David Collins	CGI	✓	✗	✗
Ian Hall	IMServ	✗	✗	✓
Ganesh Senthil Kumar	Cognizant	✓	✓	✗