

Appendix A Format for submissions: Switch process review issues paper

Submitter	Metrix
-----------	--------

Please answer the general questions once (Q1 and Q2).

For each individual issue you will be responding to (1 to 22), please answer questions Q3 to Q5. The template below has been started with the first two issues.

Question	Response
<i>General questions</i>	
Q1. Which, if any, of the 22 issues raised in this paper do you consider should not be investigated further? Please give reasons.	Q1. <i>No comments</i>

Question	Response
<p>Q2. Are there any issues not raised in this paper that you consider should be investigated? Please identify these other issues and give reasons why they should be investigated.</p>	<p><i>Q2. MEP nominations and metering event dates unable to occur independently:</i></p> <p><i>During an MEP switch, a Trader's delay in updating a proposed MEP can cause issues in updating the Registry. If a metering event date is recorded by the [unknowing] losing MEP before an MEP switch is made apparent, then it may need to be reversed to allow the Trader to nominate the gaining MEP from the physical date of install. An example of this is when a non-communicating meter is updated to show AMI Comms=N after the correct period, but a Trader has already organised for a meter change to occur with another MEP without updating the Registry. The losing MEP has no incentive to reverse the most recent time slice, but by not making the reversal update, is impeding other participants to comply with the Code.</i></p> <p><i>A greater encouragement of Traders updating Registry in parallel to raising service requests with gaining MEPs would greatly reduce this issue.</i></p>
<p><i>Issue #20</i></p>	
<p>Q3. How material is this issue?</p> <p>Q4. Is this issue getting worse?</p>	<p><i>Q3. Medium</i></p> <p><i>Q4. Not visible, however this impacts a small percentage of ICPs during switching.</i></p>

Question	Response
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	<i>Q5. For AMI metered sites, providing raw meter data within 10 business days should be achievable from the day the MEP is notified by the Registry. Issues can be caused in backdated switches, as mentioned in “shortcoming 3” or when an AMI meter is not communicating with the MEP’s back office system. Ideally when a Trader switch occurs, the MEP should provide backdated meter data from the ICP switch date if this is within a reasonable timeframe (e.g. <15 days).</i>
<i>Issue #21</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	<i>Q3. Potentially High</i>
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	<i>Q4. As more Traders and MEPs enter the market then this could continue to worsen due to increased variation between participants.</i>
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	<i>Q5. There has never been a standardised format. Meter reading file formats contain largely similar fields, so there is a certain standardisation based on what Trader systems can process.</i>
<i>Issue #22</i>	
Q3. How material is this issue?	<i>Q3. Medium</i>
Q4. Is this issue getting worse?	<i>Q4. Yes, the more MEPs providing HHR services will want to update their removal details on the Registry as per the date of the event change.</i>

Question	Response
Q5. Why do you think this issue is occurring?	<i>Q5. The Registry event system isn't very flexible. There is only one event possible for each date, and so only one MEP can update the data for each date. MEPs are also resistant to reversing removal details in the Registry, as this is not something that they see benefit in doing. If the losing MEP and the gaining MEP can make separate updates on the same event date, which are easily identifiable based on the previous metering event and the new proposed MEP; then manual reversal activity could be avoided.</i>