

1244.4 – JH - JS - Class 2 Modification – COR2831: Smart Metering - DCC Day 1 - Representation Response

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
SSE	Martin Brandt	23/08/13	Reject		<p>SSE Accept the File Hierarchy diagrams NMR, NFR, CFR, TRF, MRI, PAC - which add the option new Data Item RT_S98_SMART DATA.</p> <p>However we Reject the following as drafted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONJOB Datasets "DATASET_GROUP_ASSET" File format Version12 Issued 26th July. • ONUPD Datasets "DATASET_GROUP_ASSET" File format Version 12 Issued 26th July <p>Seeking the following amendments to both: "A0024 Asset Class Code" please add "CH - Communications Hub". Additionally amending the new allowable values codes, to consistently meet the Data items 5 Ch Length " IHD = INHOM" and "CH = COMMH"</p> <p>"A0037 - Asset Status Code" Amend the new allowable values codes, to consistently meet the Data Items 2 Ch Length -from "I" to "SI", from "E" to "SE", from "D" to "SD"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "RT_S98 Record" version 1.1 Issued 08.08.2013 <p>Seeking to remove the IHD_INSTALL_STATUS Not needed on this Record.</p> <p>Question why the industry needs the</p>	<p>Of the Smart Asset allowable values, which the SPAA change 13/231 adds – CH / PPMID / IHD / CAD – only IHD is relevant to the Transporters (this is reflected in the above SPAA change). As such, we would not expect to add allowable values to the formats that are not relevant.</p> <p>Modification 430 explicitly states the allowable values. These values were defined by the Smart Metering Groups to ensure consistency. As such we are unable to change the values.</p> <p>IHD_Install_Status: This data item has been debated at length within Smart Implementation Forums, and also the Xoserve Smart Focus Group. Some Shippers consider that this is required and have successfully petitioned that this be included in the specification and requirements. This data item is explicitly mentioned in the modification</p>

1244.4 – JH - JS - Class 2 Modification – COR2831: Smart Metering - DCC Day 1 - Representation Response

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
					<p>"NETWORK_OWNER_ID & ID_EFD".</p> <p>We have already at various UKLC expressed concern about the use of the GEA/GEO for things beyond SMSO requirements.</p>	<p>therefore cannot be removed.</p> <p>These data items are explicitly mentioned in the modification therefore cannot be removed.</p> <p>UK Link Committee approved in principle the removal of the SUN file, and the inclusion of the Supplier information within the GEA / GEO. This enhances the capability existing within the SUN file, as currently such updates cannot define an effective date of the notification.</p> <p>Xoserve still aspires to rationalise the Organisation input files, and are still assessing options regarding the GEA / GEO to allow the MAM and GAO to be updated. Amendments to this format to facilitate this are under consideration.</p>
Npower	Zoe Murphy	23/08/13	Accept but clarification required		<p>Many Thanks for giving us the opportunity to respond to the XCE735: Class 2 Modification – COR2831: Smart Metering - DCC Day 1.</p> <p>Whilst we are supportive of the intent of the modification there are a few points that we would like you to clarify as there seems to be discrepancies between the details within the modification and the example files. The modification states that parties should revert back to the current published version but it does not say that we should use the attached, brand new and previously unpublished versions. We would be grateful if you could clarify the points raised below:</p>	

1244.4 – JH - JS - Class 2 Modification – COR2831: Smart Metering - DCC Day 1 - Representation Response

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Therefore the revised ONJOB and ONUPD hierarchies are withdrawn and will revert back to the current published versions." • "Therefore the *.TRF file hierarchy will not need to change and we can revert to the current published version." <p>We are reading both of the above to mean that this modification has resulted in no changes to either of these files. However, both of these files had two requirements added in the original modification but this modification only documents the removal of one requirement. The ONUPD was to be updated with UPRN and IHD install status. This modification removes the need to add UPRN but it does not remove the requirement to add IHD install status. Therefore we don't believe we can revert to the 'current published version'.</p> <p>Similarly the TRF was to be updated with the new S98 record (Smart data items) in two separate places, firstly under the K13 record and secondly under the S75 record. This modification removes the need to add under the K13 record but makes no mention of removing the need to add under S75 record.</p> <p>We have assumed that the 'current published version' is the version that we use today and are building our requirements accordingly. However, the file attachments are contradictory to what is documented in the modification and we would</p>	<p>The Xoserve Smart Focus Group agreed that UPRN should not be provided to Transporters – as such the changes to the hierarchy for both ONJOB and ONUPD to add an ADDRESS dataset in the context of Meter Point were not required. Therefore the SPAA Change 13/231 does not reference this change.</p> <p>The change to provide IHD Install Status will be performed by provision of an ASSET dataset in the context of IHD. The existing hierarchy allows this – therefore no change is necessary.</p> <p>The Xoserve Smart Focus Group indicated that the S98 subordinate to the K13 record was not needed. However, it is still required subordinate to the S75 in instances of notification of Successful Transfer. The S98 – and child files – are detailed in v8.1 of the TRF that was issued in the Change Pack My apologies that the text of 1244.4 contradicted this.</p> <p>I trust that the above clarifies the point regarding contradiction.</p>

1244.4 – JH - JS - Class 2 Modification – COR2831: Smart Metering - DCC Day 1 - Representation Response

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	Xoserve Comments
					<p>welcome clarification on these points.</p> <p>At the SPAA/SEG meeting last week the legal drafting was discussed and it included dataset for additional IHD information. This initially contained IHD rejection reason and GUID. It was agreed that the GUID will be removed but will be referenced. If it transpires that it is required at a later stage it will be added back in. We feel this and the inclusion of the dataset should be reflected in the modification.</p>	<p>These documents reflect the changes required to the Transporter systems. SPAA CP13/231 proposes the insertion of a new dataset for additional data pertaining to the IHD (INHOM). This dataset will not be relevant to the Transporter systems so is correct to be excluded from this change pack.</p>
EDF Energy	Ashley Collins	22/08/13	Accept		<p>EDF's only concern with the smart file formats is that the S98 record (IHD Install status - length 1) vs the ONJOB and ONUPD file formats (Asset Status Code A0037 - length 2) have a difference in length. Whilst we understand it was specifically stated within the BRD to use a length of 1 for the Install status, we seek clarification from both a SPAA RGMA and UK Link perspective whether there should be a leading space or space after the value is input into the RGMA fields so parties don't have issues with this post deployment.</p> <p>We support the removal of the Sun file</p>	<p>We would expect that as a text field the length indicates a maximum value. In the RGMA input file we would expect that only the character of 'I', 'E' or 'D' would be provided. If this had a leading or trailing space this would not result in rejection.</p> <p>Noted. Thank you.</p>