

## CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

### CATEGORY 3 DOCUMENT: GUIDANCE ON METERING POINTS

DATE ISSUED	07/01/2022
RESPONSE DEADLINE	28/01/2022

### BACKGROUND

The REC Metering Expert Panel (RECMEP) has approved the creation of a new Category 3 product as the approach to retain MRA Transition Schedule Appendix 1 – Guidance on Metering Points (formerly MRA Schedule 8), following the removal of the MRA Transition Schedule at Central Switching Service (CSS) Go-Live.

It was agreed that the RECMEP would be responsible for the development and future maintenance of the new Category 3 guidance document. A Category 3 Change Proposal has been raised to enable the introduction of the new guidance document ([C3-0006](#)).

Although the guidance is recognised as a useful document, the examples defined in the document need to be reviewed and revised prior to publication as they do not represent the current metering configuration in operation.

To this end, it was agreed that the document would be consulted on with the industry. The consultation will allow industry to provide views on whether to retain, revise or remove each of the current examples, and to identify missing configurations / examples which should be included.

### LINKS AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- [C3-0006 Change Proposal Page](#)
- [Draft Category 3 document: Guidance on Metering Points](#)
- [Consultation Register](#)

The completed response document should be uploaded to the REC Portal. On the Consultation Page click 'Add Response' to upload the completed document. Further information about Consultations can be found in the [Change Management User Guide](#) under "Consultation".

All responses will be treated as non-confidential unless indicated otherwise. Responses marked as confidential will be shared with RECCo, the Code Manager and the RECMEP but will not be published to REC Parties, Service Providers, or wider stakeholders.

Anonymous responses will omit the detail of the submitting Organisation but the content of the response will be published.



## 1 RESPONDENT DETAILS

NAME	Iain Nicoll
ORGANISATION	Elexon
ORGANISATION CATEGORY	Code Body / Code Administrator
EMAIL ADDRESS	Iain.nicoll@elexon.co.uk
TELEPHONE NUMBER	020 7380 4162
RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY	Non-Confidential

## 2 QUESTIONS

<b>1. Example 1: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response</b>	
<p>Retained and revised – CoP is not defined as an abbreviation and CoP10 needs to be added. Proposed text:</p> <p>The typical Metering BSC Code of Practice (CoP) 5 and CoP10 installation where a single point of supply is measured by a single CoP5 or CoP10 device. All installed Meters must be compliant with the relevant CoP.</p>	
<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

<b>2. Example 2: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response</b>	
<p>Retained and revised – The BSC Metering CoPs do allow the Meter to be separate from the Outstation, although unlikely anyone would install metering that way in SVA. CoP is not defined as an abbreviation and it is possible to have a CoP1 and CoP2 SVA Registered site so they need to be added. Proposed text:</p> <p>The typical BSC Metering Code of Practice (CoP) 1, CoP2 and CoP3 installation where a single point of supply is measured by two meters, main and check, feeding a single CoP1 ,CoP2, or CoP3 compliant data recorder (i.e. a separate Outstation compliant with the relevant CoP).</p>	



<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

3. Example 3: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response	
<p>Retained and revised – CoP is not defined as an abbreviation and it is possible to have a CoP1 and CoP2 SVA Registered site so they need to be added. CoP5 Meters are not necessarily compliant with CoP3. This is not totalising as you wouldn't add main and check volumes together. Proposed text:</p> <p>The typical BSC Metering Code of Practice (CoP) 1, CoP2 and CoP3 installation where a single point of supply is measured by two meters, main and check, which are Integral Outstations (i.e. a data recorders that are integral to the Meter). All installed Meters must be compliant with the relevant CoP.</p>	
<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

4. Example 4: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response	
<p>Retained and revised – The BSC Metering CoPs do allow the Meter to be separate from the Outstation, although unlikely anyone would install metering that way in SVA. CoP is not defined as an abbreviation and it is possible to have a CoP1 and CoP2 SVA Registered site so they need to be added. Proposed text:</p> <p>The typical BSC Metering Code of Practice (CoP) 1, CoP2 and CoP3 installation with two (or more) feeders, each feeder is measured by two meters, main and check, feeding a single CoP1 ,CoP2, or CoP3 compliant data recorder (i.e. a separate Outstation compliant with the relevant CoP).</p>	



**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**5. Example 5: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained and revised – CoP is not defined as an abbreviation and it is possible to have a CoP1 and CoP2 SVA Registered site so they need to be added. CoP5 Meters are not necessarily compliant with CoP3. This is only offsite totalising where the Meter Technical Details include both Main Meters under a single MPAN as you wouldn't add main and check volumes together otherwise.

Document has number of Metering Points as 2 but if by "Metering Point" it essentially means MPAN in this document (which I think is the intent) then there would be 1 metering point if totalisation is taking place or 2 metering points if the feeders are not totalised.

Proposed text:

The typical Metering Code of Practice (CoP) 1, CoP2 and CoP3 installation where two (or more) feeders are measured by two meters per circuit, main and check, which are Integral Outstations (i.e. a data recorder that are integral to the Meter). All installed Meters must be compliant with the relevant CoP.

Where the Meter Technical Details include all Meters under a single MPAN, this is an example of what is commonly known as "off-site totalisation" in the current settlement arrangements.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**6. Example 6: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained – would suggest some changes to the reference to "totalised".

Document has number of Metering Points as 2 but if by "Metering Point" it essentially means MPAN in this document (which I think is the intent) then there would be 1 metering point if totalisation is taking place or 2 metering points if the feeders are not totalised.

Proposed text:



This is intended to represent a premise which may have several points of supply. In some circumstances these have been treated independently, in others they have been combined by “off-site totalisation” via the Meter Technical Details.

These metering arrangements may be half hourly or non-half hourly.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**7. Example 7: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Removed – Modern Meters combine Active Energy, Reactive Energy and Maximum Demand in a single solid state Meter. If this arrangement is for Half Hourly (including Profile Classes 5 to 8 (AMR)) it isn’t compliant as no communications or half hourly data recording options.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**8. Example 8: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Removed – Modern Meters combine Active Energy, Reactive Energy, Maximum Demand and time of use tariffs in a single solid state Meter. If this arrangement is for Half Hourly (including Profile Classes 5 to 8 (AMR)) it isn’t compliant as no communications or half hourly data recording options.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential



**9. Example 9: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Removed – Modern Meters combine Active Energy, Reactive Energy and Maximum Demand in a single solid state Meter. If this arrangement is for Half Hourly (including Profile Classes 5 to 8 (AMR)) it isn't compliant as no communications or half hourly data recording options. I don't see any reason to leave the legacy metering installed. Any reference to CALMU should be removed as this is a product of a particular manufacturer.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**10. Example 10: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Removed – There was a Metering and Data Collection Committee (MDC) Paper from 1998 that approved a recommendation on the use of Summation CTs to be prohibited for all new installations due to concerns around accuracy. Modern metering would have Maximum Demand and Reactive Energy done integral to the meter and not done separately.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**11. Example 11: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Removed – Modern Meters combine Active Energy, Reactive Energy and Maximum Demand in a single solid state Meter. If this arrangement is for Half Hourly (including Profile Classes 5 to 8 (AMR)) it isn't compliant as



no communications or half hourly data recording options. Any reference to CALMU should be removed as this is a product of a particular manufacturer.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**12. Example 12: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained and revised – Might want to make reference to SMETS Meters. SMETS Meters can cover both examples 12 and 13 dependent on the Service Request sent,

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**13. Example 13: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained and revised – Is it better to avoid a specific tariff in the title and just refer to the scenario (e.g. Non half hourly Meter: two or more rates). Might want to make reference to SMETS Meters. SMETS Meters can cover both examples 12 and 13 dependent on the Service Request sent,

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential



**14. Example 14: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained and revised – Is it better to avoid a specific tariff in the title [(a) and (b)] and just refer to the scenario (e.g. Register recording simultaneously). Also avoid descriptions of how the specific tariff operated and leave high level (e.g. unrestricted domestic supply circuit switching between “low” and “high rate”; separate controlled circuit for heating). Might want to make reference to SMETS Meters.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**15. Example 15: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**

Retained and revised – Might want to make reference to SMETS Meters.

**RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY**

Non-Confidential

**16. Example 16: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response**



<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Choose an item

<b>17. Example 17: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response</b>	
<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Choose an item

<b>18. Example 18: Should this example be retained as documented, revised or removed? Please provide rationale for your response</b>	
<p>Retained and revised – Embedded Exemptable Generation doesn't necessarily have to be CoP5. If CoP3 or above a check Meter is required. Would recommend making a) and b) for CoP5 and CoP10 and create a new c) and d) with a main and check meter for CoPs 1, 2 and 3.</p>	
<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

<b>19. What other metering point examples should be included within the guidance? Please provide rationale for your response</b>	
<p>See response to Example 18 and proposed c) and d)</p>	



<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

<b>20. Do you have any other comments relating to the introduction of the ‘Guidance on Metering Points’ as new Category 3 product?</b>	
<p>Might be worth being clear in each example whether it is for half hourly or non-half hourly.</p>	
<b>RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	Non-Confidential

<b>21. “Totalisation” is the summation of multiple feeders under one MPAN (where no differencing takes place) and is allowable under Section 4.9 “Guide to Complex Sites” of BSCP502. The draft ‘Guidance on Metering Points’ document does not account for this and suggests that a one-to-one relationship between feeders and MPANs is required. Totalising multiple feeders has been in practice for many years and Half Hourly Data Collectors regularly summate multiple meters on different feeders under one MPAN as standard. The Code Manager is proposing to include totalisation within the ‘Guidance on Metering Points’ document, to remove any ambiguity and provide clarity that totalisation is allowable under both the BSC and the REC. Do you agree with the proposal to includes totalisation within the guidance document? If not, please explain why?</b>	
<p>We agree with the proposal.</p>	



RESPONSE CONFIDENTIALITY	Non-Confidential